



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

Eugenio Maria de Hostos Charter School

School Evaluation Report 2006-2007

August 9, 2007]

Charter Schools Institute
State University of New York
41 State Street, Suite 700
Albany, New York 12207
518/433-8277, 518/427-6510, Fax
<http://www.newyorkcharters.org>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
Background on Charter Schools and the State University	2
The State University Trustees' Oversight Process.....	2
Inspection Visits and Reports	3
The Renewal Cycle and the Timing of School Inspection Visits	5
The Present Report.....	5
Keeping this Report in Context.....	6
SCHOOL DESCRIPTION.....	8
SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS EVALUATION VISIT	12
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	13
PREVIOUS SCHOOL YEARS' PERFORMANCE REIVEW.....	15
School Performance Summary for English Language Arts	17
School Performance Summary for Mathematics	18
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS AND EVIDENCE.....	19
Use of Assessment	19
Curriculum	20
Pedagogy and Leadership	21
Pedagogy and Instruction.....	22
Pedagogy and At-Risk Students.....	22
Professional Development	23
Teacher Turnover.....	24
RENEWAL BENCHMARKS USED DURING THE VISIT.....	25
CONDUCT OF THE VISIT	27

INTRODUCTION

Background on Charter Schools and the State University

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 (“the Act”) called for the creation of tuition-free public schools that would operate independently and autonomously of local school districts; schools by design committed to improving student achievement for all students, particularly those at-risk of academic failure.

The Act specifies that civic leaders, community groups, educators and/or parents interested in bringing public school choice to their communities may apply to one of three chartering entities in the state to open a new charter school: the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (the State University Trustees), the New York State Board of Regents (the Regents), or local boards of education (in New York City, authorizing power is vested in the Chancellor). Additionally, existing traditional district-operated schools can seek to convert to charter status through their governing boards of education.

The Charter Schools Institute (the Institute) was established by the State University Trustees to assist them in their responsibilities under the Act, including reviewing applications to establish charter schools as well as the review of renewal applications for those schools (as detailed more fully below, an initial charter is granted for a period of five years only). In each case the Institute makes recommendations to the State University Trustees. In addition the Institute is charged with providing ongoing oversight of SUNY authorized charter schools.

Charter schools are public schools in every respect. They are open to all children, non-sectarian in their programs and funded with public tax dollars. Unlike district operated schools, which are run by a board of education, each public charter school is governed by an independent board of trustees which is directly responsible for school performance. That board, while independent, is subject to public oversight. Just as traditional school boards, charter school boards of trustees must adhere to New York State’s Freedom of Information and Open Meetings laws. Public charter schools and their boards are also subject to oversight and monitoring. In the case of SUNY authorized schools, that monitoring is conducted by the Institute. Additionally, all public charter schools in New York State are jointly subject to inspection and oversight by the State Education Department (SED) on behalf of the Board of Regents. As such, charter schools, though free from many mandates, are more accountable to the public than district-run schools.

Charter schools are also accountable for performance. In exchange for the freedom from many state rules and regulations that the Act provides, a public charter school receives a charter, or contract, of up to five years and must meet stated student performance goals that are set forth in its Accountability Plan, as well as standards regarding its fiscal, legal and organizational effectiveness within the charter period, or risk losing its charter or not having its charter renewed. This tradeoff—freedom from rules and regulations in exchange for unprecedented accountability for student performance, and real consequences for failure—is one of the most significant differences between public charter schools and other public schools administered by traditional school districts.

The State University Trustees’ Oversight Process

The State University Trustees, jointly with the Board of Regents, are required to provide oversight sufficient to ensure that each charter school that the Trustees have authorized is in compliance with applicable law and the terms of its charter. The Institute, together with the State Education

Department, monitors compliance through a monitoring plan (which is contained in the schools' charter itself) and other methods.

In addition to monitoring a school's compliance with the law, the State University Trustees view their oversight responsibility more broadly and positively. Accordingly, they have adopted policies that require the Institute to provide ongoing evaluation of charter schools authorized by them. By providing this oversight and feedback, the State University Trustees and the Institute seek to accomplish three goals.

The first goal is to facilitate improvement. By providing substantive information about the school's strengths and weaknesses to the school's board of trustees, administration, faculty and other staff, the Institute can play a role in helping the school to recognize those strengths and weaknesses. Of course, whether the school actually takes corrective actions, and more importantly, effective corrective action, remains the school's responsibility given that it is an independent and autonomous school.

The second goal is to disseminate information about the school's performance beyond the school's professional staff and governing board to all stakeholders, including parents and the larger community in which the school is located. Ideally this information, including the present report, should help parents make choices about whether a school is serving their children well and/or is likely to continue to do so in the future. For this reason, this report (and others like it) is posted on the Institute's website and the school is asked to inform parents of its posting. By providing parents with more information, the State University hopes to enhance the market accountability to which charters are subject: if they do not attract and retain sufficient numbers of students who want the product they are providing, they cannot survive.

