New York State Education Department

Renewal Site Visit Report
2018-2019

Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School

Visit Date: November 13-14, 2018
Date of Report: April 8, 2019

Charter School Office
89 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12234
charterschools@nysed.gov
518-474-1762

CONTENTS

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION **2**

METHODOLOGY **5**

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS **6**

Summary of Findings 8
Benchmark 1: Student Performance 9
Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning 16
Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate and Family Engagement 19
Benchmark 4: Financial Condition 21
Benchmark 5: Financial Management 23
Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance 25
Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity 27
Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements 29
Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention 30
Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance 32

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Charter School Summary[1]

Name of Charter School	Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School
Board Chair	Martha Revenaugh
District of location	NYC CSD 13
Opening Date	Fall 2014
Charter Terms	August 18, 2014 -June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	Grades 6-10/ 765 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	Grades 6-12/ 909 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	None
Facilities	• Chapel Street Campus, 40 Flatbush Avenue Extension, Brooklyn, New York 11201 (Private Space: Grades 6 - 8) • Sand Street Campus, 77 Sands Street Brooklyn, New York 11201 (Private Space: Grades 7-10) • Jay Street Campus, 240 Jay Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201 (Private Space: Afterschool Programming Assemblies, School Events, Administrative Office)
Mission Statement	*"Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School (LAB) prepares students, including English language learners, students with disabilities, and over-age under-credited students, with the academic foundation, digital literacy, and leadership skills necessary to excel in college and professional life as they grow as ethical leaders."*
Key Design Elements	• College-preparatory curriculum • Extended learning time • Building productive, engaged and active citizens • High expectations school culture • Data-driven instruction • Next generation learning and assessment
Requested Revisions	**Expand from serving Grades 6-10 with 765 students to serving Grades 6-12 with 909 students**

[1] The information in this section was provided by the NYS Education Department Charter School Office.

Noteworthy: To work toward meeting the needs of all scholars, Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School (Brooklyn Lab) indicates that it uses a range of research based instructional strategies to engage its students in high-quality instruction that includes academic tutoring by InnovateEdu fellows, structured, whole group instruction, and co-teaching. Staff indicated that real-time data is used to best understand the needs of students with school leadership and teaching staff reviewing student work and analyzing assessment data to provide students with scaffolded instruction and feedback. In 2016, Brooklyn Lab was awarded $10,000,000 over a five-year period for the XQ: Super School Project. The purpose was to build partnerships with local non-profits, cultural institutions, businesses, and universities to give students career experience.

Renewal Outcomes

Pursuant to the Board of Regents Renewal Policy, the following renewal outcomes are possible:

- **Full-Term Renewal:** A school's charter may be renewed for the maximum term of five years. For a school to be eligible for a full-term renewal, during the current charter term the school must have compiled a strong and compelling record of meeting or exceeding Benchmark 1, and at the time of the renewal analysis, have met substantially all other performance benchmarks in the Framework.

- **Short-Term Renewal:** A school's charter may be renewed for a shorter term, typically of three years. As discussed above, the Regents will place an even greater emphasis on student performance for schools applying for their second or subsequent renewal**,** which is consistent with the greater time that a school has been in operation and the corresponding increase in the quantity and quality of student achievement data that the school has generated. In order for a school to be eligible for short-term renewal, a school must either:

  (a) have compiled a mixed or limited record of meeting Benchmark 1, but at the time of the renewal analysis, have met substantially all of the other performance benchmarks in the Framework which will likely result in the school's being able to meet Benchmark 1 with the additional time that short-term renewal permits, **or**

  (b) have compiled an overall record of meeting Benchmark 1; but falls far below meeting one or more of the other performance benchmarks in the Framework.

- **Non-Renewal:** A school's charter will not be renewed if the school does not apply for renewal or the school fails to meet the criteria for either full-term or short-term renewal. In the case of non-renewal, a school's charter will be terminated upon its expiration and the school will be required to comply with the Charter School Office's Closing Procedures to ensure an orderly closure by the end of the school year.

Please Note: The Regents may include additional terms, conditions, and/or requirements in a school's Full-Term or Short-Term Renewal charter to address specific situations or areas of concern. For example, a school may meet the standards for full-term renewal or short-term renewal with regard to its educational success; but may be required to address organizational deficiencies that need to be corrected but do not prevent the Regents from making the required legal findings for renewal. A school may also meet the standards for full-term renewal or short-term renewal of only a portion of its educational program (e.g., for the elementary school program, but not the middle school program).

Such additional terms and/or requirements may include, but are not limited to, restrictions on the number of students and grades to be served by the school, additional student performance metrics, heightened reporting requirements, or specific corrective action.

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

Current Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2014 to 2015	**Year 2 2015 to 2016**	**Year 3 2016 to 2017**	**Year 4 2017 to 2018**	**Year 5 2018 to 2019**
Grade Configuration	Grades 6	Grades 6 - 7	Grades 6 - 8	Grades 6 - 9	Grades 6 - 10
Total Approved Enrollment	132	249	479	700	765

***Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Revision of Enrollment Requested by the School**

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	**Year 2 2020 to 2021**	**Year 3 2021 to 2022**	**Year 4 2022 to 2023**	**Year 5 2023 to 2024**
Grade Configuration	Grades 6-11	Grades 6 - 12	Grades 6 - 12	Grades 6 - 12	Grades 6 - 12
Total Approved Enrollment	865	909	909	909	909

***This proposed chart was submitted by Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School in its renewal application. It is subject to change pending the final recommendation and approval by the Board of Regents.**

METHODOLOGY

A two-day renewal site visit was conducted at Brooklyn Lab on November 13-14, 2018. The New York State Education Department's Charter School Office (CSO) team conducted interviews with the board of trustees, school leadership team, student support team, teachers, parents and students. In cooperation with school leadership, the CSO administered an anonymous online survey to teachers.

The team conducted 36 classroom observations in Grades 6-10. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length and conducted jointly with instructional leaders.

The documents and data reviewed by the team before, during, and after the site visit included the following:

- **Renewal Application**
- **Academic data**
- **Renewal Site Visit Workbook**
- **Current organizational chart**
- **A master school schedule**
- **Map of school with room numbers and teacher names**
- **Board materials (roster, minutes)**
- **Board self-evaluation processes and documents**
- **Student/family handbook**
- **Staff handbook and personnel policies**
- **A list of major assessments**
- **Teacher and administrator evaluation processes**
- **Interventions offered at the school**
- **School-conducted surveys of teachers, parents, and/or students, and/or NYC DOE surveys**
- **Professional development plans and schedules**
- **Efforts towards achieving enrollment and retention targets**
- **School submitted Annual Reports**

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

The Performance Framework, which is part of the oversight plan included in the Charter Agreement for each school, outlines 10 Performance Framework benchmarks in three key areas of charter school performance:

- Educational Success
- Organizational Soundness
- Faithfulness to Charter and Law

Observational findings from the review of the renewal application, supporting data, and the site visit will be presented in alignment with the Performance Framework benchmarks and Indicators according to the rating scale below, although not all indicators will necessarily be assessed on every site visit. A brief summary of the school's strengths will precede the benchmark analysis. Each benchmark will be rated; however, the report narrative will highlight those indicators not fully met by the school.

