Achievement First Brooklyn K-8 Charters

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 15, 2025

By Min Kwon

Charter Name	School Address	School Phone Number
Apollo	350 Linwood St Brooklyn, NY 11208	347-471-2620
Brownsville	2021 Bergen Street Brooklyn, NY 11233	347-471-2600
Bushwick	125 Covert St Brooklyn, NY 11207	347-471-2550
Endeavor	510 Waverly Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11238	718-622-5994
Legacy	118-49 Montauk Street Queens, NY 11412	347-471-2646
Linden	800 Van Siclen Ave Brooklyn, NY 11207	347-471-2700
North Brooklyn Prep	200 Woodbine Street Brooklyn, NY 11221	347-471-2690
Voyager	601 Parkside Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11226	347-471-2640

Michael Diaz, Associate Chief of Academics, and Meaghan Ross, Team Systems & Data Director, prepared this 2024-25 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the charter school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position	
	Office (e.g., chair, treasurer, secretary)	Committees (e.g., finance, executive)
Brandon Sorlie	Chair	Academic, Executive
Paul Cabana	Vice Chair	Executive
Christopher J. Lynch	Treasurer	Executive, Finance, Facilities
Akeem Frett	Secretary	Executive
Tamika Bradley	Parent Representative	Facilities
Romy Coquillette	Trustee/Member	Academic, Finance, Facilities
Desiree Dalton	Parent Representative	Academic
Andrea Kilpatrick	Trustee/Member	Academic
Erica Murphy	Trustee/Member	Academic
Kevin Miquelon	Trustee/Member	Facilities
David Pollack	Trustee/Member	Finance
Amy Arthur Samuels	Trustee/Member	Academic, Executive
Keith Brooks	Trustee/Member	Academic

School Leaders

Charter	Principal
Apollo	Jessica McDonald has served as the elementary school principal since 2023. D'Asia Adger has served as the middle school principal since 2024.
Brownsville	Ana Samper has served as the elementary school principal since 2021. Liz Hartnett has served as the middle school principal since 2024.
Bushwick	Courtney Saretzky has served as the elementary school principal since 2017. Samantha Jones has served as the middle school principal since 2022.
Endeavor	Colleen Young has served as the elementary school principal since 2020. Jaden Joseph has served as the middle school principal since 2022.
Legacy	Stephanie Cruz has served as the elementary school principal since 2024.
Linden	Mariama Diallo has served as the elementary school principal since 2022. Stephanie Blieka has served as the middle school principal since 2022.
North Brooklyn Prep	Daliza Lawrence has served as the elementary school principal since 2024. Katherine Delacruz has served as the middle school principal since 2022.
Voyager	Leisel Renaud served as the interim middle school principal in the 2024-25 school year.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Achievement First Public Charter Schools prepare every student to excel in college and career, deepen their knowledge of self and community, and lead lives of purpose. In partnership with our families and communities, we work to disrupt the legacy of inequity in education.

The first Achievement First Schools to open in New York were Crown Heights and East New York in 2005. Aspire opened in 2013.

Core elements of the Achievement First model that support our ambitious goal of closing the achievement gap by preparing our students for success include:

- An Unwavering Focus on Breakthrough Student Achievement
- Use of a Consistent, High-Quality, Standards-Aligned Curriculum
- Strategic Use of Assessments to Monitor and Address Student Performance
- Principals have the Power to Lead their School to Execute their Vision
- Principals Provide Increased Supervision Over the Quality of Instruction
- Aggressive Recruitment and Development of Talent
- Disciplined, Achievement-Oriented School Culture
- Rigorous, High-Quality, Focused Training for Principals and Leaders
- Valuing Families as Partners

In the 2024-25 school year, AF continued implementation of externally developed high-quality instructional materials in ELA, math,and science in middle school and in ELA and math in Elementary School. We have also adopted curricula in our high school English, math, and science courses. These curricular materials were chosen after a thorough review of EdReports data, teacher and school leader input, as well as alignment to our value of Leading for Racial Equity and ensuring we would be able to leverage materials in ways that are culturally responsive and empowering. We are continuing to use our middle school history curriculum which is a standards-based program designed internally and with the collaboration of experts in the field. This work will continue to provide the strong foundation for instruction that is characteristic of AF and expected by teachers and leaders, while allowing us to prioritize supporting implementation and responding to student learning data gathered from instruction and assessment.

ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

	School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Apollo	2022-23	58	91	87	84	91	92	93	91	92					779
	2023-24	86	76	92	84	85	85	85	94	84					771

	2024-25	84	89	85	94	89	60	78	70	93					742
Brownsville	2022-23	41	57	71	60	65	88	84	83	91	70	93	82	84	969
	2023-24	53	44	74	74	65	71	95	88	91		1	67	68	791
	2024-25	42	60	45	83	83	64	70	90	91					628
Bushwick	2022-23	81	95	98	103	102	102	97	105	104					887
	2023-24	90	96	98	104	95	102	104	98	99					886
	2024-25	89	99	101	105	106	92	100	101	97					890
Endeavor	2022-23	45	63	78	92	87	96	90	91	93					735
	2023-24	51	44	60	70	90	85	87	93	95					675
	2024-25	35	50	38	51	71	80	79	84	91					579
Legacy	2022-23	62	91												153
	2023-24	62	54	79											195
	2024-25	54	62	54	85										255
Linden	2022-23	64	62	80	97	94	75	86	70	81					709
	2023-24	44	60	62	78	96	76	81	76	72					645
	2024-25	51	46	61	70	78	82	85	82	70					625
North Brooklyn	2022-23	90	94	88	88	96	96	94	94	95					835
	2023-24	86	90	91	94	92	99	96	94	94					836
	2024-25	96	88	90	96	96	91	94	97	94					842
Voyager	2022-23							41	54	60					155
	2023-24							37	52	66					155
	2024-25								41	56					97

GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Background

In Achievement First's K-8 ELA program, the purpose of ELA instruction is to build a love of reading among students, to create knowledge and language-rich learning experiences, as well as to ensure that every scholar leaves elementary school proficient at reading and writing grade-level standards. In doing so, students will enter their middle school experience prepared for the academic learning ahead.

In the 2024-25 school year, our schools continued implementing the new high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) that we implemented in 2023 -24 including:

- Fundations & Heggerty (K-2, sometimes 3)
- Geodes (K-2, sometimes 3)
- *Wit and Wisdom* across all of our K-8 campuses.

We continue to believe these are the best HQIM for our students and achieving our achievement goals because it is:

- Aligned with the Science of Reading
- Intentional word and world knowledge building throughout and across grade levels
- Aligned to knowledge and skill demands of state exams NYSE
- Highly rated in EdReports
- Aligned with NY NextGen Standards
- W&W supports foundational reading skills across grades K through 4, and continues to build on those skills and critical thinking in grades 5-8.
- W&W (and thus Geodes) is built and organized into cohesive units that follow the principles of backwards design
- Starting in kindergarten, students are positioned to ask questions, read rich, complex texts, write across various genres, make use of textual evidence, and construct explanations and arguments
- Includes regular formative and summative assessments to monitor student learning are part of every module

To support strong data practices, we invest in both curriculum-based and external formative and summative assessments:

- Universal Screeners: mCLASS (K-4), iReady, and STAR (5-8) (3x; BOY, MOY, EOY)
- Fundations (K-3): Unit Exams
- Wit and Wisdom: New Reads, Vocabulary Assessments, Focusing Question Tasks, End of Module Tasks
- Gr 3-8: Interim Assessments and Mock Exam (used as proxies for NYSE state exams) and short bi-weekly quizzes (aligned to the State exams, prioritizing the standards taught in the Wit in Wisdom). The IAs and Mocks are predominantly built from released items for nyEngage.

In 2024-25, the professional development shifted from ensuring that teachers taught the new curriculum with fidelity and integrity, to stronger internalization and responding to student data in class. Teachers attended sessions developing their skills in identifying the purpose of each lesson and how the different parts of the lesson connect to the purpose. Leaders were developed on how to use data to inform the purpose and individualized instruction, and how to coach their teachers to use their data to inform instructional planning. All of this was grounded in maintaining the rigor and goal of the lessons as defined by the HQIM, while also ensuring teachers were responding to students' needs.

In our high school ELA program, students deeply engage with texts through research-based, structured close reading cycles, carefully reading diverse texts from many genres and writing in a variety of formats that deepen thinking and learning. Scholars practice the discipline in order to construct understanding; they are the "doers" (reading, analyzing, unpacking, posing questions, thinking critically, discussing,

researching, writing) and teachers are facilitators who support scholars in leading the learning. The high school ELA program supports the development of adolescent literacy at all stages of readiness and leverages structured reading approaches and supports that seek to mitigate learning barriers for struggling readers accessing grade level texts. We use research-based instructional approaches to develop vocabulary and background-knowledge and focus on student engagement as a means for developing literacy and facilitating deep and authentic conversation with text, each other, and the world.

In the 2023-2024 school year, our high schools began full-scale implementation of the StudySync curriculum across grades 9 and 10, with optional unsupported implementation in grades 11 and 12, and then moved to full-scale supported implementation across grades 9-12 in school year 2024-2025. We identified StudySync as the best choice for our students, over several other HQIM options, for a number of reasons:

- Greater diversity of representation of authors
- Most aligned to knowledge and skill demands on AP, Regents, and SAT/PSAT exams
- Highly rated by EdReports
- Aligned with NY NextGen State Standards
- Aligned with the Science of Reading
- Provides detailed guidance for implementing instructional approaches to support literacy development in students who enter high school reading below grade level
- Includes resources for addressing foundational reading skills like phonics and fluency
- Greatest support for flexibly differentiating instruction for all learners, including students who are MLL and exceptional learners.