The third goal is to allow the Institute to build a database of the school's progress over time. By evaluating the school periodically, the Institute is better able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a school—and the likelihood for continued success or failure. Having information based on past patterns, the Institute and the State University Trustees are better positioned to make recommendations and a decision on whether a school's charter should be renewed. In turn, a school will also have a far better sense of where they stand in the eyes of its authorizer.

Inspection Visits and Reports¹

A central component of the Institute's evaluative oversight system is a schedule of periodic visits to and inspections of charter schools, resulting in letters and reports to the school's board of trustees. This inspection report is a product of one of those visits.

In evaluating schools at renewal and on a regular and ongoing basis, the Institute uses a series of benchmarks that cover not only the strength of the academic program but the strength and effectiveness of the organizational and fiscal policies, structures and procedures that the school has instituted at the time of the visit ("the Renewal Benchmarks"). How these benchmarks are used (and which are used) varies, depending on the specific year of the visit as well as whether the school is in its initial renewal cycle (the first five years) or, having been renewed one or more times, in subsequent renewal cycles.

¹ More information on the Institute's school oversight and evaluation system may be found online at <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/schoolsPubsReports.htm>.

In particular, the Institute uses a subset of the Renewal Benchmarks to review the effectiveness of a charter school's academic programs, e.g., the strength of a school's internal assessment system, the rigor of its pedagogical approach, and the breadth and focus of the school's curriculum. This subset, Renewal Benchmarks 1.B-1.F, is often referred to as the "Qualitative Education Benchmarks," or "QEBs." In the formative years of a school (generally the first three years of operation), the QEBs are important precisely because the quantitative indicators of academic achievement, i.e., students' performance on standardized tests (especially the state's 3rd - 8th grade testing program and Regents assessments), are generally few in number and difficult to interpret. The qualitative indicators serve as proxy indicators, therefore, for student assessment data sets that are necessarily limited and incipient. Moreover, only by using these qualitative indicators can the Institute provide feedback not only on *how* the school is doing but also *why* it is succeeding or failing.²

Over time, and particularly at the school's initial renewal (and subsequent renewals thereafter), the quantitative indicators (as defined by Renewal Benchmark 1.A, the school's progress in meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals) take on paramount importance and the qualitative indicators concordantly diminish in importance. This is consonant with the fact that charter schools must demonstrate results or face non-renewal. However, while subsequent renewal decisions are based almost solely by the school's progress toward meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals during the charter period, the Institute continues to use the Qualitative Education Benchmarks in its evaluation of charter schools. The reason for this is that it can give the school, parents, and other stakeholders information not only on how the school is doing but perhaps the reasons for its lack of performance (if such is the case).

This inspection report includes a review of academic attainment and improvement based on the school's performance on state and other assessments. The School Performance Review provides an evaluation of the school's academic achievement in the context of Renewal Benchmark 1A. Because of the timing of the release of state assessment data, the review is based on test results from the school year preceding the date of the school visit upon which the evidence for the Qualitative Education Benchmarks is based.³ The narrative refers to School Performance Summaries which follow the School Performance Review section. These one page summaries present a synopsis of the Accountability Plan outcome measures in ELA and mathematics and the school's performance against these measures over a three year time period:⁴

- Measure 1 (absolute) shows the grade level and aggregate performance on the state test of both all students and students enrolled in at least their second year.
- Measure 2 (absolute) presents the school's Performance Index (PI) measured against the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set by the state's NCLB accountability system. The PI is derived by adding together the percentage of students at Levels 2 and above and the percentage at Levels 3 and above.
- Measure 3 (comparative) compares the performance of charter school students enrolled in at least their second year to all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

² More often, of course, schools do not succeed or fail so much as parts of the highly complex organization are working well and parts are not.

³ Not all schools will have state test results because the state only administers tests in certain grades: state ELA and math tests are administered to grades 3-8, science tests in grades 4 and 8, and social studies tests in grades 5 and 8.

⁴ In indicating whether a performance measure has been met, the summaries only present a strict, narrow accounting; they do not show whether the school came close to meeting a measure or the relative weight of each measure for gauging student progress.

For instance, a 5th through 8th grade charter school would compare only its 6th through 8th grade results to the same tested grades in the district because students in its 5th grade were only in their first year at the charter school.

- Measure 4 (comparative) compares the actual overall performance of the school to the predicted level of performance of similar schools statewide using a regression analysis based on free lunch statistics. The Effect Size is a statistical measure calculated by dividing the difference between the actual and predicted outcomes by the standard deviation difference.
- Measure 5 (value added) shows both the number of grade level cohorts that achieved their target as well as the overall performance of all cohort students combined. If the baseline is above 50 NCE, then the target is an increase of any amount.