Level	Description
Exceeds	The school meets the performance benchmark; potential exemplar in this area.
Meets	The school generally meets the performance benchmark; few concerns are noted.
Approaches	The school does not meet the performance benchmark; a number of concerns are noted.
Falls Far Below	The school falls far below the performance benchmark; significant concerns are noted.

For the site visit conducted November 13-14, 2018 at Brooklyn Lab, see the following Performance Framework benchmark ratings and discussion.

New York State Education Department
Charter School Performance Framework Rating

	Performance Benchmark	Level
Educational Success	**Benchmark 1: Student Performance:** The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic trends toward proficiency, proficiency and high school graduation. At all grade levels and all assessments, scoring proficiently means achieving a performance level of 3 or higher (high school Regents and Common Core Regents exam score of 65 or higher).	Approaches
	Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning: School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students' well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLS) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.	Approaches
	Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Family Engagement: The school has systems in place to support students' social and emotional health and to provide for a safe and respectful learning environment. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school's academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.	Meets
Organizational Soundness	**Benchmark 4: Financial Condition:** The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.	Meets
	Benchmark 5: Financial Management: The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls and procedures, and in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.	Approaches
	Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance: The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.	Approaches
	Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity: The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure, clearly delineated roles for staff, management, and board members. The school has systems and protocols that allow for the successful implementation, evaluation, and improvement of its academic program and operations.	Meets
Faithfulness to Charter & Law	**Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements:** The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.	Meets
	Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention: The school is meeting or making annual progress toward meeting the enrollment plan outlined in its charter and its enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced priced lunch program; or has demonstrated that it has made extensive good faith efforts to attract, recruit, and retain such students.	Approaches
	Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance: The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.	Falls Far Below

Summary of Findings

Brooklyn Lab is in year five of operation and serves students in Grades 6-10. During its current charter term, the school is rated in the following manner: meeting 4 benchmarks, approaching 5 benchmarks, and falling far below 1 benchmark. Additional details regarding those ratings are provided below.

Areas of Strengths: The school has developed a school culture where students feel safe and adults feel they have input and opportunities to grow. The school enrolls a significant percentage of students with disabilities, and provides a range of services and programs to students with disabilities, including a 12:1:1 classroom setting. The school employs a large staff, and has a Fellowship program that provides middle school students with two periods of small group instruction/tutoring daily and frequent opportunities for co-teaching. The school also operates a Residency program to develop novice teachers. The school appears to have a new leadership team that share a common vision. The school has adopted new curriculum and The New Teacher Project (TNTP) framework for teaching and instructional leadership; and is focusing on norming expectations for quality instruction and teacher supervision as reported by Brooklyn Lab staff.

Areas in Need of Improvement: The school has not yet consistently met the academic expectations identified in the Performance Framework benchmark standards. Instructional rigor and student engagement was not observed to be consistent during the site visit classroom observations. The board appears unaware of several longstanding compliance issues, as detailed in other sections of this report. Throughout the charter term, the board has failed to consistently provide sufficient oversight in regard to fiscal management, statutory and regulatory facility requirements, and ensuring enrollment targets have been met as described below. With regard to enrollment, and in comparison to NYC CSD 13 (district of location) for English language learners (ELLs)/multi-lingual learners (MLLs) and for economically disadvantaged (ED) students, the school is below the NYC CSD 13 grade level specific average in the school years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018.

Benchmark 1: Student Performance

The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic trends toward proficiency, proficiency and high school graduation. At all grade levels and all assessments, scoring proficiently means achieving a performance level of 3 or higher (high school Regents and Common Core Regents exam score of 65 or higher).

Finding: Approaches

In its charter, Brooklyn Lab is designed as a college preparatory middle and high school. It is focused on every student taking an Advanced Placement (AP) course in high school and has initiated pre-AP instruction to prepare students for that requirement. The school uses co-teaching to provide differentiated learning opportunities with an emphasis on small group instruction. The school supports a fellowship program that provides all students with daily small group or 1:1 tutoring by recent college graduates, which provides a pipeline of potential candidates for its teacher residency program. The school has adopted the New Teacher Project (TNTP) framework for teaching and leadership.

The school offers integrated co-teaching (ICT) and 12:1:1 settings. According to interviewed school leaders, the latter utilizes adapted general education curriculum with shared but modified lessons. School leaders also reported that they have experimented more with pull-out to provide sheltered instruction for English language learners (ELLs)/multi-lingual learners (MLLs).

During its focus group, school leaders noted many of their incoming 6th grade students scored at levels 1 and 2 on NYS testing in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics, and that performance increases in Grades 7 and 8. School leaders also noted that last year they enrolled more economically disadvantaged, students with IEPs, and homeless students. Brooklyn Lab states that they have a different student population compared to the overall NYC CSD 13. They also contend that that the school enrolls more high needs students with disabilities, including more students with 12:1:1 settings in their IEPs and students formerly enrolled in NYC District 75 schools (See Benchmark 9).

While 20.57% of students come from NYC CSD 13, which is the school's district of location, 19.78% of students, almost as many as the school's district of location, come from neighboring NYC CSD 17. Therefore, comparisons are made to both CSDs although the primary district of comparison remains the school district of location, NYC CSD 13.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 1:

<u>Indicator 1: All Schools</u>

1.a.i. Accountability - ESEA Accountability Designation:
The school's ESEA Accountability Designation for 2017-18 was Good Standing.

1.b.i. Similar Schools Comparison – Comparative Proficiency:
In ELA and math, Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School students did tend to outperform students in the majority of schools with similar grade spans and demographics.

As noted above, while 20.57% of students come from NYC CSD 13, which is the school's district of location, 19.78% of students come from NYC CSD 17, almost matching the percentage of students residing in the school's district of location.

Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

2.a.i. Trending Toward Proficiency – Aggregate Standards-Based Trend Toward Proficiency:
In 2015-2016, 61% of students attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in ELA. In 2016-2017, the rate was 43%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 43%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

In 2015-2016, 52% of students attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in math. In 2016-2017, the rate was 32%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 37%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

2.a.ii. Trending Toward Proficiency - Subgroup Standards-Based Trend Toward Proficiency:
In 2015-2016, 37% of students with disabilities attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in ELA. In 2016-2017, the rate was 27%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 33%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework. In 2015-2016, 34% of students with disabilities attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in math. In 2016-2017, the rate was 18%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 26%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

In 2016-2017, 44% of English language learners/multi-lingual learners attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in ELA. In 2017-2018, the rate was 23%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework. In 2016-2017, 11% of ELLs/MLLs attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in math. In 2017-2018, the rate was 31%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

In 2015-2016, 53% of economically disadvantaged students attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in ELA. In 2016-2017, the rate was 38% and in 2017-2018, the rate was 42%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework. In 2015-2016, 43% of economically disadvantaged students attending Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School were trending towards proficiency in math. In 2016-2017, the rate was 26%, and 35% in 2017-2018. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

2.b.i. Proficiency - Aggregate School Level Proficiency for All Students: See Table 1 below.

Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: School, District & NYS Level Aggregates: NYC CSD 13

	ELA					Math				
	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS
2014-2015	25%	18%	+7	31%	-6	25%	16%	+9	39%	-14
2015-2016	41%	25%	+16	35%	+6	38%	19%	+19	38%	0
2016-2017	31%	31%	0	40%	-9	23%	18%	+5	34%	-11
2017-2018	33%	40%	-7	46%	-13	25%	26%	-1	40%	-15

NOTE:
(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: School, District & State Level Aggregates: NYC CSD 17

	ELA					Math				
	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS
2014-2015	25%	22%	+3	31%	-6	25%	25%	0	39%	-14
2015-2016	41%	28%	+13	35%	+6	38%	24%	+14	38%	0
2016-2017	31%	34%	-3	40%	-9	23%	21%	+2	34%	-11
2017-2018	33%	43%	-10	46%	-13	25%	30%	-5	40%	-15

NOTE:
(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

2.b.ii. Proficiency – Subgroup School Level Proficiency: See Tables 3 and 4 below.

NOTE: A "." In any table indicates that the data is suppressed, no student sat for the exam, or the exam was not given. While 20.57% of students come from NYC CSD 13, which is the school's district of location, 19.78% of students come from NYC CSD 17. Data for both districts are presented in the tables below since such a high percentage of students reside in NYC CSD 17, almost matching the percentage of students residing in the school's district of location.

Table 3: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup: NYC CSD 13

Subject	School Year	*Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)*	*ELL/MLL (Variance to the district of location)*	*Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)*
ELA	2014-2015	5% (-1)	. .	19% (+6)
	2015-2016	16% (+6)	14% (+9)	33% (+14)
	2016-2017	13% (-1)	10% (+5)	26% (+2)
	2017-2018	17% (0)	21% (+5)	29% (-4)
Mathematics	2014-2015	5% (-3)	. .	22% (+11)
	2015-2016	17% (+6)	14% (+8)	30% (+15)
	2016-2017	9% (0)	10% (+2)	16% (+3)
	2017-2018	12% (+1)	21% (+8)	22% (+4)

NOTES:
(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.
(2) For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.
(3) In some cases, student subgroups still did not have enough tested students to form a representative sample (<5 students). For these subgroups testing data was withheld.

Table 4: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup: NYC CSD 17

Subject	School Year	*Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)*	*ELL/MLL (Variance to the district of location)*	*Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)*
ELA	2014-2015	5% (+1)	. .	19% (-3)
	2015-2016	16% (+9)	14% (+5)	32% (+5)
	2016-2017	13% (+2)	10% (+2)	26% (-7)
	2017-2018	17% (0)	21% (+1)	29% (-13)
Mathematics	2014-2015	5% (-1)	. .	22% (-3)
	2015-2016	17% (+9)	14% (0)	30% (+7)
	2016-2017	9% (+2)	10% (+2)	16% (-5)
	2017-2018	12% (+2)	21% (+4)	22% (-7)

NOTES:
(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.
(2) For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.
(3) In some cases, student subgroups still did not have enough tested students to form a representative sample (<5 students). For these subgroups testing data was withheld.

2.b.iii. Proficiency – Grade Level Proficiency: See Tables 5 - 8 below.

Table 5: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: ELA: NYC CSD 13

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 13 / NYS
Grade 6	37%	24% / 34%	+13 / +3	15%	27% / 32%	-12 / -17	39%	39% / 49%	0 / -10
Grade 7	44%	27% / 35%	+17 / +9	32%	32% / 42%	0 / -10	22%	41% / 40%	-19 / -18
Grade 8	.	. / .	. / .	55%	34% / 45%	+21 / +10	42%	39% / 48%	+3 / -6

NOTES:
(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.
(2) In 2015-2016, the school did not serve Grade 8.

Table 6: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: ELA: NYC CSD 17

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 17 / NYS
Grade 6	37%	30% / 34%	+7 / +3	15%	24% / 32%	-9 / -17	39%	45% / 49%	-6 / -10
Grade 7	44%	25% / 35%	+19 / +9	32%	35% / 42%	-3 / -10	22%	38% / 40%	-16 / -18
Grade 8	.	. / .	. / .	55%	42% / 45%	+13 / +10	42%	47% / 48%	-5 / -6

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

(2) In 2015-2016, the school did not serve Grade 8.

Table 7: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: Mathematics: NYC CSD 13

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 13 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 13 / NYS
Grade 6	36%	23% / 40%	+13 / -4	22%	26% / 40%	-4 / -18	32%	27% / 44%	+5 / -12
Grade 7	41%	16% / 36%	+25 / +5	24%	17% / 38%	+7 / -14	19%	32% / 41%	-13 / -22
Grade 8	.	. / .	. / .	24%	6% / 22%	+18 / +2	26%	15% / 30%	+11 / -4

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

(2) In 2015-2016, the school did not serve Grade 8.

Table 8: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: Mathematics: NYC CSD 17

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Brooklyn Laboratory CS	NYC CSD 17 / NYS	Variance to NYC CSD 17 / NYS
Grade 6	36%	29% / 40%	+7 / -4	22%	29% / 40%	-7 / -18	32%	34% / 44%	-2 / -12
Grade 7	41%	19% / 36%	+22 / +5	24%	18% / 38%	+6 / -14	19%	25% / 41%	-6 / -22
Grade 8	.	. / .	. / .	24%	17% / 22%	+7 / +2	26%	29% / 30%	-3 / -4

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

(2) In 2015-2016 the school did not serve Grade 8.

Over the five-year charter term, Brooklyn Lab has administered the NYS English Language Arts and mathematics assessments to students in Grades 3-8 as well as both the Regents Common Core Algebra I exam and Living Environment. Table 9 below compares the schools' student performance with New York State outcomes. Sixteen students took the Algebra I exam and 81% of those students scored proficient in comparison to 70% proficiency across the state. A little over half of the 108 students who took the Living Environment exam scored proficient with students in all subgroups performing below the state proficiency rate.

Table 9: 2017-2018 Annual Regents Outcomes by Subgroup

		Total Charter Tested	Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School	NYS	Variance to NYS
Algebra I (Common Core)	All Students	16	81%	70%	+11
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	100%	60%	+40
Living Environment	All Students	108	56%	73%	-17
	Students with Disabilities	33	39%	44%	-5
	ELL/MLL	6	33%	44%	-10
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	52%	62%	-11

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents students within their respective subgroups who passed the Annual Regents and Regents

Common Core Examinations (score of 65 or better).

(2) *For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.*

(3) *In some cases, student subgroups still did not have enough tested students to form a representative sample (<5 students). For these subgroups the testing data was withheld.*

Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning

School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students' well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLS) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.