In the first year of implementation of the StudySync curriculum in school year 2023-2024, we aligned across schools on implementing units 1-4, though schools were encouraged to select the “version” of the unit that best met the needs/interests of their students. We heard feedback throughout the year about a need for greater support from network for novel study units, and this feedback informed a shift in our approach in school year 2024-2025 to to aligned units, and aligned versions of units, across all schools and grades in the network, with the network high school ELA team providing daily lesson resources for the novel study unit selections. In addition, in school year 2025-2026, the network team is responding to ongoing data by producing more robust resources to support close reading cycles across grades and units.

In school year 2023-2024 we piloted mandatory Extended Writing Projects (EWPs) across grades 9 and 10. Students complete these process-based writing pieces, involving multiple drafts, with least invasive scaffolding. The EWPs are curricular assessments aligned to unit standards and provide students with additional opportunities to demonstrate their learning, both as readers and writers. The EWP requires both cumulative knowledge built across unit texts and facility with writing in a target genre for which the unit provides mentor texts and several “at bats” for students to build skill in a specific genre of writing. As a result of the positive impacts from the pilot, in school year 2024-2025 we moved to fully implement EWPs across all grades and units. Schools received data support on demand and developed and instituted data-based plans to support continuous improvement with process-based writing projects. Additionally, in 2025-2026, schools are now taking mandatory mid-unit formatives that are aligned to the HS ELA Regents

in both standards assessed and format to support shorter cycles of improvement that will lead to higher performance on the Regents in June. In this way, our schools are making data-informed instructional choices throughout the school year to support learning for all.

In addition to EWPs, we leveraged assessment resources provided by StudySync to develop network interim assessments, broad benchmark assessments that track progress against a wide array of NY NextGen Literacy and Writing Standards across the year.

Professional learning for ELA teachers focused on a scope and sequence of support for new and ongoing curriculum implementation. The year began with technical training to support teachers in developing facility with the various tools offered with the StudySync curriculum, including a suite of online tools and teacher guides. We then shifted our focus to developing skill with the Close Reading Cycle, a Science of Reading-aligned approach to reading that is the fulcrum of the StudySync curriculum. The approach involves multiple reads of a text interspersed with targeted skills lessons to develop students ability to independently apply analytical skills as they read and develop their own evidence-based interpretations of texts. This year, we have layered in enhanced close reading supports, which include a streamlined set of text-dependent questions that span from the first-read lesson to the close-read lesson, skill models and practice opportunities, both multiple choice and open-ended that support students' building of the modeled skill, and sample proficient responses with scoring notes to support normed evaluation of students' analytical writing at the end of each close reading cycle in the unit.

We leveraged quarterly continuous improvement cycles, which included targeted support for individual academic deans and instructional walkthroughs to track progress and collaborate directly with school leaders on observing instruction, and aligning on prioritized feedback and action steps for moving instruction forward.

Elementary and Middle ELA

ELA Measure 1 - Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

The tables below summarize the participation information for this year's test administration as well as the performance of all students and students enrolled for at least two years.

2024-25 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

	Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested						Total Enrolled
			Absent	Refusal	ELL/IEP	Admin error	Medically excused	Other reason	
Apollo	3	88		5					93
	4	73		16					89

	5	58	1	2		1		1	63
	6	75	3					5	83
	7	71						1	72
	8	88	4	4				2	98
	All	**453**	**8**	**27**		**1**		**9**	**498**
Brownsville	3	66	2	14				1	83
	4	70	1	10					81
	5	58	2					1	61
	6	65	3					2	70
	7	78	4	1					83
	8	88	5	1				1	95
	All	**423**	**17**	**26**				**5**	**473**
Bushwick	3	99	3						102
	4	95	6					2	103
	5	89	4	1				1	95
	6	96	1					1	98
	7	96	1				1	4	102
	8	94	11						105
	All	**569**	**26**	**1**			**1**	**8**	**605**
Endeavor	3	50							50
	4	68						1	69
	5	72	4	1					77
	6	75	3	1					79
	7	74	3	1					78
	8	84	3						87
	All	**423**	**13**	**3**				**1**	**440**
Legacy	3	81		5					86
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7								
	8								
	All	**81**		**5**					**86**
Linden	3	47		20				2	69
	4	62		13				2	77
	5	79		3					82
	6	87						1	88
	7	75		2					77
	8	64							64
	All	**414**		**38**				**5**	**457**
North Brooklyn	3	85		9					94
	4	85		8					93
	5	89	1						90

	6	91					1		92
	7	94					1		95
	8	93		1					94
	All	**537**	**1**	**18**			**2**		**558**
Voyager	3								
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7	40		1					41
	8	52							52
	All	**92**		**1**					**93**

Performance on 2024-25 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year[1]

	Grade	All Students			Enrolled in at least their Second Year		
		Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
Apollo	3	88	50	56.8%	77	46	59.7%
	4	73	39	53.4%	62	37	59.7%
	5	58	36	62.1%	30	21	70.0%
	6	75	31	41.3%	63	26	41.3%
	7	71	39	54.9%	61	34	55.7%
	8	88	54	61.4%	83	50	60.2%
	All	**453**	**249**	**55.0%**	**376**	**214**	**56.9%**
Brownsville	3	66	38	57.6%	57	35	61.4%
	4	70	37	52.9%	62	33	53.2%
	5	57	25	43.9%	51	23	45.1%
	6	64	37	57.8%	52	33	63.5%
	7	78	44	56.4%	71	38	53.5%
	8	88	59	67.0%	82	55	67.1%
	All	**423**	**240**	**56.7%**	**375**	**217**	**57.9%**
Bushwick	3	99	43	43.4%	78	39	50.0%
	4	95	49	51.6%	85	46	54.1%
	5	89	58	65.2%	80	54	67.5%
	6	96	66	68.8%	89	63	70.8%
	7	96	58	60.4%	91	57	62.6%
	8	94	70	74.5%	86	67	77.9%
	All	**569**	**344**	**60.5%**	**509**	**326**	**64.0%**
Endeavor	3	50	27	54.0%	44	23	53.2%

[1] Students are considered "enrolled in at least their second year" if they were enrolled on BEDS day of the school year prior to the most recent exam administration.

	4	68	34	50.0%	57	29	50.9%
	5	72	37	51.4%	61	31	50.8%
	6	75	33	44.0%	53	22	41.5%
	7	74	53	71.6%	62	45	72.6%
	8	84	59	70.2%	75	53	70.7%
	All	**423**	**243**	**57.4%**	**352**	**203**	**57.7%**
Legacy	3	81	54	66.7%	69	47	68.1%
	4						
	5						
	6						
	7						
	8						
	All	**81**	**54**	**66.7%**	**69**	**47**	**68.1%**
Linden	3	47	16	34.8%	41	15	36.6%
	4	62	30	48.4%	55	28	50.9%
	5	79	50	63.3%	29	13	44.8%
	6	87	43	49.4%	62	31	50.0%
	7	75	36	48.0%	53	28	52.8%
	8	64	33	51.6%	56	28	50.0%
	All	**414**	**208**	**50.2%**	**296**	**143**	**48.3%**
North Brooklyn	3	85	43	50.6%	79	41	51.9%
	4	85	45	52.9%	78	41	52.6%
	5	89	51	57.3%	83	46	55.4%
	6	91	57	62.6%	85	54	63.5%
	7	94	62	66.0%	87	58	66.7%
	8	93	71	76.3%	86	69	80.2%
	All	**537**	**329**	**61.2%**	**498**	**309**	**62.0%**
Voyager	3						
	4						
	5						
	6						
	7	40	21	52.5%	28	16	57.1%
	8	52	33	63.5%	42	27	64.3%
	All	**92**	**54**	**58.7%**	**70**	**43**	**61.4%**

ELA Measure 2 - Absolute

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the State English language arts exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of

these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2024-25 English language arts MIP for all students of **117.3**. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250. [2]

English Language Arts 2024-25 Performance Index

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Apollo	453	17.4%	27.6%	31.1%	23.8%

$$PI = 0 * 17.4 + 1 * 27.6 + 2 * 31.1 + 2.5 * 23.8 =$$ **149.3**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Brownville	425	18.6%	24.7%	38.6%	18.1%

$$PI = 0 * 18.6 + 1 * 24.7 + 2 * 38.6 + 2.5 * 18.1 =$$ **147.2**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Bushwick	569	18.1%	21.4%	35.3%	25.1%

$$PI = 0 * 18.1 + 1 * 21.4 + 2 * 35.3 + 2.5 * 25.1 =$$ **154.8**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Endeavor	423	16.8%	25.8%	38.1%	19.4%

$$PI = 0 * 16.8 + 1 * 25.8 + 2 * 38.1 + 2.5 * 19.4 =$$ **150.5**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Legacy	81	17.3%	16.0%	38.3%	28.4%

$$PI = 0 * 17.3 + 1 * 16.0 + 2 * 38.3 + 2.5 * 28.4 =$$ **163.6**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Linden	414	22.5%	27.3%	32.6%	17.6%

$$PI = 0 * 22.5 + 1 * 27.3 + 2 * 32.6 + 2.5 * 17.6 =$$ **136.5**

[2] You can find the statewide MIP goals for 2022-23 to 2026-27 here

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
North Brooklyn	537	16.0%	22.7%	36.9%	24.4%

$$PI = 0 * 16.0 + 1 * 22.7 + 2 * 36.9 + 2.5 * 24.4 = \mathbf{157.5}$$

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Voyager	92	9.8%	31.5%	41.3%	17.4%

$$PI = 0 * 9.8 + 1 * 31.5 + 2 * 41.3 + 2.5 * 17.4 = \mathbf{157.6}$$

ELA Measure 3 - Comparative

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[3]

2024-25 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

	Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
		Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
		Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
Apollo (District 19)	3	59.7%	77	54.0%	1217
	4	59.7%	62	49.0%	1185
	5	70.0%	30	55.7%	1201
	6	41.3%	63	37.8%	1086
	7	55.7%	61	39.2%	1251
	8	60.2%	83	39.2%	1282
	All	**56.9%**	**376**	**45.8%**	**7222**
Brownsville (District 23)	3	61.4%	57	58.3%	432
	4	53.2%	62	50.6%	427

[3] Schools can access these data when the NYSED releases its database containing grade level ELA and mathematics results for all schools and districts statewide.