The Renewal Cycle and the Timing of School Inspection Visits

Because some schools take planning years before opening (during which time their five-year charter continues to run as if they had opened) and/or receive renewal charter terms of less than five years, the number of years that a school has been in operation is not always co-terminus with the number of years that a school has provided instruction. Thus for example, a school that is in its seventh year of operation may be facing initial renewal, having previously received a short-term planning year renewal for a period of time equivalent to the number of planning years the school took. It will therefore receive a renewal visit, whereas another school that did not take any planning years and was renewed for five years would be in the second year of its second five-year charter. This school would therefore not receive a renewal visit but rather an evaluation visit and inspection report, which all schools in that position receive.

As such, each of the Institute's inspection reports contains a chart indicating the years the school has been in operation, the year of its present charter period, when it has been renewed and for how long, and the feedback that has been previously issued to the school. This chart is set forth in the following section.

The Present Report

The information contained within this report is the result of evidence obtaining during the Institute's visit to the school conducted in the spring of the school's second year of instruction of its first or second charter term. In addition to this introduction, the report includes a brief description of the school, conclusions and analysis from the present visit, the Renewal Benchmarks, and, finally, data on the visit, including identities of the school inspectors and the date of the visit.

The report reflects the observations and findings from the one-day inspection visit conducted typically by a two- to four-member team comprised of Institute staff, and, in some cases, outside experts. Consistent with the Institute's evaluation process throughout the life of the charter, Institute visitors seek evidence of effectiveness in key areas: the academic success of the school including teaching and learning (curriculum, instruction and assessment) and the effectiveness and viability of the school as an organization, including such items as board operations and student order and discipline. Issues regarding compliance with state and federal laws and regulations may be noted (and subsequently addressed), and where the Institute finds serious deficiencies in particular relating to student health and safety it may take additional and immediate action; however, monitoring compliance is not the principal purpose of the visit. The same is true with issues pertaining to the fiscal soundness of the school. Evaluation visits typically include an interview with the school board, the school leader, classroom visitations, in addition to the review of other school-based documents.

Keeping this Report in Context

In reviewing this report, readers should keep in mind that charter schools face a variety of challenges as they mature, and not all charter schools address each challenge at the same pace. The State University and the Institute recognize the difference between the challenges of starting-up a school and those involved in sustaining its viability and effectiveness over the long-term, as well as the differences in the richness of student assessment data available for a school which has recently opened compared to a school which has been in operation for an extended time. In reviewing this report, readers should keep in mind that charter schools face major challenges in the first few years of their charter. These challenges include:

- establishing a positive, academically focused school culture that provides high expectations, support and encouragement for students and teaching staff, and any necessary remediation for students;
- establishing operational and communication patterns with the governing school board of trustees, as well as communication patterns with staff, parents and the community;
- setting up sound fiscal processes and procedures;
- establishing the school in often less-than-ideal facilities, without ready access to facilities funding mechanisms available to district administered public schools;
- creating an environment with strong instructional leadership where teachers receive timely professional development to address changing student needs;
- ensuring that all staff are familiar with and consistently use an effective system for behavior management; and
- retaining qualified staff and minimizing the frequency and rate of any staff turnover by understanding the reason for it, and providing replacement staff with an orientation to the school and its program, as well as the necessary professional development.

Readers should also keep in mind the inherent limitations of a one-day visit, which provides only a snap-shot of the school on visit day. While the Institute is confident that the majority of its observations are valid, in that they reflect an underlying reality about the school's academic and organizational structures, they are not perfect or error-free.

For the reasons above, and because of the inherent complexity of an organization such as a school, this report does not contain a rating or a single comprehensive indicator that would indicate at a glance the school's prospects for renewal. It does, however, summarize the various strengths of the school and the areas that the inspection team found in need of improvement. To the extent appropriate and useful, we encourage school boards to use the inspection team's conclusions in planning school improvement efforts.

While there is no one rating that the Institute gives as a result of a single-day visit, it is important to note that where the inspection team identifies area after area with not just room for improvement but significant and severe deficiencies, and few, if any, countervailing strengths, the difficulty that the school may have in presenting a compelling case for renewal is likely to be substantially increased and this fact may well be noted. Conversely, where the inspection team finds that strengths outnumber weaknesses in both quantity and quality, the school is likely to be better positioned to build a strong case for renewal. So, too, this fact may be noted.

In sum, then, we urge all readers to review the entire report and not to take a particular comment in the report about the school out of context.

Finally, we note that this report cannot serve its three functions (providing data to the school to use for its potential improvement; disseminating information to stakeholders; and gathering data so that the Institute may come to renewal with a richer set of evidence) unless the report is not only unsparingly candid regarding the observations that the Institute has made, but also focused on those areas that are potentially in need of improvement rather than those accomplishments that the school has accumulated to date.