Finding: Approaches

Element	*Indicators*
1. *Curriculum*	a. The school has a documented curriculum that is aligned to the NYSLS. b. Teachers use unit and lesson plans that introduce complex materials, stimulate higher order thinking, and build deep conceptual understanding and knowledge around specific content. c. The curriculum is aligned horizontally across classrooms at the same grade level and vertically between grades. d. The curriculum is differentiated to provide opportunities for all students to master grade-level skills and concepts.
2. *Instruction*	a. The school staff has a common understanding of high-quality instruction, and observed instructional practices align to this understanding. b. Instructional delivery fosters engagement with all students.
3. *Assessment and Program Evaluation*	a. The school uses a balanced system of formative, diagnostic and summative assessments. b. The school uses qualitative and quantitative data to inform instruction and improve student outcomes. c. The school uses qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the academic program, and modifies the program accordingly.
4. *Supports for Diverse Learners*	a. The school provides supports to meet the academic needs for all students, including but not limited to: students with disabilities, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students. b. The school has systems to monitor the progress of individual students and facilitate communication between interventionists and classroom teachers regarding the needs of individual students.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 2:

1. Element: ***Curriculum***:
    - **Indicator a:** The school has a documented curriculum in place, including use of EngageNY, a newly implemented math program (Illustrative Mathematics) beginning in the 2018-2019 school year, and with other curriculum programs and resources. During the school leadership focus group, school leaders indicated that they were designing some of their curriculum, such as the middle school writing curriculum that incorporates social studies content and science; and is piloting high school pre-AP courses in partnership with the College Board. Based on the NYSED teacher survey, 93% of teachers reported that the school has a documented curriculum that is aligned to the New York State learning standards.
    - **Indicator b:** The quality of observed lesson plans varied. Most had clear learning objectives, though not all addressed higher order thinking and conceptual understanding, based on CSO team observations and follow-up conversations with accompanying school leaders. Instructional leaders acknowledged some teachers need to work on rigor of content. School leaders described next steps as increasing teacher familiarity with new curriculum and deepening teacher-created curriculum.
    - **Indicator c:** School leaders reported working to align the middle and high school programs with the College Board AP for All framework and SAT assessment expectations. On the NYSED teacher survey, 89% of teachers felt the curriculum is horizontally and vertically aligned. Students interviewed during the site visit described the small group instruction (SGI) periods as providing helpful individualized support, but also reported that it is not always aligned with classroom learning.
    - **Indicator d:** The school uses small group instruction within class lessons to differentiate instruction as well as daily small group and one on one tutoring sessions. Surveyed teachers noted the use of data to identify mastery of standard and subsequently differentiate pacing, reteach, and adjust curriculum.

2. Element: ***Instruction***:
    - **Indicator a:** Most observed classes had clear learning objectives, and many objectives and tasks were challenging. However, lessons were not always effectively structured and delivered so students could access the curriculum. One example of such type of a lesson did not show the teacher providing clear guidance on the math concept, or set-up necessary for solving a challenging word problem. The accompanying instructional leader noted working with the teacher to improve delivery of instruction by developing clear access for individual practice. While school leaders described the goal of student-directed learning and higher order thinking, observed instruction did not always support this. For example, instructional leaders noted pushing teachers to give students more ownership and independent work. In addition, some classes were primarily procedural with little opportunity for learning higher order thinking skills. In one class when a student asked a "why" question, the teacher responded "because it's the rule" rather than address conceptual understanding. When another student asked if they needed to memorize the rule, the teacher responded that it is on a reference sheet.
    - **Indicator b:** The school has adopted a co-teaching model and multiple adults were observed in many classrooms. Nevertheless, despite relatively small classes (typically 20 or less), students were not consistently engaged by instruction in all classes. For example, in some

observed classrooms not all students understood the task and sat waiting for assistance while other students finished tasks and sat with nothing to do. Teachers' skill with classroom management also varied. In some classes teachers quickly and effectively re-directed off-task behavior while in other classes students ignored teacher directions, used computers inappropriately, or engaged in off-topic conversations. A teacher was also observed actively ignoring disruptive behavior during guided practice with few students on task during independent practice. The school provides daily small group instruction (SGI) provided by fellows and most observed tutoring was engaging.

3. Element: ***Assessment and Program Evaluation***:
   - **Indicator a:** The school has a system of assessments in place. These include curriculum-based assessments; interim assessments administered every 6-8 weeks as well as the NWEA MAP assessments three times per year. Interviewed students reported that the MAP tests inform them of their status are so they can set goals. Interviewed school leaders and faculty described a variety of formative assessment strategies used to inform instruction, including Do Nows, exit tickets, quizzes, questioning, and conferencing.
   - **Indicator b:** Surveyed teachers indicated that they use data to inform grouping, target instruction, modify pacing, and differentiate materials and activities. Interviewed school leaders and faculty described using grade team meetings and professional learning communities (PLCs) to examine student performance data and plan instruction and interventions. For example, two deans described monitoring student performance in order to develop curriculum for SGI fellows to use in their daily lessons with students. Checks for understanding were inconsistent in observed classroom lessons, and instructional leaders noted that this was an area of support for some teachers with a focus on "aggressive monitoring" of student performance.
   - **Indicator c:** According to the NYSED teacher survey, 91% of teachers felt the administration uses data from assessments to make school-wide decisions and interviewed school leaders were familiar with a variety of data points regarding academic growth and achievement, including disaggregated data to monitor subgroup performance. For example, the school has devoted resources to its 12:1:1 program to provide supports for high needs students with disabilities.

4. Element: ***Supports for Diverse Learners***:
   - **Indicator a:** Brooklyn Lab has a variety of supports in place for its students, including frequent co-teaching, daily SGI tutoring provided by the school's fellowship program, after school academic club, and integrated co-teaching (ICT) and 12:1:1 settings for student with disabilities. A daily independent practice period in the high school provides students with the opportunity to choose the assistance they need. The school has a robust student support staff, including tutors, social workers/counselors, and special education teachers. Interviewed staff indicated that they enroll few ELL/MLL students, most of whom are high functioning, and that services are coordinated on a case-by-case basis, e.g., assigning appropriate tutors. On the NYSED survey, 40% of teachers believe the school has a strong and effective program for ELLs/MLLs. Moreover, staff acknowledged little professional development regarding the needs of ELL/MLL students and English as a new language (ENL) is an area for growth.
   - **Indicator b:** The school has a variety of systems in place to monitor student needs and target supports. The scholar support services staff includes social workers, counselors and instructional leaders, who meet regularly in various teams and attend grade level teacher

team meetings as needed. Each campus has a special education coordinator who facilitates IEP development and coordinates staff communication about student needs. IEPs are available to pertinent staff via a secure internal drive and teachers are provided with a summary at the beginning of the year. Deans develop lessons for the SGI fellows based on classroom instruction, and fellows reported some interaction with teachers, e.g., via participation in the advisory program. However, interviewed students reported some disconnect between SGI and classroom learning. Deans are responsible for tracking data, including behavior and discipline, and a culture team comprised of deans and counselors regularly reviews data.

Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate and Family Engagement

The school has systems in place to support students' social and emotional health and to provide for a safe and respectful learning environment. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school's academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.