	5	45.1%	51	47.6%	456
	6	63.5%	52	46.9%	386
	7	53.5%	71	47.5%	478
	8	67.1%	82	41.5%	468
	All	**57.9%**	**375**	**48.6%**	**2647**
Bushwick (District 32)	3	50.0%	78	39.2%	543
	4	54.1%	85	34.9%	519
	5	67.5%	80	44.6%	603
	6	70.8%	89	36.7%	698
	7	62.6%	91	43.2%	768
	8	77.9%	86	45.9%	790
	All	**64.0%**	**509**	**41.2%**	**3921**
Endeavor (District 13)	3	53.2%	44	70.4%	842
	4	50.9%	57	67.5%	800
	5	50.8%	61	61.9%	746
	6	41.5%	53	51.5%	517
	7	72.6%	62	54.4%	493
	8	70.7%	75	49.9%	431
	All	**57.7%**	**352**	**61.2%**	**3829**
Legacy (District 29)	3	68.1%	69	55.5%	1484
	4				
	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	All	**68.1%**	**69**	**55.5%**	**1484**
Linden (District 19)	3	36.6%	41	54.0%	1217
	4	50.9%	55	49.0%	1185
	5	44.8%	29	55.7%	1201
	6	50.0%	62	37.8%	1086
	7	52.8%	53	39.2%	1251
	8	50.0%	56	39.2%	1282
	All	**48.3%**	**296**	**45.8%**	**7222**
North Brooklyn (District 32)	3	51.9%	79	39.2%	543
	4	52.6%	78	34.9%	519
	5	55.4%	83	44.6%	603
	6	63.5%	85	36.7%	698
	7	66.7%	87	43.2%	768
	8	80.2%	86	45.9%	790
	All	**62.0%**	**498**	**41.2%**	**3921**
Voyager (District 17)	3				
	4				
	5				

	6				
	7	57.1%	28	1041	54.4%
	8	64.3%	42	965	50.6%
	All	**61.4%**	**70**	**5513**	**56.1%**

ELA Measure 4 - Comparative

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the target for this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results.[4]

2023-24 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

	Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted	
Apollo	3	83.3	445.0	439.3	0.59
	4	90.7	450.0	438.9	1.05
	5	78.6	439.0	439.9	-0.09
	6	83.7	438.0	439.1	-0.11
	7	79.4	451.0	445.0	0.62
	8	79.2	454.0	445.8	0.81
	All	**82.3**	**446.2**	**442.5**	**0.48**
Brownsville	3	89.5	444.0	438.2	0.60
	4	92.3	442.0	438.6	0.31
	5	93.0	435.0	436.7	-0.17
	6	92.7	442.0	437.3	0.51

[4] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

	Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted	
	7	92.1	448.0	443.2	0.50
	8	88.0	449.0	444.4	0.47
	All	**91.2**	**443.6**	**439.9**	**0.39**
Bushwick	3	90.4	441.0	438.0	0.31
	4	92.6	449.0	438.6	0.97
	5	89.1	446.0	437.6	0.87
	6	85.7	448.0	438.7	0.94
	7	91.3	455.0	443.3	1.21
	8	89.2	454.0	444.2	1.00
	All	**89.6**	**448.8**	**440.0**	**0.88**
Endeavor	3	85.7	440.0	438.9	0.12
	4	90.9	447.0	438.9	0.75
	5	77.6	446.0	440.1	0.63
	6	82.8	442.0	439.2	0.28
	7	81.5	453.0	444.7	0.86
	8	84.2	459.0	445.0	1.39
	All	**83.8**	**448.3**	**441.3**	**0.70**
Legacy	3				
	4				
	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	All	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Linden	3	92.3	438.0	437.6	0.04
	4	90.6	440.0	439.0	0.10
	5	89.5	442.0	437.5	0.46
	6	87.7	441.0	438.3	0.28
	7	92.2	443.0	443.2	-0.02
	8	83.3	448.0	445.1	0.28
	All	**89.7**	**441.5**	**439.7**	**0.18**
North Brooklyn	3	90.4	440.0	438.2	0.19
	4	92.6	449.0	439.0	0.95
	5	89.1	441.0	437.8	0.32
	6	85.7	447.0	437.9	0.95
	7	91.3	450.0	443.4	0.70
	8	89.2	460.0	444.0	1.59
	All	**89.6**	**447.9**	**440.1**	**0.79**
Voyager	3				

	Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted	
	4				
	5				
	6	83.8	441.0	439.0	0.20
	7	90.2	452.0	443.5	0.91
	8	80.3	455.0	445.7	0.93
	All	**84.5**	**450.4**	**443.2**	**0.74**

ELA Measure 5 - Growth

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.

Method

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[5]

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2023-24 and also have a state exam score from 2022-23 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2022-23 score are ranked by their 2023-24 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the target for this measure, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

2023-24 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

	Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
		School	Target
Apollo	4	55.2	50.0
	5	34.0	50.0
	6	48.4	50.0
	7	52.7	50.0
	8	50.5	50.0
	All	**48.2**	**50.0**
Brownville	4	44.8	50.0
	5	42.4	50.0
	6	53.5	50.0

	Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
		School	Target
Legacy	4		50.0
	5		50.0
	6		50.0
	7		50.0
	8		50.0
	All	**N/A**	**50.0**
Linden	4	54.5	50.0
	5	45.7	50.0
	6	57.5	50.0

[5] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

	7	46.9	50.0
	8	49.5	50.0
	All	**48.1**	**50.0**
Bushwick	4	60.0	50.0
	5	50.1	50.0
	6	53.4	50.0
	7	61.0	50.0
	8	51.5	50.0
	All	**55.1**	**50.0**
Endeavor	4	48.9	50.0
	5	47.9	50.0
	6	48.6	50.0
	7	60.7	50.0
	8	59.0	50.0
	All	**52.9**	**50.0**

	7	45.8	50.0
	8	57.8	50.0
	All	**52.1**	**50.0**
North Brooklyn	4	73.4	50.0
	5	48.2	50.0
	6	60.9	50.0
	7	59.6	50.0
	8	67.2	50.0
	All	**61.7**	**50.0**
Voyager	4		50.0
	5		50.0
	6	50.0	50.0
	7	58.8	50.0
	8	56.5	50.0
	All	**55.9**	**50.0**

ELA Internal Exam Results

During 2024-25, in addition to the New York State 3rd – 8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in ELA: mCLASS in grades K-4 & STAR Reading in Grades 5-8.

mCLASS (K-4)

Percent Proficient for 2024-25 mCLASS

	Grades	Percent Proficient **BOY**	Percent Proficient **EOY**	Percentage Point Difference
Apollo	K	53.3%	91.3%	+38.0
	1	59.6%	82.0%	+22.4
	2	52.4%	65.5%	+13.1
	3	57.9%	84.9%	+27.0
	4	52.9%	79.8%	+26.9
	All	**55.4%**	**80.6%**	**+25.2**
Brownsville	K	31.6%	81.1%	+49.5
	1	37.3%	64.4%	+27.1
	2	25.0%	68.1%	+43.1
	3	43.9%	71.6%	+27.7
	4	46.3%	59.3%	+13.0
	All	**39.1%**	**67.5%**	**+28.4**
Bushwick	K	21.7%	88.9%	+67.2
	1	46.4%	79.2%	+32.8
	2	48.0%	63.7%	+15.7
	3	45.0%	61.0%	+16.0
	4	46.6%	58.3%	+11.7
	All	**42.2%**	**69.7%**	**+27.5**
Endeavor	K	40.0%	94.3%	+54.3

	1	66.7%	83.0%	+16.3
	2	48.6%	72.5%	+23.9
	3	52.0%	72.0%	+20.0
	4	54.9%	50.7%	-4.2
	All	**53.5%**	**71.5%**	**+18.0**
Legacy	K	50.9%	90.7%	+25.9
	1	71.9%	90.6%	+13.5
	2	74.5%	78.7%	+12.7
	3	62.8%	65.1%	+2.9
	4			
	All	**65.1%**	**79.6%**	**+14.5**
Linden	K	40.8%	66.7%	+25.9
	1	63.0%	76.5%	+13.5
	2	60.3%	73.0%	+12.7
	3	45.6%	48.5%	+2.9
	4	56.0%	77.3%	+21.3
	All	**53.0%**	**68.2%**	**+15.2**
North Brooklyn Prep	K	11.6%	90.3%	+78.7
	1	76.1%	91.9%	+15.8
	2	75.8%	93.3%	+17.5
	3	78.1%	90.3%	+12.2
	4	80.2%	90.2%	+10.0
	All	**64.2%**	**91.2%**	**+27.0**

STAR Reading (5-8)

The following tables evaluate the median student growth percentile for all students. The STAR Reading Assessment is a comprehensive and nationally administered assessment focused on a variety of literacy skills. It is given three times a year in 5-8th grades to assess growth in reading and help identify students for further interventions and support.