While this level of what can reasonably be termed *brutal honesty* is necessary, as is the focus on areas for improvement, readers should remember that almost no other entity in education is held to such a high standard of review. This is especially true of public schools that traditional districts and Boards of Education oversee. In so saying, the Institute does not ask the reader to make excuses for schools that are not succeeding—and the Institute’s accountability system does not and will not—but we do note that providing this level of accountability, which almost every charter school welcomes and even advocates for, represents in and of itself a revolution in how public education is governed.

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

The Board of Trustees of the State University of New York approved the charter for Eugenio Maria De Hostos Charter School (“Eugenio Charter School”) on January 25, 2000, which was subsequently approved by the Board of Regents on April 4, 2000. With the support of the Ibero American Action league, Inc., the school opened in September 2000 with an enrollment of 120 students in Kindergarten through second grades. The school added one grade each year thereafter throughout the duration of its original charter for an enrollment of 280 students in Kindergarten through sixth grades in 2004-05. The school is located in a former parochial school facility at 938 Clifford Avenue in Rochester, New York.

Eugenio Charter School submitted an Application for Charter Renewal in the fall of 2004 and was granted a full-term, five-year renewal charter by the State University Trustees on March 1, 2005. The Renewal Charter became effective on June 24, 2005. The school’s Application for Charter Renewal included a request to add seventh and eighth grades, but due to limited evidence of academic success in the upper grades, Eugenio Charter School was authorized to provide instruction only to kindergarten through sixth grades.

The mission of Eugenio Charter School as stated in the school’s Renewal Charter is as follows:

It is the mission of the Eugenio Maria De Hostos Charter School to produce students who meet or exceed the New York Learning Standards in Language Arts, math, science and social studies. Our students will be able to communicate in both English and Spanish. Staff and students will view themselves as self reflective, continuous learners. Parents will view themselves as partners in their child’s education.

Eugenio Charter School’s instruction is based on the performance-oriented America’s Choice design. The goal of the school is to create an environment where Spanish-dominant students are quickly and smoothly immersed in English, while exposing English-dominant student to Spanish immersion. Although the school originally anticipated a majority of students to be Spanish-dominant, the majority of students are English-dominant, and the school has adapted its educational program to meet the needs of the students it serves.

Key design elements for Eugenio Charter School as stated in the school’s Application for Charter Renewal include the following:

- Dual language program, consisting of an enrichment language model;
- Transition from a Title I Targeted Assistance Program to a Schoolwide Program, consisting of Title I and special education teachers participating within grade level teams to support student learning;
- Extended day program, which includes a 30-minute tutoring block utilizing various community organizations, and dance/drama classes offered through a 21st Century Grant;
- Commitment to maintain class size at 20 to 25 students per classroom with the assistance of a paraprofessional and the support services of Title I teachers and special education teachers;
- Student intervention plans that distribute responsibility between the student, parent, and school;

- Support for professional development, including a Reading First Grant that makes available to primary grade teachers the Voyager U Reading Academy;
- Expanded use of assessment data, including a school improvement plan, grade level, and student level plans;
- Extended use of community resources, including the YMCA for swimming and physical education, the Hochstein School of Music for music classes, and the Strong Museum for enrichment of the science and social studies curriculum;
- Continued use of the America's Choice School Design, focusing instruction on a workshop model;
- Daily independent reading opportunities for all students;
- Consistent and enforced student discipline efforts;
- Strong parental involvement; and
- School uniforms.

School Year (2006-07)

190 instructional days

School Day⁵ (2006-07)

8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

⁵ 3:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. is used as a tutoring period, while 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. is used as an Extended Day period.

Enrollment

	Original Chartered Enrollment	Revised Chartered Enrollment ⁶	Actual Enrollment ⁷	Original Chartered Grades	Revised Grades Served	Actual Grades Served	Complying
2000-01	120	120	120	K-2	K-2	K-2	YES
2001-02	160	160	160	K-3	K-3	K-3	YES
2002-03	200	200	195	K-4	K-4	K-4	YES
2003-04	240	240	240	K-5	K-5	K-5	YES
2004-05	280	280	280	K-6	K-6	K-6	YES
2005-06	280	280	291	K-6	K-6	K-6	YES
2006-07	280	280	290	K-6	K-6	K-6	YES
2007-08	280			K-6			
2008-09	280			K-6			
2009-10	280			K-6			

	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006	
Race/Ethnicity	No. of Students	% of Enroll.	No. of Students	% of Enroll.	No. of Students	% of Enroll.	No. of Students	% of Enroll.
American Indian, Alaskan, Asian, or Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Black (Not Hispanic)	115	57.5%	119	49.4%	141	50.4%	149	51.6%
Hispanic	80	40.0%	119	49.4%	131	46.8%	131	45.3%
White	5	2.5%	3	1.2%	8	2.9%	9	%

Source: NYSED 2004-05 Report Card (2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05), NYSED Database (2005-06)

⁶ In their renewal decision, the State University Trustees authorized a maximum enrollment of 320 in 2005-06 and 410 each year thereafter; however, the school has set its maximum at 280. .