Finding: Meets

Element	*Indicators*
1. *Behavior Management and Safety*	a. The school has a clear approach to behavioral management, including a written discipline policy. b. The school appears safe and all school constituents are able to articulate how the school community maintains a safe environment. c. The school has systems in place to ensure that the environment is free from harassment and discrimination. d. Classroom environments are conducive to learning and generally free from disruption.
2. *Family Engagement and Communication*	a. Teachers communicate with parents to discuss students' strengths and needs. b. The school assesses family and student satisfaction using strategies such as surveys, feedback sessions, community forums, or participation logs, and considers results when making schoolwide decisions. c. The school has a systematic process for responding to parent or community concerns. d. The school shares school-level academic data with the broader school community to promote transparency and accountability among parents, students and school constituents.
3. *Social-Emotional Supports*	a. School leaders collect and use data to track the socio-emotional needs of students. b. School leaders collect and use data regarding the impact of programs designed to support students' social and emotional health.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 3:

1. Element: ***Behavior Management and Safety***:
    - **Indicator a:** Brooklyn Lab has a clear, written discipline policy, which is published in the school's Scholar and Family Handbook. Interviewed students described a discipline system with clear consequences, such as detention and in-school suspension. More than 90% of teachers reported via the NYSED survey that there is "a uniform expectation for all teachers' classroom management" in the school. Interviewed staff reported that this is the school's first explicit year using restorative justice practices and support staff indicated that the school is working to define its restorative strategies, such as de-escalation and mediation. Support staff also noted a "big push to minimize suspensions" using mediations and resets to return students quickly to class. Interviewed students also reported that discipline frequently involved reflective activities. Finally, members of the culture team described encouragement of positive affirmation and increased accountability for teachers to build relationships with their students.
    - **Indicator b:** Interviewed parents and students uniformly described the school as safe, noting the role of deans, cameras and "a lot of adults" in the buildings. Students reported that teachers could remove students from classrooms with assistance from deans and directors, and suspensions were used for serious incidents. Parents noted that staff watched over their children even outside of the school, walking students to buses and trains.
    - **Indicator c:** According to the NYSED survey, two-thirds of teachers felt the school "is generally free of bullying, discrimination, and harassment for students." Surveyed teachers reported covering the issue of harassment and bullying in their advisory program curriculum, and that grade teams and deans handle incidents immediately through disciplinary consequence, restorative justice practices and parent involvement.
    - **Indicator d: N**early one-third of teachers surveyed by NYSED did not feel "school-wide discipline policy is consistently applied" and observed classrooms indicated a lack of consistency in implementation. For example, in some classes the majority of students were on task and effectively re-directed when they went off task. In other classrooms, students were allowed to be off-task without consequence or students defied teacher attempts at re-direction. Interviewed students also described classroom management as inconsistent and indicated that some students disrupted instruction without effective responses from teachers. In addition, according to the NYSED survey, 38% of teachers felt attendance is an issue at the school.

2. Element: ***Family Engagement and Communication***:
    - **Indicator a:** Interviewed parents reported frequent communication with the school, noting frequent e-mail, text and in-person conversations with teachers and staff. They felt encouraged to come in to the school to meet with teachers and noted that they receive both positive and negative feedback about their child. The school also provides regular progress reports and its Cortex system provides access to grades, assignments, and test scores.
    - **Indicator b:** The school administers surveys to both students and families. Interviewed parents described the school as open and welcoming and school staff noted an open-door policy and frequent communication between teachers and parents.
    - **Indicator c:** Interviewed parents said they are encouraged to come into the school and talk to their child's teachers and other staff. They also described the school's deans as a point of contact and described support staff as available and responsive.

- **Indicator d:** Interviewed parents were not familiar with the school's overall academic performance. They indicated monthly meetings and e-mails addressed the school's performance; and described the school as a "work in progress."

3. Element: ***Social-Emotional Supports***:
   - **Indicator a:** 84% of teachers (via NYSED survey) reported that the school has systems in place to support students' social-emotional needs. The school has a structured social emotional development program, including a course called Foundations of Leadership with curriculum developed by counselors. Observed lessons covered a range of topics, including promotion of a positive, safe learning culture, mindfulness and emotional regulation. Student engagement varied widely across observed classes. At the middle school level, teachers lead advisory classes that reportedly address topics such as conflict and coping skills.
   - **Indicator b:** According to the NYSED survey, 71% of teachers reported that the school collects and uses data to track the social-emotional needs of all students. The school uses Deans List software to track social emotional data, as well as behavior and intervention plans and more informal grade team meeting notes.

Benchmark 4: Financial Condition

The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.

Finding: Meets

Important Notes:

- The key financial indicators used to evaluate this benchmark will be presented within a separate fiscal dashboard instrument that will provide context for the school's performance on each of the metrics, outline the specific targets for each metric, and also provide additional subsidiary detail on each calculation.
- Unless otherwise indicated, financial data is derived from the school's annual independently audited financial statements.

1. Near-Term Indicators:	
1a.	Current Ratio
1b.	Unrestricted Days Cash
1c.	Enrollment Variance
1d.	Composite Score
2. Sustainability Indicators:	
2a.	Total Margin
2b.	Debt to Asset Ratio
2c.	Debt Service Coverage Ratio

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 4:

Financial Condition

Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School appears to be in good financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements.

The Charter School Office reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school's capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to asset ratio, are measures of the charter school's capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.

Overall Financial Outlook

A *composite score* is an overall measure of financial health calculated by the Department's Office of Audit Services. This score is based on a weighting of primary reserves, equity, and net income. A charter school with a score between 1.5 and 3.0 is considered to be in strong financial health. Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School's 2016-2017 composite score is 2.8.

Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School's Composite Scores
2014-2015 to 2016-2017

Year	*Composite Score*
2014-2015	0.8
2015-2016	2.5
2016-2017	2.8

Source: NYSED Office of Audit Services

Near-Term Indicators

Near-term indicators of financial health are used to understand the current financial performance and viability of the school. The Charter School Office uses three measures:

The *current ratio* is a financial ratio that measures whether or not a charter school has enough resources to pay its debts over the next 12 months. The ratio is mainly used to give an idea of the school's ability to pay back its short-term liabilities (debt and payables) with its short-term assets (cash, inventory, receivables). The higher the current ratio, the more capable the school is of paying its obligations, with a ratio under 1.0 indicating concern. For 2016-2017, Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School had a current ratio of 3.8.

Unrestricted cash measures, in days, whether the charter school can meet operating expenses without receiving new income. Charter schools typically strive to maintain at least 90 days of cash on hand. For fiscal year 2016-2017, Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School operated with 122 days of unrestricted cash.

Enrollment maximization measures whether or not a charter school is meeting its enrollment projections, thereby generating sufficient revenue to fund ongoing operations. Actual enrollment that is

over 85 percent is considered reasonable. Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School's enrollment maximization for 2016-2017 was at 94 percent.

Long-Term Indicators

A charter school's *debt to asset ratio* measures the extent to which the school relies on borrowed funds to finance its operations. It is calculated as total liabilities divided by total assets. A ratio of 0.9 or less meets a standard of low risk. For 2016-2017, Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School's debt to asset ratio was 0.6.

Total margin measures the deficit or surplus a charter school yields out of its total revenues; in other words, whether or not the school is living within its available resources. Total margin is calculated as net income divided by total revenue. A total margin that is positive indicates low risk. For 2016-2017, Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School's total margin was 6 percent.