Our target goal of 50 refers to the average student growth percentile. STAR Reading is a nationally administered assessment, giving us comparative data. This comparative data helps us understand how students at AF grew relative to peers across the country, given the same initial data. For the purposes of this goal, we expect the average student growth percentile to be at the 50th percentile comparing beginning of year scores to end of year scores.

End of Year Growth on 2024-25 STAR Reading Assessment
By All Students

	Grades	Median Growth Percentile	Number Tested
Apollo	5	17	57
	6	26	78
	7	44	61
	8	33.5	84

	Grades	Median Growth Percentile	Number Tested
Linden	5	42	71
	6	58	75
	7	62	73
	8	53.5	60

	All	**30**	**280**
Brownsville	5	29	58
	6	43.5	62
	7	32	77
	8	49	86
	All	**38**	**283**
Bushwick	5	50	86
	6	48	95
	7	59	95
	8	50.5	86
	All	**51**	**362**
Endeavor	5	28	75
	6	30	72
	7	33	73
	8	47.5	78
	All	**36**	**298**

	All	**54**	**279**
North Brooklyn Prep	5	43	87
	6	49	88
	7	49	88
	8	41	88
	All	**45**	**351**
Voyager	5	N/A	N/A
	6	N/A	N/A
	7	50	34
	8	64	47
	All	**61.5**	**81**

Summary of the ELA Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Apollo: NO Brownsville: NO Bushwick: NO Endeavor: NO Legacy: NO Linden: NO North Brooklyn: NO Voyager: NO
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: YES Endeavor: YES Legacy: YES Linden: YES North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: YES
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: YES Endeavor: NO Legacy: YES Linden: YES North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: YES

Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: YES Endeavor: YES Legacy: N/A Linden: NO North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: YES
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.	Apollo: NO Brownsville: NO Bushwick: YES Endeavor: YES Legacy: N/A Linden: YES North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: YES
Growth	Each year, the percent of students at or above the proficiency benchmark on the internally administered mCLASS assessment will increase by 10% from the beginning of the year to the end of the year for all students in grade K through 4.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: YES Endeavor: YES Legacy: YES Linden: YES North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: N/A
Growth	Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 5th through 8th grade students will be greater than 50 on the internally administered STAR Reading assessment. Student growth is the difference between the beginning of year score and the end of year score.	Apollo: NO Brownsville: NO Bushwick: YES Endeavor: NO Legacy: N/A Linden: YES North Brooklyn: NO Voyager: YES

Evaluation of ELA Goal

AF Brooklyn K-8 schools had mixed results on the applicable measures; the network met 2 of the 7 measures at all schools. Other measures had mixed performance.

No school met the goal for measure 1. The overall percent proficient for students enrolled at least in their second year across all schools is 59.4% which is below the 75% target. However, in K-8, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the State English and Language Arts Exam enrolled in 'at least their second year' is greater than the percentage of 'all students' who scored proficient in 7 of 8 schools (Apollo +1.9%,

Brownsville +1.2%, Bushwick +3.5%, Endeavor +0.3%, Legacy +0.4%, North Brooklyn Prep +0.8%, and Voyager +2.7%). Students who have been enrolled for more than one year consistently outperform the overall student population, showing higher proficiency rates across nearly every grade and campus. This suggests that continued enrollment at our schools directly supports stronger ELA outcomes.

8/8 schools met measure 2, the state's 2024-25 ELA Performance Index target, with every campus exceeding the required PI of 117.3 by a substantial margin (lowest - 136.5 at Linden; highest - 163.6 at Legacy).

7/8 schools met the comparative proficiency goal (measure 3), with charter students outperforming their district peers by margins ranging from +2 to +23 points. The only exception was Endeavor, which underperformed its district by 3.5 points. Every school outperformed the district in grades 7 and 8, this supports the idea that students who stay at AF longer achieve stronger ELA results than the district average. Multiple grades underperformed their peers in Grade 5 (Brownsville, Endeavor, Linden).

6/7 schools met measure 4 (note: Legacy not included in the measure this year). 6/7 schools achieved or exceeded the effect side of 0.3, demonstrating performance meaningfully above predicted levels. Linden was the only school below the benchmark (overall = 0.18). The network's strongest results came from Bushwick, North Brooklyn Prep, and Voyager, where effect sizes approached or exceeded +1.0, indicating performance dramatically above predicted levels.

5/7 schools met measure 5 (note: Legacy not included in this measure this year). North Brooklyn Prep at outlier high performance (+11.7%), driven by grades 4 and 8. Bushwick (+5.1) exceeded the goal across all grades, and the network saw strong performance on this measure in Grades 7 and 8.

7/7 schools met measure 6. The network-wide, students grew well above the +10% proficiency of students at or above benchmark between the beginning of the year and the end of the year. Kindergarten consistently produced the largest gains across schools, but growth was consistently strong in early grades.

3/7 schools met measure 7. Linden and Bushwick are consistent near or above the 50th percentile across grades. Voyager shows exceptional growth in grades 7 and 8.

Additional Context and Evidence

In interpreting these ELA results, it's important to note that all campuses faced significant technical disruptions during the first week of state testing. The online platform repeatedly failed, forcing schools to attempt log-ins multiple mornings (and multiple times each morning) only to be kicked off or delayed. As a result, some classrooms spent entire days trying to test, while others had to reschedule for the week after Spring Break or even later. This created a highly irregular and stressful testing environment particularly for elementary students, many of whom were taking a computer-based state exam for the first time. These conditions likely introduced additional variability into scores.

ELA Action Plan

While student growth is encouraging, our ELA program still falls short of absolute proficiency targets.

Beginning in 2024-25, reading continues to be a multi-year network priority, beginning in 2024–25. Lexia PowerUp was implemented in almost all of our 5-8 schools, and the Senior Director of K-12 Reading, will continue to monitor fidelity and develop teachers, school leaders and network leaders on the best way to use this program. This will be Year 2 of this program in most of our schools and the trainings are getting more and more targeted to ensure this is effective for our struggling readers. This work continues to be done in close collaboration with Special Services to train leaders and teachers for effective implementation.

The Elementary Teaching & Learning team will continue to support K-4 schools with mCLASS data and analysis to strengthen early-literacy outcomes. Additionally, in 2025-26, we are introducing the iReady Reading assessment in all of our K-4 schools, specifically for grades 2-4. This adaptive assessment adjusts the difficulty of questions in real times and pinpoints each student's current level and growth over time. Additionally, it recommends targeted instruction or interventions to close gaps. In our analysis, we felt that mCLASS did not provide enough data on vocabulary knowledge, general comprehension or targeted instruction recommendations outside of explicit instruction around specific measures. While this is especially effective in K-2, it did not meet our needs for 3-4. In an effort to find an assessment that gave us more data on vocabulary and standards instructions, we evaluated several and selected iReady. We will provide professional development and support in analyzing the data provided by iReady and how to use it to support instruction in our core blocks as well as our differentiated reading blocks. This assessment will be administered 3x a year.

iReady is the only new addition to our program and is only being added in grades 2-4. This year is our third year implementing a science of reading aligned curriculum - Wit & Wisdom from Great Minds - across our K-8 classrooms. We will continue to assess 5-8 scholars using the STAR assessment, and in grades K-4, we will continue to use the mCLASS/Dibels reading assessments 3x per year. We have also implemented FUNdations and Heggerty across our K-2 (and in most cases 3rd grade) classrooms and have implemented Geodes, a Great Minds series of decodable texts aligned to both Wit & Wisdom and the FUNdations scope and sequence. We are also investing in sending our network leaders and school teams to literacy professional development, including the Reading League conference for the 2nd year in a row.

Across all grades, we are strengthening how teachers use data from mCLASS, CUBED, STAR, and internal assessments—such as daily exit tickets, quizzes, unit exams, and interim assessments—to guide instruction, support struggling students, and extend learning for those at or above grade level. We have expanded training and supports for reading intervention to ensure a strong Tier 2 program for students reading below grade level. Tier 1 instruction is reinforced through frequent classroom observations and leader coaching to help teachers implement curriculum and respond to student data. In addition, our professional development plan now includes a monthly dean cohort, four annual leader pods where small groups of ELA leaders gather for practice-based learning, and a network-wide Day of Practice providing at least 4.5 hours of targeted content development for teachers and leaders. Finally, we are also aligning our work to our network wide focus on specific goals outlined in the "Arc of the Year." The essentials we focus on are "Rigor," "Thinking" and "Feedback." Most of our development sessions will center around making sure our classrooms meet the grade level standards, have students doing the majority of thinking (and

teachers being more of the facilitators), and ensuring teachers are providing batched and differentiated feedback.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

Background

In the K-4 mathematics program at Achievement First, mathematics instruction is focused on fostering our student's mathematical identities such that they see themselves as powerful mathematicians. We are committed to a program that fosters authentic joy and curiosity about mathematical discovery and problem solving and, at the same time, proficiency in mathematical practices, all while keeping teaching for understanding as the centered norm.