⁷ Actual enrollment per the Institute's Official Enrollment Table. Note that the NYSED 2004-05 School Report Card, upon which the Free and Reduced lunch and student demographic figures are calculated, cited the following enrollment totals: 2002-03: 200 ; 2003-04: 241; 2004-05: 280. The NYSED 2005-06 database cited an enrollment of 289 students.

	2002-2003		2003-2004		2004-2005		2005-2006	
Free/Reduced Lunch	No. of Students	% of Enroll.	No. of Students	% of Enroll.	No. of Students	% of Enroll.	No. of Students	% of Enroll.
Eligible for Free Lunch	151	75.5%	188	78.0%	215	76.8%	166	64.4%
Eligible for Reduced Lunch	27	13.5%	24	10.0%	30	10.7%	44	15.2%

Source: NYSED 2004-05 Report Card (2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05), NYSED Database (2005-06)

School Charter History

Charter Year	School Year	Year of Operation	Evaluation Visit	Feedback to School	Other Actions Taken
Original Charter 1 st Year	2000-01	1 st	YES	Prior Action Letter; End-of-Year Evaluation Report	
Original Charter 2 nd Year	2001-02	2 nd	YES	End-of-Year Evaluation Report	
Original Charter 3 rd Year	2002-03	3 rd	YES	End-of-Year Evaluation Report	
Original Charter 4 th Year	2003-04	4 th	NO		
Original Charter 5 th Year	2004-05	5 th	YES	Initial Renewal Report	Granted full Charter Renewal for period of five years with conditions
Renewal Charter 1 st Year	2005-06	6 th	NO		
Renewal Charter 2 nd Year	2006-07	7 th	YES	End-of-Year Evaluation Report	

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS EVALUATION VISIT

Over the term of its first charter, Eugenio Maria de Hostos Charter School had met some of the key academic outcomes it had set for itself in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. In 2003-2004, the school outperformed all of its comparison schools on the fourth grade state ELA and mathematics examinations. Despite this comparative success, at the time of its 2005 renewal, Eugenio Charter School had not made uniform progress in achieving its absolute or value-added goals. While the school made substantial progress on the state's mathematics exam in 2003-2004, its ELA results showed only a slight increase and remained far from the school goal. In addition, both quantitative and qualitative data indicate that the school had achieved its strongest program implementation in Kindergarten through fourth grades with the quality and rigor of the program diminishing at the upper grades.

The renewal visit revealed that the school had remained committed to its dual language approach which had succeeded in developing oral and written Spanish skills among its primarily English-speaking population. Parents, teachers, administrators and school board members clearly and consistently articulated the school's mission to help all students learn by providing them with a variety of instructional opportunities that complement their learning style and help them become bilingual and bi-literate. In each six-day instructional cycle, students received instruction in English for three days and then were immersed in instruction in Spanish for three days.

From the school's inception, Eugenio Charter School put in place a consistent and effective behavior system that promoted calm, safe classrooms and that fostered a supportive environment. Moreover, the school benefited from a committed, hardworking and caring instructional staff. Yet the school's continuing growth in enrollment strained the leadership's capacity to provide effective instructional oversight. Teachers did not receive discerning, critical feedback on their instructional practices.

School inspectors found that the quality and rigor of teacher instruction at Eugenio Charter School varied widely across classrooms and diminished in strength in the upper grades. The lack of explicit, content-rich, teacher-led instruction, insufficiently challenging content and learning activities and the school's practice of not consistently correcting students' oral and written language hindered the school's ability to "produce students who meet or exceed the New York State standards" in English language arts as set forth in the school's mission statement.

Of note, school staff examined assessment data and instituted major curricular changes in response to identified weaknesses. For example, based on an analysis of internal and external assessment measures, the school modified the mathematics instructional program to include the use of curriculum that provides a strong conceptual base for thinking mathematically. At the time of the renewal, the implementation of these new programs was incomplete.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Charter Schools Institute conducted the Seventh-Year Visit to Eugenio Maria de Hostos Charter School (Eugenio Charter School) on May 8, 2007. Inspectors visited classrooms, reviewed documents and interviewed instructional and administrative staff. Each of their conclusions is summarized below. The evidence base and further analysis is contained in the Benchmark Analysis and Evidence section.

Academic Attainment and Improvement

The school did not meet its goals in English language arts or mathematics in 2005-06 but is achieving its goals in science and social studies. In addition, the school is in good standing under its No Child Left Behind goal.

Use of Assessment

The school has demonstrated elements of a system to gather assessment and evaluation data and to use it to improve instructional effectiveness and student learning. However, the system is not yet fully developed. Several sources of data indicated that there is a well-defined, comprehensive system of English language arts assessments. At this point, the assessment system for the content areas of mathematics, science and social studies do not appear to be as well developed and rely primarily on publishers' tests. The school is beginning to analyze the results of state exams (English language arts and mathematics) as well as Terra Novas to determine gaps in the curriculum and areas of weaknesses in student achievement.