Benchmark 5: Financial Management

The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls and procedures, and in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.

Finding: Approaches

Renewal is based on evidence that the following indicators are generally present:

1. The school has an accurate and functional accounting system that includes monthly budgets.
2. The school sets budget objectives and regularly analyzes its budget in relation to those objectives.
3. The school has allocated budget surpluses in a manner that is fiscally sound and directly attends to the social and academic needs of the students attending the school.
4. The school has and follows a written set of fiscal policies.
5. The school has complied with state and federal financial reporting requirements.
6. The school has and is maintaining appropriate internal controls and procedures.
7. The school follows generally accepted accounting principles as evidenced by independent financial audits with an unqualified audit opinion, a limited number of findings that are quickly corrected, and the absence of a going concern disclosure.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 5:

The NYSED CSO reviewed the 2014-2015 audited financial statements and management letter issued to the school; and noted the three suggestions for improvement within the management letter. As per its charter agreement, the school was required to complete a corrective action plan, within 30 days of receipt of the CSO letter dated January 6, 2016. to address weaknesses or problems identified in the annual financial audit. The identified areas cover general ledger maintenance and account analysis, banking information, and payroll processing. The school responded on January 22, 2016. Based on internal control issues and suggestions for improvement, the charter school office conducted a fiscal site visit in February 2016. While on site, three internal control issues were tested: general ledger

maintenance and account analysis, payroll processing, and related party concerns. Additionally, the charter school office site visit team met with board members. During the discussion the board agreed to provide additional fiscal oversight; and agreed to work directly with the school's contracted accounting firm relating to items of concern. The board response to a corrective action plan in June 2016 for each of the noted concerns.

As indicated in the final 2016-2017 mid-term site visit report, the CSO indicated that it reviewed Brooklyn Lab's 2015-2016 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any current deficiencies in internal controls, demonstrating improvement from the prior year. The CSO encouraged the board to continue to ensure strong conflict of interest policies are in place regarding the relationship between the school and InnovateEDU.

During the March 2017 mid-year site visit, the board and leadership confirmed that the school is in the process of making changes to its organizational structure to address previously noted concerns. For example, the board plans to add a Chief Operating Officer, who will report directly to a designated board member. The board stated that their primary candidate is the Founder and Executive Director of InnovateEDU, which is a company that provides services to the school. This raises additional internal control and conflict of interest concerns.

The CSO also reviewed Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School's 2016-2017 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses; however, additional concerns are noted elsewhere in this section. The school is currently being audited by the NYSED Office of Audit Services, and the report is expected to be finalized and released in the 2018-2019 school year.

The NYSED Child Nutrition Office (CNO) conducted an Administrative Review at the school during the 2017-2018 school year. The review resulted in the school having failed to accurately claim reimbursements from the NYSED CNO, necessitating reclamation of over $15,000 by NYSED. This fiscal action resulted from systemic meal counting and claiming errors.

Based on that Administrative Review, the NYSED CNO provided the school with an Administrative Review Report and Corrective Action Plan (CAP) form indicating the areas of non-compliance, technical assistance, and required corrective action plan(s). The NYSED CNO gave the school an Initial Corrective Action plan. The school was to submit corrective action to the NYSED CNO by April 29, 2018. That office notified the school on May 1, 2018 that it had not received corrective action documents and asked that it receive the information by May 4, 2018. A review of the documentation provided on May 4, 2018 resulted in the school not having satisfactorily implemented the agreed upon corrective action and the SFA was placed on reimbursement hold. The NYSED CNO then provided the school with necessary next steps.

In addition, several fiscal improprieties were brought to NYSED attention by the SUNY Charter School's Institute (CSI) when the school attempted to change authorizers. CSI conducted a financial review of Brooklyn Lab. Following the CSI review, a summary of findings were made regarding bank accounts, the Fiscal Policy and Procedures Manual, unaudited financial statements, the 2014 calendar year filed Federal tax return 990, related party transactions, outside financial service provider, and the InnovateEDU Federal Tax return. Documents utilized during CSI's review included:

1) Federal tax returns for both the charter school and InnovateEDU;
2) Unaudited financial statements for the charter school;
3) Marked up fiscal policy and procedures manual for the charter school that states it was approved by the board in July 2015;
4) 501(c)3 exempt status notification with Federal EIN assignment for both charter school and InnovateEDU; and
5) Documents provided to the Institute through the SSF Grant process including expenditure detail.

Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance

The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.

Finding: Approaches

Element	*Indicators*
1. Board Oversight and Governance	a. The board recruits and selects board members with skills and expertise that meet the needs of the school. b. The board engages in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting priorities and goals that are aligned with the school's mission and educational philosophy. c. The board demonstrates active oversight of the charter school management, fiscal operations and progress toward meeting academic and other school goals. d. The board regularly updates school policies. e. The board utilizes a performance-based evaluation process for evaluating school leadership, itself and providers. f. The board demonstrates full awareness of its legal obligations to the school and stakeholders.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 6:

1. Element: **Board Oversight and Governance**:
   - **Indicator a:** Brooklyn Lab's board of trustees possesses relevant expertise with which to govern the school, including charter school administration, real estate, philanthropy, finance, education, legal, and business. However, the board appears unaware of the reoccurring compliance issues, as detailed in other sections of this report.
   - **Indicator b:** The board recognizes that the school enrolls a challenging student population, indeed defines this as central to the school mission, but maintains its focus on absolute proficiency and college and career readiness. Interviewed board members indicated their priority is to "simplify, clarify and deepen" school practices and programs. They remain committed to the current model; but recognize the need to improve implementation through better vertical and horizontal alignment of the curriculum and alignment of the

tutoring program to classroom instruction. The board supported the school leader's adoption of the TNTP framework to develop consistency across grades and campuses.

- **Indicator c:** The board receives a dashboard of pertinent information at every meeting, though board members also indicated they had streamlined their board packet to focus on priorities. The board's academic committee monitors student performance, including data visualization and analysis of at-risk subgroups. Interviewed board members reported taking a "granular look at grades, campuses and subjects." The board is familiar with the school's performance, recognizes the need for consistent academic success and believes the school as a whole is "trending in the right direction." This belief is not supported by the school's latest state academic outcome measures which reflects that it has fallen below the minimum standards for renewal as set forth in Benchmark 1 of the Performance Framework, and aggregate proficiency has fallen below the district and the state in both ELA and math.
- **Indicator d:** The board uses a committee structure to review and revise policies. For example, the Academic Committee oversees staff and family handbooks while the Finance/Audit Committee is responsible for the school's Financial Policies and Procedures Manual.
- **Indicator e:** The board evaluates the school leader using a school-created rubric and holds the leader accountable for meeting annual goals, renewal benchmarks, and talent development goals. The board also takes into consideration feedback from funding partners and other external experts. The school leader evaluates the remainder of the school's leadership team, but team members are present at board meetings and interact with board members through committees. Throughout the charter term, the school has experienced enrollment issues and school reported staff turnover, including the departure of principals in the first few years of the charter term. The board did not articulate a plan to review the reasons for staff departures, which may have had a negative overall impact on the school's academic performance. The board does not appear to review the effectiveness of the school's service providers; and did not articulate a process by which services handled by outside providers are evaluated to determine if they may be done in-house at reduced cost. For example, the school uses InnovateEDU, its largest service provider, to apply for certain grants which most other schools apply for directly. The board must find more effective means of monitoring school leadership and their service provider, InnovateEDU, and ensuring that the school is receiving the best value for services rendered.
- **Indicator f:** The board reports that it consults with legal counsel on its review and revision of policies and conducts an annual review of financial policies and procedures to ensure compliance with laws and regulations. However, the board did not acknowledge or appear to be aware of the school's extensive history of legal compliance issues. Throughout the charter term, the board has at times failed to provide sufficient oversight in regard to fiscal management, statutory and regulatory facility requirements, and ensuring enrollment targets have been met.

Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity

The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure, clearly delineated roles for staff, management, and board members. The school has systems and protocols that allow for the successful implementation, evaluation, and improvement of its academic program and operations.

Finding: Meets

Element	*Indicators*
1. School Leadership	a. The school has an effective school leadership team that obtains staff commitment to a clearly defined mission and set of goals, allowing for continual improvement in student learning. b. Roles and responsibilities for leaders, staff, management, and board members are clearly defined. Members of the school community adhere to defined roles and responsibilities. c. The school has clear and well-established communication systems and decision-making processes in place which ensure effective communication across the school. d. The school successfully recruits, hires, and retains key personnel, and makes decisions – when warranted – to remove ineffective staff members.
2. Professional Climate	a. The school is fully staffed with high quality personnel to meet all educational and operational needs, including finance, human resources, and communication. b. The school has established structures for frequent collaboration among teachers. c. The school ensures that staff has requisite skills, expertise, and professional development necessary to meet students' needs. d. The school has systems to monitor and maintain organizational and instructional quality—which includes a formal process for teacher evaluation geared toward improving instructional practice. e. The school has mechanisms to solicit teacher feedback and gauge teacher satisfaction.
3. Contractual Relationships ✓*N/A*	a. The board of trustees and school leadership establish effective working relationships with the management company or comprehensive service provider. b. Changes in the school's charter management or comprehensive service provider contract comply with required charter amendment procedures. c. The school monitors the efficacy of contracted service providers or partners.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 7:

1. Element: ***School Leadership***:
   - **Indicator a:** Brooklyn Lab Charter School has a newer large leadership team to manage a middle school and growing high school program across three campuses. The school has initiated a leadership boot camp to norm expectations and school leaders described a number of standing meetings with which they coordinate their school improvement efforts. The school has engaged TNTP to provide leadership development with a TNTP on site three days per week.

- **Indicator b:** Roles and responsibilities for leaders, staff, management, and board members are clearly defined. The school has a detailed organizational chart and interviewed stakeholders indicated clear lines of reporting and supervision. The school is located in three facilities and uses frequent leadership communication, subject specific leaders across sites, common professional development, and modeling between sites to connect the campuses. The school's administrative staff is organized into numerous teams, including a leadership team, school director and operations team, and instructional team that facilitate communication and decision-making across the campuses.
- **Indicator c:** The school has leadership positions associated with both campuses and subjects, and these staff members facilitate team meetings and provide coaching and modeling. School leaders also noted new "instructional walks" across campuses this year to norm leadership practices.
- **Indicator d:** The school had a teacher retention rate of 76% from last school year to this year; and interviewed school leaders reported that teacher departures was a combination of "our choice and their choice." Regarding administrative retention, which was 43% from the previous year, school leaders offered a number of reasons, including promotion to shared service team, mission alignment and school culture fit. They added that the school has made a large investment in leadership, including a summer boot camp. In addition, a TNTP coach is at the school three times per week to provide guidance to school directors and deans.

2. Element: ***Professional Climate***:
   - **Indicator a:** At the time of the renewal visit the school was staffed for all function areas, though the COO/CFO position was open. Because the school enrolls such a challenging student population, school leaders indicated that they believe they need to develop teachers rather than rely on traditional pipelines and have invested heavily in a fellowship program and residency program to attract and develop tutors and faculty. As a result, the school employees a relatively novice teaching force. According to the NYSED teacher survey, more than half of the school's teachers have three years or less teaching experience. As noted above, observed faculty did not demonstrate consistently high-quality instruction and classroom management. School leaders acknowledged "wide variation in the effectiveness of teachers," which informed their decision to engage TNTP to build capacity around explicit teaching and leading rubrics.
   - **Indicator b:** The school schedule supports frequent collaboration among teachers, including grade level team meetings, faculty meetings, and co-teacher planning. According to the NYSED survey, 96% of teachers felt faculty members frequently collaborate on matters of curriculum and instruction. Interviewed teachers described weekly team meetings used to review data, share materials and academic vocabulary, and discuss students of concern.
   - **Indicator c:** Through its fellows and residency programs the school employs a large number of novice teachers and provides them with ongoing professional development, including dedicated time on Wednesday afternoons as well as professional learning communities. Teachers reported receiving targeted training and feedback during weekly grade team meetings as well as department and other meetings. However, only 44% of teachers reported on the NYSED survey that their meetings are "recognized by all faculty as valuable." A number of teachers are also in a residency program through Relay that provides external training as well. Reviewed documents show a weekly scope and sequence for professional development including classroom "Look-fors" and instructional leaders were familiar with their teacher's strengths and areas for growth during classroom observations.

- **Indicator d:** The school has adopted TNTP rubrics for teaching and leadership and engaged TNTP to provide a coach to support implementation of instructional leadership practices. The TNTP consultant is working to norm teacher supervision and evaluation and pushing staff to evaluate student work for evidence of learning.
- **Indicator e:** The school administers internal surveys to gauge teacher concerns and satisfaction as well as the NYCDOE annual survey (though only 50% of teachers completed that survey last year). On the NYSED teacher survey, 96% believe school leadership has systems in place to solicit staff feedback. Surveyed teachers also listed multiple avenues to raise issues, including through grade level team discussions, communication with instructional leaders and deans, and the Dean's List app. Interviewed teachers described a responsive administration, noting a new schedule that made them feel like teacher input was heard. Furthermore, on the NYSED survey, 93% of teachers felt Brooklyn Lab Charter School is a long-term, sustainable option as a place to work.

3. Element: ***Contractual Relationships***:
   - **Indicator a:** Brooklyn Lab Charter School has a contract with InnovateEDU, which coordinates the school's fellowship program to provide daily tutoring, the after-school program, and designed the school's online learning platform Cortex.
   - **Indicator b:** NA
   - **Indicator c:** The board states that they ensure that all service contracts are monitored and evaluated.

Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements

The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.