The K–4 math program is designed to balance conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical identity. Instruction is built around four interrelated components:

- Core Math Lesson: Through the use of guided inquiry, students develop conceptual understanding of big ideas and strategies aligned to grade level standards by making connections to previously learned content and applying mathematical practices.
- CGI: Students develop a problem solving approach and conceptual understanding of varied problem types, strategies and mathematical principles by solving real-world story problems and applying mathematical practices. In the 24-25 school year we continued to invest in strengthening our Cognitively Guided Instruction, a framework that helps teachers to understand how student's mathematical ideas develop, and provides an opportunity to build on the student's own thinking and understanding.
- Math Routines (K-2): Through strategically designed problem strings or routines, students deepen their number sense and flexibility with numbers to gain fluency with priority skills and big ideas.
- Math Cumulative Review (3-4): Individualized and whole group instruction used to solidify skills and understandings students have acquired as well as revisit strategic topics in order to facilitate the making of connections and skill fluency over time.

To ensure that our academic program meets the needs of the students we serve, we require the strategic use of benchmark assessments, (Internally built Interim Assessments and Spiraled Quizzes) that are taken by EVERY student. The data from these assessments are used by teachers, school leaders, and network instructional teams to inform instructional decisions to further support student learning throughout the school year.

In order to support our schools in achieving student achievement goals , we strategically mapped out professional learning opportunities for both school leaders and teachers focused on the following key components:

- Develop a shared understanding of mathematical teaching and learning philosophy and build utility with navigating the curriculum and supplement resources.
- Build discrete and differentiated teacher and leaders skills based on the individual needs of leaders and teachers.
- Build vision and skill in analyzing summative data to unpack individual student's mastery and retention of standards taught up to the point of administration.
- Sub-group data analysis (Black Scholars, Black Male Scholars, MLLs, Students with Disabilities) and planning for supporting all learners.

In 2023-2024, Achievement First Middle Schools began full implementation of Illustrative Mathematics in Grade 5-8, a nationally renowned, research-based curriculum. Our top priority in the 24-25 school year is helping students develop proficiency with mathematical practice standards and conceptual understanding through the faithful implementation of this core curriculum. We selected Illustrative Mathematics as it obtained high ratings from EdReports and is aligned to our vision for math instruction, and strong alignment to NY state math standards.

In the 5-8 mathematics program at Achievement First, we are committed to a program that approaches teaching from an asset-based perspective, understanding and acknowledging that all of our students bring knowledge and unique ways of thinking and problem solving to the classroom. To bring this vision to fruition, the AF math program is made up of two primary components:

- Illustrative Math Lesson
- IXL/Intervention: During our IXL time, students are working on skills that are either aligned to current unit skills, aligned to spiral review informed by the IXL nationally normed diagnostic, or working directly with a teacher based on skills aligned to individual student needs.

To support implementation of Illustrative Mathematics curriculum:

- teachers attended summer training facilitated by our Teaching and Learning team to build on implementation trends observed in the previous year
- leaders had monthly cohorts focus on implementation vision, supporting teacher planning, and giving feedback on observations
- teachers received weekly support at their school site to unpack units and strengthen key parts of their instruction such as discussion facilitation
- developed and executed data-driven school support plans to drive instructional improvement and student learning outcomes

Our assessment strategy included the curricular assessments as well as Interim Assessments built by Achievement Network, or ANet, to monitor learning across the year. ANet curriculum-compatible interim assessments complement the curricula's existing daily and unit-level assessments. Schools developed data-driven plans to respond to the data with their teachers with the aim of improving student learning outcomes.

In our high school mathematics program at Achievement First, we believe that a high quality mathematics education not only involves developing and mastering key skills and concepts, but additionally fostering students' mathematical identities such that they see themselves as powerful mathematicians with the ability to use the transformative power of mathematical practices to enrich our lives beyond college and career aspirations. We seek to prepare all of our students to meet the mathematical thinking/quantitative demands of their future careers and lives as well as to disrupt the underrepresentation of BIPOC and women in the STEM workforce.

In the 2024–2025 school year, we entered Year 2 of implementing Illustrative Mathematics (IM) in our high school classrooms. IM is a highly rated curriculum that is strongly aligned to our vision for mathematics education and to New York State math standards. Illustrative Mathematics provides rigorous, grade-appropriate curricular materials that position teachers as facilitators and students as active thinkers and doers of mathematics.

Because Illustrative Mathematics curricular offerings extend through Algebra 2, we continued to use our internally developed curriculum for Precalculus, Calculus, and AP Calculus, aligned to college readiness and AP standards. However, to strengthen the quality of instruction and improve student learning outcomes in those courses, we also leveraged instructional strategies and routines from Illustrative Mathematics as best practices aligned to our vision.

To best support teachers and leaders with implementation of Illustrative Mathematics and facilitating instruction aligned to our vision of excellence in mathematics, we:

- Provided robust summer training for all leaders and teachers to deepen content knowledge and strengthen instructional practice. Illustrative Math teachers had additional training to support curriculum implementation.
- Facilitated monthly cohort sessions for leaders focused on implementation vision, supporting teacher planning, and providing feedback based on classroom observations.
- Engaged teachers in a day of practice on implementing Math Language Routines to strengthen equitable access and discourse in mathematics aligned to our vision for student-centered learning.
- Measured and tracked the quality of implementation using Implementation Progression Indicators from Columbia's Center for Public Research & Leadership.
- Conducted quarterly instructional improvement walkthroughs.
- Developed and executed data-driven school support plans to drive instructional improvement and student learning outcomes.
- Developed Curriculum Fellows to serve as leaders in implementation through bi-weekly meetings and monthly working groups

To appropriately monitor student progress and instructional effectiveness across the year, we implemented formative and summative assessments including Pre-Unit Assessments, End of Unit Assessments, and quarterly Interim Assessments. From these assessments, teachers and leaders developed data-driven plans to respond to student needs and inform instructional practice. For courses implementing Illustrative Mathematics, Interim Assessments were developed by the Achievement Network (ANet) to ensure focus,

coherence, rigor, and alignment with the curriculum. For SY 25-26 we are continuing with Year 3 of implementation for Illustrative Mathematics.

Elementary and Middle Mathematics

Math Measure 1 - Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State Mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

The tables below summarize the participation information for this year's test administration as well as the performance of all students and students enrolled for at least two years.

2024-25 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

	Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested						Total Enrolled
			Absent	Refusal	ELL/IEP	Admin error	Medically excused	Other reason	
Apollo	3	88		5					93
	4	73		16					89
	5	58	1	3				1	63
	6	75	3					5	83
	7	71	1					2	74
	8	84	5	7				3	99
	All	**449**	**10**	**31**				**11**	**501**
Brownsville	3	66	1	15				1	83
	4	70		11					81
	5	59	1					1	61
	6	69	1						70
	7	80	2	1					83
	8	88	6					1	95
	All	**432**	**11**	**27**				**3**	**473**
Bushwick	3	101		1					102
	4	100		1				2	103
	5	93		1				1	95
	6	97						1	98
	7	96	1				1	4	102
	8	50	55						105
	All	**537**	**56**	**3**			**1**	**8**	**605**
Endeavor	3	50							50
	4	67	1	1					69
	5	73	3	1					77
	6	76	1	2					79
	7	75	1	2					78

	8	86	1						87
	All	**427**	**7**	**6**					**440**
Legacy	3	81		5					86
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7								
	8								
	All	**81**		**5**					**86**
Linden	3	50		17				2	69
	4	62		13				2	77
	5	79		3					82
	6	85		2				1	88
	7	74		3					77
	8	63		1					64
	All	**413**		**39**				**5**	**457**
North Brooklyn	3	86		8					94
	4	84	1	8					93
	5	88	1				1		90
	6	92							92
	7	94					1		95
	8	89	3	2					94
	All	**533**	**5**	**18**			**2**		**558**
Voyager	3								
	4								
	5								
	6								
	7	38		3					41
	8	0	52						52
	All	**38**	**52**	**3**					**93**

Performance on 2024-25 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

	Grade	All Students			Enrolled in at least their Second Year		
		Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
Apollo	3	88	69	78.4%	77	62	80.5%
	4	73	62	84.9%	62	53	85.5%
	5	58	31	53.4%	31	20	64.5%
	6	75	35	46.7%	63	29	46.0%
	7	71	37	52.1%	60	35	58.3%
	8	84	53	63.1%	81	51	63.0%
	All	**449**	**287**	**63.9%**	**374**	**250**	**66.8%**