Curriculum

The school has made significant changes to the curriculum and delivery of the program since renewal. Two years ago the school shifted to a departmentalized structure in which teachers focus on an instructional specialty and also decreased the amount of instruction in Spanish. There was documentation of standardized curriculum guidelines in all subject areas and substantial evidence that curricula and lessons are standards-based. The process for curriculum review and selection relies heavily upon curriculum mapping and places a great emphasis upon alignment with New York State standards.

Pedagogy and Leadership

At Eugenio Charter School, teachers perceive the school principal, along with the coaches, as the instructional leaders. On a day-to-day basis, the literacy coaches and mathematics lead teacher clearly provide teachers the greatest support. While the formal observation of teachers is regular and timely, the design of the evaluation system limits its effectiveness. The America's Choice observation instruments focus on structural aspects of the lesson but not on appropriateness of the content or the quality of the delivery of the content.

Pedagogy and Instruction

Teachers used a variety of instructional methodologies to engage students in purposeful learning activities. Teachers were engaged in purposeful instruction in most classrooms. Over the course of the day, inspectors saw teachers utilize a variety of approaches and methodologies to engage students. Paraprofessionals are trained and utilized to support the instructional program provided in the classroom. Classroom observations suggest that most teachers and paraprofessional work together productively and that the paraprofessional was integral to the instructional setting,

Pedagogy and At-Risk Students

The school has identified and put into place multiple resources to aid students at-risk of academic failure. These resources include additional instructional time and extra adult staffing.

Professional Development

A variety of professional development opportunities are provided to teachers in the summer and throughout the school year. At the time of the visits, the school had two literacy coaches—one for the primary grades and one for the intermediate grades—who provide support to new and veteran teachers. Teachers felt that the professional development opportunities offered by the school were useful and were indeed helping them to become better teachers. Moreover, inspectors observed that teachers were focusing on and implementing some of their own learning in their classrooms.

Teacher Turnover

Members of the teaching, coaching and administrative staff all mentioned teacher turnover as an area of concern. At the time of the visit, the school had invested significant resources in the teachers' development and hoped that most would return next fall. The school board and principal were focused on ways to hire and retain staff members, particularly at the intermediate levels.

PREVIOUS SCHOOL YEARS' PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The following review of academic attainment and improvement (Benchmark 1A) is based on assessment results and other data from the 2005-06 school year, although data is presented from the two previous years as well.

Summary: The school did not meet its goals in English language arts or mathematics in 2005-06 but is achieving its goals in science and social studies. In addition, the school is in good standing under its No Child Left Behind goal.

English Language Arts: Student performance rose from 42 percent proficient on the state 4th grade English language arts exam in 2003-04 to 54 percent in 2004-05. In 2005-06, when students in 3rd – 6th grades took the test, 51 percent were proficient. The school has achieved the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) established by the state's NCLB accountability system for last three consecutive years. For the first two of those years the school came close to the local district's level of performance, and in 2005-06 exceeded it. In comparison to similar schools statewide, the school has performed about the same as predicted for 2004-05 and 2005-06. On its value added measure, two out of three cohorts met their target on the Terra Nova exam in 2005-06 and overall the school improved to just at grade level.

Mathematics: In 2003-04 and 2004-05 the school achieved its absolute measure with 83 percent and 85 percent of students respectively performing at the proficient level on the state's 4th grade mathematics exam. In 2005-06 when students in 3rd – 6th grades took the state exam, the school did not meet this measure with only 53 percent proficient. The 5th and 6th grade students' performance was considerably lower than that of 3rd and 4th grade students. The school has both achieved its AMO and exceeded the performance of the local school district for the last three consecutive years. In 2004-05 the school performed considerably better than predicted in comparison to similar schools statewide; in 2005-06 it performed considerably worse than predicted. Two out of three cohorts met their target on the Terra Nova exam in 2005-06 and overall the school improved to just above grade level.

Science: On the state science exam, 92 percent of 4th grade students were at least proficient in 2005-06; 54 percent scored at the advanced level. This was an increase over the previous two years. The school also outperformed the local school district by 12 percentage points and neighborhood comparison schools by at least 45 points.

Social Studies: On the state social studies exam, 82 percent of 5th grade students performed at the proficient level in 2005-06, a large increase over the previous two years. The school also outperformed the local school district and three out of four of the neighborhood comparison schools.

No Child Left Behind: The school is deemed to be in Good Standing under the state's NCLB Accountability system.

Optional Goals: Of the parents who did respond to the school's satisfaction survey, the school did achieve its goal for parent satisfaction; however, given the low response rate it cannot be determined if that represents the views of all parents. The school came close to meeting its goal for student retention and met its goal for daily attendance. The school did not meet either measure under its

Spanish language goal with only 31 percent moving one Second Language Acquisition stage in a year and 37 percent of students who had five years of Spanish instruction scoring a three or above on the Language Assessment Survey.