Finding: Meets

Element	*Indicators*
1. *Mission and Key Design Elements*	a. School stakeholders share a common and consistent understanding of the school's mission and key design elements outlined in the charter. b. The school has fully implemented the key design elements in the approved charter and in any subsequently approved revisions.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 8:

1. Element: ***Mission and Key Design Elements***:
   - **Indicator a:** 88% of teachers reported via the NYSED survey that "the school's mission is clear and is shared by all stakeholders." Teachers understood the mission as college preparation, leadership development and career readiness. One surveyed teacher described the mission as "focused on supporting/knowing the whole student, meeting students where they are and supporting their academic growth." School leaders and board members both noted their commitment to serving at-risk youth while retaining high expectations for all students.

- **Indicator b:** The school has implemented a college preparatory curriculum with a focus on all students taking AP courses at the high school level. The school has increased learning time over district schools and is developing a data-driven culture. While the school prioritizes student-centered learning, it has not yet established consistent classroom management and rigorous instruction to achieve that goal.

Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention

The school is meeting or making annual progress toward meeting the enrollment plan outlined in its charter and its enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced priced lunch program; or has demonstrated that it has made extensive good faith efforts to attract, recruit, and retain such students.

Finding: Approaches

Element	*Indicators*
1. Targets are met	a. The school maintains sufficient enrollment demand for the school to meet or come close to meeting the enrollment plan outlined in the charter.
2. Targets are not met	a. The school is making regular and significant annual progress toward meeting the targets. b. The school has implemented extensive recruitment strategies and program services to attract and retain students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for free and reduced priced lunch. Strategies include; but are not limited to: outreach to parents and families in the surrounding communities, widely publicizing the lottery for such school, efforts to academically support these students, and enrollment policy revisions, such as employing a weighted lottery or enrollment preference, to increase the proportion of enrolled students from the three priority populations. c. The school has implemented a systematic process for evaluating recruitment and outreach strategies and program services for each of the three categories of students, and makes strategic improvements as needed.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

1. Element: ***Targets Are Not Met***:
   - The school has consistently been below the district of location (CSD 13) and CSD 17 since the 2014-2015 school year, in serving ELLs/MLLs and economically disadvantaged students.
   - School leaders described their commitment to an "equity agenda" by their focus on enrolling and retaining at-risk students, including low-income students from public housing and students with district 75 placement on their IEPs. The school backfills vacant seats in Grades 6-10. At the time of the evaluation visit, school leaders reported enrollment as 706 students, with 31% students with disabilities, 81% eligible for free and reduced-price lunch (but 100% meeting community eligibility program calculations), 5% ELLs/MLLs, and 11% are transient (homeless or in the foster care system). Regarding the small percentage of ELL/MLL students, school leaders noted that most ELL/MLL students in the district attend one single district school (Brooklyn International) and that they employ bilingual canvassers

to recruit ELL/MLL students and provide applications and marketing in multiple languages. Interviewed board members noted that enrollment is not where they want it to be, which they attribute to distraction by and uncertainty over their facility development, which they believe is now resolved.

Table 10 Student Demographics – Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School Compared to District of Location: NYC CSD 13

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School	NYC CSD 13	Variance	Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School	NYC CSD 13	Variance
Students with Disabilities	29%	27%	+2	30%	19%	+11
ELL/MLL	2%	7%	-5	2%	8%	-6
Economically Disadvantaged	65%	72%	-7	69%	73%	-4

NOTES:
(1) Data in the table above represents a comparison between those grades served in the charter school to only those same grades in the district.
(2) For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

According to NYSED data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 70% of students were retained in Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School compared with 75% in the district of location NYC CSD 13.

Table 11: Student Demographics – Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School Compared to NYC CSD 17

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School	NYC CSD 17	Variance	Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School	NYC CSD 17	Variance
Students with Disabilities	29%	20%	+9	30%	21%	+9
ELL/MLL	2%	10%	-8	2%	13%	-11
Economically Disadvantaged	65%	78%	-13	69%	83%	-14

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents a comparison between those grades served in the charter school to only those same grades in the district.

(2) For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance

The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.

Finding: Falls Far Below

Element	*Indicators*
1. *Legal Compliance*	a. The school has compiled a record of substantial compliance with applicable state and federal laws and the provisions of its charter including, but not limited to: those related to student admissions and enrollment; FOIL and Open Meetings Law; protecting the rights of students and employees; financial management and oversight; governance and reporting; and health and safety requirements. b. The school has undertaken appropriate corrective action when needed; and has implemented necessary safeguards to maintain compliance with all legal requirements. c. The school has sought Board of Regents and/or Charter School Office approval for significant revisions.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 10:

1. Element: ***Legal Compliance***:
    - **Indicator a:** Throughout the charter term, the school has had several legal compliance issues. These include, but are not limited to:
        - Serving children in the same grade at more than one site. This has been an ongoing issue the school received a letter of concern in March 2017. In April the school submitted a short-term plan to come into compliance; and then again in January 2018, it submitted a long-term plan to come in to compliance over a three-year period. This plan was approved by the NYSED CSO;
        - Attempting to combine the enrollment of its school with a separate charter school operated by the same education corporation. The school also had inaccurate and misleading information about the lottery and admissions process on its website which caused the CSO to reach out to the Executive Director and school principal to discuss the upcoming 2017 lottery. The school was attempting to combine enrollment of Brooklyn Lab with the Edmund W. Gordon Brooklyn Laboratory Charter School which was in its pre-opening phase. The CSO asked for written clarification and the school's board requested a planning year;
        - Failing to obtain certificates of occupancy as required; the CSO sent the school a March 2017 Notice of Concern;
        - After multiple attempts to obtain fire inspection documents from the school in 2017, NYSED facilitated the FDNY's inspection of the school, so that they obtained the required certificates. However, despite assurances that the school would remain in compliance, they failed to submit fire inspection documents as required in the 2018 annual report submission;
        - Was the only charter school in the state that failed to submit a report on corporal punishment, after months of NYSED follow-up. The school did not respond to repeated attempts—10 emails and 2 phone calls to submit their "Report of Incidents of Complaints About the Use of Corporal Punishment" which was due on January 15, 2019. The CSO was contacted and the CSO Executive Director reached out to the school's Executive Director on March 28, 2019. The school received confirmation that the report was received on March 28, 2019; and
        - In the spring 2019, and despite being contacted five times by the NYSED Office of ESSA-Funded Programs, the school has failed to respond to the federally mandated *2018-2019 Title I Supplement Not Supplant Survey*.
    - **Indicator b:** The school undertakes corrective action to address legal concerns. However, the school does not identify concerns internally, and does not undertake corrective actions independently. Instead, these actions are taken only when the school is confronted by NYSED, often repeatedly, and concerns are resolved only to the extent necessary to avoid adverse action. For example, the school abandoned its plan to hire the leader of InnovateEDU as COO after concerns regarding potential conflicts of interest and potential violations of the NYS General Municipal Law were raised. However, this same individual now directly reports to the board as an "advisor," which may cause continuing conflict of interest concerns. Likewise, when confronted with prohibited grade-splitting across multiple sites, the school submitted both a short and a long-term plan which corrects the issue over the course of three years (2018-2019 to 2020-2021).

- **Indicator c:** The school sought and received two material changes to its charter during the current term: it merged with another related school into a single education corporation, and reduced its maximum approved enrollment from 909 to 765 students.