Brownsville	3	66	46	69.7%	57	41	71.9%
	4	70	45	64.3%	61	40	65.6%
	5	59	31	52.5%	50	28	56.0%
	6	69	35	50.7%	53	32	60.4%
	7	80	43	53.8%	73	39	53.4%
	8	88	54	61.4%	81	52	64.2%
	All	**432**	**254**	**58.8%**	**375**	**232**	**61.9%**
Bushwick	3	101	62	61.4%	77	53	68.8%
	4	100	55	55.0%	84	49	58.3%
	5	93	56	60.2%	82	52	63.4%
	6	97	69	71.1%	89	65	73.0%
	7	96	70	72.9%	91	68	74.7%
	8	50	25	50.0%	41	19	46.3%
	All	**537**	**337**	**62.8%**	**464**	**306**	**65.9%**
Endeavor	3	50	40	80.0%	44	36	81.8%
	4	67	36	53.7%	56	31	55.4%
	5	73	37	50.7%	61	31	50.8%
	6	76	31	40.8%	53	21	39.6%
	7	75	47	62.7%	62	38	61.3%
	8	86	56	65.1%	77	52	67.5%
	All	**427**	**247**	**57.8%**	**353**	**209**	**59.2%**
Legacy	3	81	52	64.2%	69	44	63.8%
	4						
	5						
	6						
	7						
	8						
	All	**81**	**52**	**64.2%**	**69**	**44**	**63.8%**
Linden	3	50	31	63.3%	43	29	67.4%
	4	62	39	62.9%	55	35	63.6%
	5	79	41	51.9%	29	12	41.4%
	6	85	50	58.8%	60	37	61.7%
	7	74	42	56.8%	52	31	59.6%
	8	63	34	54.0%	55	30	54.5%
	All	**413**	**237**	**57.4%**	**294**	**174**	**59.2%**
North Brooklyn	3	86	82	95.3%	80	78	97.5%
	4	84	77	91.7%	77	71	92.2%
	5	88	60	68.2%	82	54	65.9%
	6	92	37	40.2%	86	35	40.7%
	7	94	63	67.0%	87	58	66.7%
	8	89	51	57.3%	82	49	59.8%
	All	**533**	**370**	**69.4%**	**494**	**345**	**69.8%**
Voyager	3						

	4						
	5						
	6						
	7	38	14	36.8%	26	22	42.3%
	8	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	All	**38**	**14**	**36.8%**	**26**	**11**	**42.3%**

Math Measure 2 - Absolute

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

Method

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2024-25 mathematics MIP for all students of **119.4**. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

Mathematics 2024-25 Performance Index (PI)

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Apollo	449	14.0%	22.0%	38.1%	25.8%

$$PI = 0 * 14.0 + 1 * 22.0 + 2 * 38.1 + 2.5 * 25.8 =$$ **162.7**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Brownville	432	17.6%	23.6%	39.8%	19.0%

$$PI = 0 * 17.6 + 1 * 23.6 + 2 * 39.8 + 2.5 * 19.0 =$$ **150.7**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Bushwick	537	19.2%	18.1%	38.0%	24.8%

$$PI = 0 * 19.2 + 1 * 18.1 + 2 * 38.0 + 2.5 * 24.8 =$$ **156.1**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Endeavor	427	17.3%	24.8%	42.9%	15.0%

$$PI = 0 * 17.3 + 1 * 24.8 + 2 * 42.9 + 2.5 * 15.0 =$$ **148.1**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Legacy	81	6.1%	29.6%	43.2%	21.0%

$$PI = 0 * 6.1 + 1 * 29.6 + 2 * 43.2 + 2.5 * 21.0 =$$ **168.5**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Linden	413	17.9%	24.4%	40.0%	17.7%

$$PI = 0 * 17.9 + 1 * 24.4 + 2 * 40.0 + 2.5 * 17.7 =$$ **148.7**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
North Brooklyn	533	13.3%	17.3%	38.6%	30.8%

$$PI = 0 * 13.3 + 1 * 17.3 + 2 * 38.6 + 2.5 * 30.8 =$$ **171.5**

	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Voyager	38	10.5%	52.6%	18.4%	18.4%

$$PI = 0 * 10.5 + 1 * 52.6 + 2 * 18.4 + 2.5 * 18.4 =$$ **135.4**

Math Measure 3 - Comparative

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.

2024-25 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

	Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
		Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
		Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
Apollo (District 19)	3	80.5%	77	61.1%	1263
	4	85.5%	62	55.1%	1231
	5	64.5%	31	51.3%	1256
	6	46.0%	63	30.1%	1151
	7	58.3%	60	38.6%	1286
	8	63.0%	81	44.6%	1160
	All	**66.8%**	**374**	**47.0%**	**7347**
Brownsville (District 23)	3	71.9%	57	62.9%	450
	4	65.6%	61	53.6%	444
	5	56.0%	50	42.3%	471
	6	60.4%	53	49.8%	406
	7	53.4%	73	47.6%	479
	8	64.2%	81	19.4%	139
	All	**61.9%**	**375**	**49.3%**	**2389**
Bushwick (District 32)	3	68.8%	77	48.2%	558
	4	58.3%	84	37.7%	547
	5	63.4%	82	38.6%	630
	6	73.0%	89	31.7%	704
	7	74.7%	91	42.8%	773
	8	46.3%	41	44.0%	323
	All	**65.9%**	**464**	**40.0%**	**3535**
Endeavor (District 13)	3	81.8%	44	69.7%	852
	4	55.4%	56	62.3%	809
	5	50.8%	61	51.2%	750
	6	39.6%	53	41.5%	520
	7	61.3%	62	49.2%	478
	8	67.5%	77	30.7%	225
	All	**59.2%**	**353**	**55.1%**	**3634**
Legacy (District 29)	3	63.8%	69	64.2%	1534
	4				

	5				
	6				
	7				
	8				
	All	**63.8%**	**69**	**64.2%**	**1534**
Linden (District 19)	3	67.4%	43	61.1%	1263
	4	63.6%	55	55.1%	1231
	5	41.4%	29	51.3%	1256
	6	61.7%	60	30.1%	1151
	7	59.6%	52	38.6%	1286
	8	54.5%	55	44.6%	1160
	All	**59.2%**	**294**	**47.0%**	**7347**
North Brooklyn (District 32)	3	97.5%	80	48.2%	558
	4	92.2%	77	37.7%	547
	5	65.9%	82	38.6%	630
	6	40.7%	86	31.7%	704
	7	66.7%	87	42.8%	773
	8	59.8%	82	44.0%	323
	All	**69.8%**	**494**	**40.0%**	**3535**
Voyager (District 17)	3				
	4				
	5				
	6				
	7	42.3%	26	52.7%	926
	8	N/A	N/A		
	All	**42.3%**	**26**	**52.7%**	**926**

Math Measure 4 - Comparative

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the target for this measure. Given the timing of the state's

release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results.[6]

2023-24 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

	Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted	
Apollo	3	83.3	464.0	446.4	1.26
	4	90.7	4700	447.1	1.45
	5	78.6	446.0	445.3	0.05
	6	83.7	441.0	444.6	-0.26
	7	79.4	473.0	450.9	1.49
	8	79.2	467.0	442.6	1.55
	All	**82.3**	**460.3**	**446.3**	**0.93**
Brownsville	3	89.5	456.0	445.1	0.77
	4	92.3	454.0	446.7	0.47
	5	93.0	437.0	441.5	-0.32
	6	92.7	446.0	442.1	0.31
	7	92.1	456.0	447.5	0.62
	8	88.0	461.0	441.5	1.17
	All	**91.2**	**452.0**	**444.1**	**0.53**
Bushwick	3	90.4	450.0	444.9	0.36
	4	92.6	459.0	446.6	0.79
	5	89.1	461.0	442.5	1.35
	6	85.7	473.0	444.1	2.05
	7	91.3	459.0	447.7	0.82
	8	89.2	466.0	441.4	1.47
	All	**89.6**	**461.5**	**444.5**	**1.15**
Endeavor	3	85.7	455.0	445.9	0.65
	4	90.9	464.0	447.0	1.08
	5	77.6	444.0	445.6	-0.12
	6	82.8	446.0	444.9	0.08
	7	81.5	466.0	450.4	1.06
	8	84.2	472.0	442.0	1.90
	All	**83.8**	**458.2**	**446.0**	**0.80**
Legacy	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

[6] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

	Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted	
	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	All	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Linden	3	92.3	447.0	444.5	0.18
	4	90.6	443.0	447.1	-0.26
	5	89.5	439.0	442.4	-0.25
	6	87.7	440.0	443.5	-0.26
	7	92.2	445.0	447.5	-0.18
	8	83.3	445.0	442.1	0.18
	All	**89.7**	**442.8**	**444.9**	**-0.15**
North Brooklyn	3	89.4	472.0	445.1	1.90
	4	90.2	484.0	447.2	2.33
	5	87.9	451.0	442.9	0.59
	6	89.6	456.0	443.0	0.96
	7	90.4	456.0	448.0	0.57
	8	90.4	470.0	441.2	1.69
	All	**89.6**	**464.4**	**444.5**	**1.32**
Voyager	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	6	83.8	448.0	444.6	0.24
	7	90.2	450.0	448.0	0.14
	8	80.3	462.0	442.5	1.24
	All	**84.5**	**454.3**	**444.9**	**0.61**

Math Measure 5 - Growth

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.