Note: The following two pages present School Performance Summaries that provide data addressing the required Accountability Plan outcome measures for ELA and mathematics and the school's performance against these measures. Please refer to the "Inspection Visits and Reports" section of the Introduction of this report for full definitions of the measures used and details about the tables themselves.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

English Language Arts

Eugenio Maria De Hostos Charter School



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

	2003-04 Grades Served: K-5			MET	2004-05 Grades Served: K-6			MET	2005-06 Grades Served: K-6			MET
ABSOLUTE MEASURES 1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam.	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	NO	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	NO	Grades All Students % (N) 2+ Years Students % (N) 3 41.0 (39) 42.0 (39) 4 65.0 (40) 65.0 (37) 5 51.0 (49) 48.0 (40) 6 45.2 (42) 50.0 (30) 7 (0) (0) 8 (0) (0) All 50.6 (170) 50.7 (146)			NO
2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES
COMPARATIVE MEASURES 3. Each year the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local district.	Grades	School	District	NO	Grades	School	District	NO	Grades	School	District	YES
4. Each year the school will exceed its expected level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size (at least 0.3).					Grades	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO			NO
VALUE ADDED MEASURE 5. Each grade level cohort will reduce by one half the difference between the previous year's baseline and 50 NCE on a norm referenced test or 75 percent proficient on the state exam.	Grades	Cohorts Making Target	0 of 2	NO	Grades	Cohorts Making Target	4 of 4	YES	Grades	Cohorts Making Target	2 of 3	NO
	N	Base	Target	Result	N	Base	Target	Result	N	Base	Target	Result
	96	55.3	55.4	51.8	106	53.3	53.4	48.2	117	48.7	49.4	50.0

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Mathematics

Eugenio Marie de Hostos



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

	2003-04 Grades Served: K-5			MET	2004-05 Grades Served: K-6			MET	2005-06 Grades Served: K-6			MET
ABSOLUTE MEASURES 1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam.	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	YES		All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	YES		All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	YES	NO
2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES
COMPARATIVE MEASURES 3. Each year the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local district.	Grades	School	District	YES	Grades	School	District	YES	Grades	School	District	YES
4. Each year the school will exceed its expected level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size (at least 0.3).	Grades	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	Grades	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	Grades	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
VALUE ADDED MEASURE 5. Each grade level cohort will reduce by one half the difference between the previous year's baseline and 50 NCE on a norm referenced test or 75 percent proficient on the state exam.	Grades	Cohorts Making Target	1 of 3	NO	Grades	Cohorts Making Target	0 of 4	NO	Grades	Cohorts Making Target	2 of 3	NO
	67	58.1	58.2	55.1	108	49.0	49.5	53.0	117	49.8	49.9	53.6

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS AND EVIDENCE

Use of Assessment

The school has demonstrated elements of a system to gather assessment and evaluation data, and to use it to improve instructional effectiveness and student learning. However, the system is not yet fully developed.

Several sources of data indicated that there is a well-defined, comprehensive system of English language arts (ELA) assessments. The Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) is regularly administered and students in primary grades take the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) three times a year. In addition, students take Terra Novas and state ELA exams as well as produce writing portfolios. During interviews, intermediate teachers and the Reading First coordinator could speak to all aspects of the assessment system and cite numerous examples of the use of assessment data to drive instruction, map and align curriculum, determine student groupings, sequence curriculum within grades and across grades, and select instructional strategies to address identified deficiencies.

At the time of the visit, the assessment system for the content areas of mathematics, science and social studies did not appear to be as well-developed and relied primarily on publishers' tests. For example, content teachers reported using the assessments from the Mathematics Navigator program, including pre- and post-tests, to identify students in need of remedial and differentiated mathematics instruction for their 4th grade students. One teacher noted that there was an effort to match tests with the lessons taught and to use the results in order to pace future lessons and identify those concepts and skills that may need to be taught again. However, the re-teaching of concepts was limited by the pace at which new materials had to be covered and the nature of the instructional methodology (i.e., America's Choice constructs for lesson delivery). The teachers believed that re-teaching typically had to be provided through the tutoring sessions after regular school hours.

The school is beginning to analyze the results of state exams (English language arts and mathematics) as well as Terra Novas to determine gaps in the curriculum and areas of weaknesses in student achievement. While the ongoing assessments for the content areas are not as well-developed, the school has analyzed the standardized tests to inform curricular and structural changes school-wide.

This analysis resulted in decisions to create curriculum maps for the year in science, social studies and mathematics, select supplemental instructional materials designed to improve alignment to state standards for curriculum already in place and guide the initial grouping of students. As a result of this process, the school had identified and was implementing a number of supplemental programs to meet gaps in the school's curriculum. These included Corrective Reading, Achieve 3000, Mathematics Navigator, and Math Advantage. In addition, a teacher reported, "we analyze the data and determine which standards we are meeting and which we are not.... From the state English language arts test and the Terra Novas we knew that the kids were weak in non-fiction, so we are going to bring in Achieve 3000."