METHOD

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[7]

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2023-24 and also have a

[7] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

state exam score in 2022-23 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2022-23 scores are ranked by their 2023-24 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

2023-24 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

	Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
		School	Target
Apollo	4	67.7	50.0
	5	30.6	50.0
	6	31.2	50.0
	7	67.9	50.0
	8	48.0	50.0
	All	**49.1**	**50.0**
Brownville	4	43.3	50.0
	5	27.8	50.0
	6	43.8	50.0
	7	40.0	50.0
	8	54.3	50.0
	All	**42.5**	**50.0**
Bushwick	4	55.6	50.0
	5	61.1	50.0
	6	68.2	50.0
	7	30.6	50.0
	8	64.3	50.0
	All	**56.1**	**50.0**
Endeavor	4	45.1	50.0
	5	28.6	50.0
	6	49.8	50.0
	7	48.1	50.0
	8	74.8	50.0
	All	**49.6**	**50.0**

	Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
		School	Target
Legacy	4	N/A	50.0
	5	N/A	50.0
	6	N/A	50.0
	7	N/A	50.0
	8	N/A	50.0
	All	**N/A**	**50.0**
Linden	4	55.0	50.0
	5	38.3	50.0
	6	39.9	50.0
	7	34.5	50.0
	8	55.8	50.0
	All	**43.4**	**50.0**
North Brooklyn	4	81.6	50.0
	5	35.4	50.0
	6	52.7	50.0
	7	46.9	50.0
	8	79.4	50.0
	All	**58.8**	**50.0**
Voyager	4	N/A	50.0
	5	N/A	50.0
	6	55.8	50.0
	7	50.7	50.0
	8	63.9	50.0
	All	**57.4**	**50.0**

Mathematics Internal Exam Results

During 2024-25, in addition to the New York State 3rd – 8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in mathematics: internally created Interim Assessments in grades 3-8.

A comparison between the October 2024 (IA1) and March 2025 (IA3) interim assessments provide insight into the progress scholars made.

For both internal cumulative exams, the cut scores were set in a manner similar to those used on the New York State exam.

Percent Proficient for 2024-25 IA Math By All Students

2024-25 Accountability Plan Progress Report

	Grades	Percent Proficient **IA1**	Percent Proficient **IA3**	Percentage Point Difference
Apollo	3	69%	76%	+7
	4	52%	63%	+11
	5	41%	54%	+13
	6	27%	49%	+22
	7	48%	61%	+13
	8	34%	67%	+33
Brownsville	3	59%	45%	-14
	4	51%	51%	0
	5	57%	67%	+10
	6	20%	54%	+34
	7	38%	69%	+31
	8	12%	43%	+31
Bushwick	3	46%	36%	-10
	4	41%	41%	0
	5	54%	66%	+12
	6	47%	72%	+25
	7	60%	35%	-25
	8	15%	35%	+20
	8th Algebra	98%	100%	+2
Endeavor	3	57%	47%	-10
	4	49%	47%	-2
	5	44%	43%	-1
	6	7%	42%	+35
	7	32%	58%	+26
	8	23%	54%	+31
Legacy	3	42%	36%	-6
Linden	3	46%	41%	-5
	4	67%	42%	-25
	5	34%	56%	+22
	6	18%	51%	+33
	7	34%	52%	+18
	8	21%	44%	+23
North Brooklyn Prep	3	90%	85%	-5
	4	92%	82%	-10
	5	42%	60%	+18
	6	21%	53%	+32
	7	46%	55%	+9
	8	34%	23%	-11
Voyager	7	37%	23%	-14
	8th Algebra	9%	11%	+2

2024-25 Accountability Plan Progress Report

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State Mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Apollo: NO Brownsville: NO Bushwick: NO Endeavor: NO Legacy: NO Linden: NO North Brooklyn: NO Voyager: NO
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's mathematics exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: YES Endeavor: YES Legacy: YES Linden: YES North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: YES
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: YES Endeavor: YES Legacy: NO Linden: YES North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: NO
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: YES Endeavor: YES Legacy: N/A Linden: NO North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: YES
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.	Apollo: NO Brownsville: NO Bushwick: YES Endeavor: NO Legacy: N/A Linden: NO North Brooklyn: YES Voyager: YES

Growth	Between each Interim Assessment cycle there is at least a 10% growth in students who are proficient on average across tested grades.	Apollo: YES Brownsville: YES Bushwick: NO Endeavor: YES Legacy: NO Linden: YES North Brooklyn: NO Voyager: NO

Evaluation of the Mathematics Goal

Despite challenges in meeting the measures outlined in this report, the network did overall meet 1 of the 6 measures across all schools and many schools met multiple measures. While there is still a great deal of work to do, we are on the right path towards supporting growth and development in math towards proficiency.

No schools met measure 1. Schools saw a range of percent proficient across grades. Grades 3 and 4 saw outlier strong performance when compared to other grade levels, particularly at North Brooklyn Prep and Apollo, with more than 80% of students in these grades proficient.

For measure 2, all schools met the measure of 80% of students scoring at a level 3 or higher. North Brooklyn Prep and Apollo had the highest percentage of students scoring at a level 3 or 4.

For measure 3, all schools, except Legacy and Voyager met the measure. We outperformed the district consistently in grades 3 and 8. Apollo, Brownsville, Bushwick, and North Brooklyn Prep outperformed the district in all grades.

For measure 4, three schools met the measure. North Brooklyn Prep was a bright spot with a 1.32 average.

For measure 5, four schools met the measure with Apollo and Endeavor falling just shy (less than 1.0 away from target). North Brooklyn Prep was a bright spot with a 58.8 mean growth percentile average across all grades.

For measure 6, four schools met the measure. Growth varied within grade levels across schools, with many schools seeing double digit growth in more than one grade level, while not meeting the measure in other grades.

Additional Context and Evidence

In 2024-25, we were in year two of implementing a new curriculum in grades 5-8, Illustrative Mathematics. Based on the work of Student Achievement Partners, Instruction Partners and others who have studied implementation efforts research shows you need at least 3-5 years to fully implement a curricular change. Additionally, we contracted with Achievement Partners to assess the quality of a new curriculum we have been expanding across grades K-4 called Context for Learning Mathematics. The relative strength of 3rd

and 4th grade performance is potentially associated with the adoption of and implementation of Context for Learning Mathematics.

We also continued to implement Achievement Network (Anet) built interim assessments aligned to state math standards and curriculum bringing clarity and coherence during our implementation and assessment of student proficiency. This rigorous curriculum and assessment design increased the quality of math instruction this cohort of students received.

Mathematics Action Plan

For the year 25-26, we are continuing our implementation of Illustrative Mathematics in Grades 5-8 We expect that instruction with this curriculum for multiple consecutive years will improve student performance.

In the K-4 mathematics program at Achievement First, we are continuing to expand our pilot for Context for Learning Mathematics for the core math block across all K-2 classrooms. CFLM curriculum uses a workshop environment and authentic real life contexts to foster the use of mathematical models as thinking tools. CFLM in combination with our existing math program component of CGI will support teachers in meeting instructional rigor and driving depth of thinking, as aligned on state assessments.

In Grades 5-8, we will be deepening our use of IXL Math to focus on promoting procedural fluency through custom skills matching to state standards and Illustrative Mathematics curriculum. Additionally, we are using the IXL Math Diagnostic, to provide schools with up-to-date, accurate assessments of student proficiency to support instructional decisions to amplify student growth.

Deans who coach math across grade K-8 will have regular professional development days with sessions aligned with the Network priority of Excellent Tier 1 instruction. Development will include real-time observations of math classrooms with shared debriefs and planning for next coaching steps. Additionally, schools will be developed on data progress monitoring. After each interim, K-8, deans and teachers will analyze data trends for their students to create actionable data plans for student learning.

GOAL 3: SCIENCE

Background

Across all of K-12 science we emphasize the three dimensions of science instruction that anchor the NY state science standards and the Next Generation Science Standards: Disciplinary Core Ideas, Cross-Cutting Concepts, and Science and Engineering Practices. We see three-dimensional science instruction using relevant, rigorous, and standards-aligned curriculum as foundational to ensuring we are providing full access to science instruction and experiences that will provide students with the access and opportunity to disrupt the underrepresentation of BIPOC and women in the STEM workforce and equip all students with

the conceptual understanding of the natural world and a framework to think scientifically necessary for all members of our society.

At Achievement First elementary schools, the purpose of science instruction is to build a love of science and engineering, and to build content knowledge and skill with science practices. This joint purpose serves to lay the foundation for future science learning. Our internally-developed NYS P-12 Science Standards-aligned curriculum materials for K-4 are organized into cohesive units that follow the BSCS 5-E cycle of inquiry. Teachers play the role of facilitator and students, starting in kindergarten, are positioned to ask questions, obtain evidence, and construct explanations. Regular formative assessments to monitor student learning are part of every unit.

A focus in 2024-2025 for K-4 was increasing the number of schools with science specialists which allowed for teachers to receive more science-specific professional development and coaching. These teachers were supported through professional development focused on teaching investigation lessons and on discussion facilitation.

In 2024-2025, Achievement First Middle Schools continued full implementation of OpenSciEd in Grade 6-8, and began implementation of OpenSciEd in Grade 5 in January 2025 when the first unit was released. OpenSciEd has obtained high ratings from EdReports for 6-8 and NSTA for 5, and is aligned to NYS P-12 Science Standards, as well as to our vision for science instruction. Students collaboratively engage in the science practices to work towards explanations of phenomena across units of instruction.

To support implementation of OpenSciEd:

- Teachers had a network-led summer training session focused on formative assessment data response
- Teachers received school-based content sessions and coaching focused on intellectual preparation for lessons, and analyzing and responding to assessment data
- Leaders had network-led summer training sessions and quarterly cohorts focused on implementation vision, and giving feedback to teachers on planning and observations
- We developed a cohort of Curriculum Fellows to provide leadership in implementation, facilitated through monthly working group meetings

Our assessment strategy included OpenSciEd curricular assessments as well as internally developed state-standard aligned Interim Assessments administered online in Illuminate three times a year to monitor learning. Leaders developed data-driven plans to respond to the data with their teachers with the aim of improving student learning outcomes.

At our Achievement First high schools, our belief is that science education must include the following:

- INVESTMENT: Teacher and student passion for science is front-and-center
- RIGOR of CONTENT/TASK: The driving investigation question and aligned task are appropriately challenging for remote learning, engaging, and connected to the New York State P-12 Science Learning Standards.

- THINKING: Scholars spend the majority of the lesson in discussion and writing across consistent technology platforms for collaboration and communication. Facilitation of investigation and discussion effectively deepens scholar understanding of science concepts and practices.
- FEEDBACK: There are clearly established and consistently maintained structures for oral and written scholar work within the online platform.
- CULTURALLY RELEVANT: Planning and teaching to integrate social, political, and economic aspects of science issues into existing best practices to support students' development and maintenance of cultural competence.

In the 24-25 school year, we began a phased implementation of OpenSciEd in Grades 9-11. Similar to our middle school program, we selected OpenSciEd as it obtained high ratings from EdReports and is aligned to NYS P-12 Science Standards and the demands of the AP standards, as well as to our vision for science instruction.

At Ujima HS and in 11th grade Biology at Brooklyn High School we continued to use our internally-developed curriculum (legacy curriculum). With this, we intentionally worked to support these teachers in teaching in a more student-centered way using strategies and tools from OpenSciEd and in-house.

To support implementation of OpenSciEd and our Legacy curriculum:

- teachers attended a full day of summer training facilitated by OpenSciEd facilitators
- teachers attended two full days of summer training facilitated by the HS Science Achievement Director
- leaders had monthly cohorts focus on implementation vision, supporting teacher planning, and giving feedback on observations
- We utilized an OpenSciEd Implementation Progression from Columbia's Center for Public Research & Leadership in observations to track the quality of implementation and inform supports across the year
- We developed Curriculum Fellows to serve as leaders in implementation through bi-weekly meetings and monthly working groups

In the 25-26 school year, we are continuing our phased implementation of OpenSciEd in Grades 9-11 with all of our classrooms in Grades 9-11 leveraging OpenSciEd. We are building on our support from last year by incorporating more frequent school visits to develop academic deans to feel more confident with the curriculum and to develop them to be the leaders of this curriculum on campus.

Elementary and Middle Science

Science Measure 1 - Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State science examination.

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 5th and 8th grade in spring 2025. The table below summarizes the performance of students enrolled for at least two years.

Charter School Performance on 2024-25 State Science Exam
By Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

	Grade	Students in At Least Their 2nd Year		
		Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
Apollo	5	30	18	60.0%
	8	82	47	57.3%
	All	**112**	**65**	**58.0%**
Brownsville	5	50	18	36.0%
	8	79	48	60.8%
	All	**129**	**66**	**51.2%**
Bushwick	5	82	34	41.5%
	8	86	44	51.2%
	All	**168**	**78**	**46.4%**
Endeavor	5	61	24	39.3%
	8	77	45	58.4%
	All	**138**	**69**	**50.0%**
Legacy	5	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8	N/A	N/A	N/A
	All	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Linden	5	29	8	27.6%
	8	56	31	55.4%
	All	**85**	**39**	**45.9%**
North Brooklyn	5	84	37	44.0%
	8	85	56	65.9%
	All	**169**	**93**	**55.0%**
Voyager	5	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8	42	21	50.0%
	All	**42**	**21**	**50.0%**

Science Measure 2 - Comparative

Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the

school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the school district of comparison.

2024-25 State Science Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level							
		Charter School Students in at Least 2nd Year			All District Students		
	Grade	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
Apollo	5	30	18	60.0%			
	8	82	47	57.3%			
	All	**112**	**65**	**58.0%**			
Brownsville	5	50	18	36.0%			
	8	79	48	60.8%			
	All	**129**	**66**	**51.2%**			
Bushwick	5	82	34	41.5%			
	8	86	44	51.2%			
	All	**168**	**78**	**46.4%**			
Endeavor	5	61	24	39.3%			
	8	77	45	58.4%			
	All	**138**	**69**	**50.0%**			
Legacy	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	All	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	N/A	N/A	N/A
Linden	5	29	8	27.6%			
	8	56	31	55.4%			
	All	**85**	**39**	**45.9%**			
North Brooklyn	5	84	37	44.0%			
	8	85	56	65.9%			
	All	**169**	**93**	**55.0%**			
Voyager	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	8	42	21	50.0%			
	All	**42**	**21**	**50.0%**			

Summary of the Elementary/Middle Science Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Apollo: NO Brownsville: NO Bushwick: NO Endeavor: NO Legacy: N/A

		Linden: NO North Brooklyn: NO Voyager: NO
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Apollo: N/A Brownsville: N/A Bushwick: N/A Endeavor: N/A Legacy: N/A Linden: N/A North Brooklyn: N/A Voyager: N/A

Evaluation of the Science Goal

No school met the absolute proficiency goal of 75% proficiency when aggregating across 5th and 8th grade students enrolled in at least their second year. Overall, schools were 17.0-29.1 percentage points below the goal (Apollo -17.0%, Brownsville -23.8%, Bushwick -28.6%, Endeavor -25.0%, Linden -29.1%, North Brooklyn -20.0%, Voyager -25%). Analyzing schools with data, 6 of the 7 schools did demonstrate increases year over year ranging from +14.4% (at Apollo and Brownsville) to +1.7% (at Bushwick). Performance varied by grade.

For 8th grade, results ranged from -25.0 to -9.1 percentage points under the 75% goal. Notable year over year increases were seen for Brownsville at +13.8% (47.0% to 60.8%), and Linden at +9.8% (45.6% to 55.4%). Performance at Voyager was down -10% between SY23-24 and SY24-25 (60% to 50%).

For 5th grade, performance remained further below the goal, ranging -47.4 to -15.0 percent below the 75% goal. Comparing SY23-24 and SY24-25, notable growth is seen for Apollo at +27.2% (32.8% to 60%), North Brooklyn at +23.1% (20.9% to 44%), and Brownsville at +12.5 (23.5% to 36%).

8th grade remains the relative strength, while 5th grade remained flat and further below the 75% benchmark at most schools.

The relative strength of 8th grade performance is potentially associated with the adoption and implementation of the OpenSciEd curriculum in Grades 6-8 starting in SY23-24. This rigorous curriculum increased the quality of science instruction this cohort of students received in both 7th and 8th grades.

At the time of writing, comparative data is not available so that goal cannot be evaluated.

Additional Context and Evidence

Teacher turnover may be playing a role in student outcomes, as 3/7 schools were using long-term substitutes or had mid-year hires in grade 5 and/or 8.

Schools that administer a Regents science exam to 8th grade students in lieu of the state exam should report the results in the table below.

Performance on a Regents Science Exam
Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

Grade	Year	Regents Exam	Number Tested	Number Passing	Percent Passing
8	2022-23	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	2023-24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	2024-25	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Action Plan

For SY25–26, Achievement First will deepen implementation of OpenSciEd across the network to improve science outcomes. In Grades 6–8, schools will continue using OpenSciEd, with multi-year, coherent instruction expected to drive gains in student performance. Grade 5 will implement OpenSciEd for the first full school year. In Grades K–4, we will begin a phased rollout of OpenSciEd in selected schools and grade levels. The Elementary OpenSciEd curriculum engages students in three-dimensional, phenomenon-based learning and supports equitable, rigorous instruction. This curricular shift for K-4 supports vertical coherence from Kindergarten through Grade 8.

Across K–8 classrooms using OpenSciEd, teachers will leverage IXL Science to review prerequisite standards and provide targeted practice with grade-level standards.

Our assessment strategy maintains internally developed interim assessments at regular intervals in Grades 5–8 and adds parallel interim assessments for schools teaching OpenSciEd in Grades 3–4. These interims provide specific, actionable data to inform instruction and to monitor progress toward the 75% proficiency goal.

To support high-quality implementation, deans who coach OpenSciEd in K–8 will participate in regular professional learning aligned to the network priority of Excellent Tier 1 instruction, with a focus on access for all learners. Development will include real-time classroom observations, shared debriefs, and planning next coaching steps. Following each interim, deans and teachers will analyze trends and create actionable data plans to accelerate student learning.

GOAL 4: ESSA

ESSA Measure 1

Under the state's ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

2024-25 Accountability Plan Progress Report

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school's status under the state accountability system. More information on assigned accountability designations and context can be found here.

Accountability Status by Year

	Year	Status
Apollo	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Local Support and Improvement
Brownsville	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Local Support and Improvement
Bushwick	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Local Support and Improvement
Endeavor	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Local Support and Improvement
Legacy	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Comprehensive Support and Improvement+
	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Comprehensive Support and Improvement+
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Comprehensive Support and Improvement+
Linden	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Local Support and Improvement

	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Local Support and Improvement
North Brooklyn	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Local Support and Improvement
Voyager	2022-23 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2021-22 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2023-24 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2022-23 Data	Local Support and Improvement
	2024-25 Accountability Status and Support Model based on 2023-24 Data	Local Support and Improvement

Additional Context and Evidence

N/A