The teachers all spoke highly of the process used for the analysis of data from the standardized tests and the New York State exams. Each was comfortable pointing out that the process has helped the staff to isolate a number of areas requiring attention, and that the process will be ongoing and refined when further opportunities to gather and analyze data occur. The intensity of the process has

markedly increased since January according to Eugenio Charter School teachers, especially in the area of mathematics, in preparation for the state exams.

Curriculum

The school has made significant changes to the curriculum and delivery of the program since renewal. Two years ago the school shifted to a departmentalized structure in which teachers focus on an instructional specialty, such as English language arts, Spanish language arts, and Content (Mathematics/Science/Social Studies). The principal indicated that all content subjects are taught in English because “students were not grasping concepts as quickly as necessary.” In addition, writing workshop is now taught in the child’s “dominant language,” according to the principal who asserted that the writing pieces were “so much better developed.” During the tutoring and enrichment block, students who did not need remedial instruction received Spanish writing instruction. While the principal, and the school’s board, believe that “any child given the opportunity could learn two languages,” they believed that they needed to make these changes because they “weren’t getting the results they wanted.”

With the adoption of the Reading First initiative, the school had to make some modifications to its English language arts curriculum. While teachers still use the America’s Choice model for reading and writing workshops, Open Court is now used for skills block and some reading instruction.

There was documentation of standardized curriculum guidelines in all subject areas. The school presented the team with a curriculum binder. The binder was divided by grade level, and within each grade level section were unit plans for each content area. The unit plans were sophisticated (especially English language arts), providing teachers access to relevant information to guide lesson plan development. Each unit plan was sequenced, and suggested a timeframe during which the unit should be taught. It also identified state standards to be addressed through the unit; the specific concepts and skills students will learn; resources that teachers should consult when planning the unit; charts that teachers and students can create together in order to document learning; and assessments to evaluate teaching and learning. Some unit plans also identified links to other subject areas. During interviews, teachers indicated that these guidelines were a product of a school-wide effort to analyze, standardize, formalize, and memorialize the school’s curriculum within grade levels and from grade to grade (as described in further detail below).

Curricula and lessons are standards-based. Curriculum documents within the curriculum binder made specific reference to state standards and sub-standards by unit. Reference to state standards and sub-standards were present throughout the school. Observed lessons as well as classroom environments integrated standards. For example, the full set of writing standards were posted in the fifth grade classroom. Sub-standards were also listed and identified on chart papers around the 5th grade English language arts room as a header to student learning objectives. Similarly, sub-standards were also identified by letter, number, and description in the mathematics classroom (although less prominently). One inspector noted that in all observed lessons, the standard was quickly reviewed at the onset of the lesson and was found in a prominent location on the board.

Eugenio Charter School has a structure for the development and review of curriculum. The process for curriculum review and selection relies heavily upon curriculum mapping and places a great emphasis upon finding and filling the gaps in the alignment of intended instruction and the state standards. The maps were developed during the previous summer and were continually reviewed and modified during the “day 6” planning sessions. These sessions are conducted by the coaches and occasionally by the school leader or the Reading First Coordinator (an experienced administrator

with special education background). The sessions were generally across grades and content specific. Overall, teachers reported that this work had been helpful and had made a marked difference in their “understanding of the curriculum.”

Both the school principal and teachers believed that this work was ongoing. For example, the instructional leaders are continuing to facilitate aligning curriculum with state assessment time frames (January to January for English language arts and March to March for mathematics). Some teachers also believed that there are curriculum sources that are better aligned with the New York State standards and that the school will choose these curriculum sources to supplement the America’s Choice regimen.

Pedagogy and Leadership

At Eugenio Charter School, teachers perceive the school principal, along with the coaches, as the instructional leaders. These leaders observe classrooms regularly, both formally and informally. While the formal observation of teachers is regular and timely, the design of the evaluation system limits its effectiveness.

Interviews revealed that teachers perceive the school principal as a competent and involved instructional leader. On a day-to-day basis, the literacy coaches and mathematics lead teacher clearly provide teachers the greatest support. Teachers report that the intermediate literacy coach conducts observations and provides feedback in addition to providing model lessons. One teacher stated that the Intermediate Literacy Coach “helps her understand how to teach.” Several teachers reported relying heavily on the lead mathematics teacher for guidance in planning lessons, because she “explained and modeled the workshop model for mathematics.” As an aside, although the school leader does not describe the third grade teacher who supports the curriculum work in mathematics as a mathematics coach, the teachers perceive that her behaviors are that of a mathematics coach.

Interviews with teachers, coaches and administrators indicated that teachers were often informally observed. The principal conducted numerous informal observations where she would “pop in” to a classroom as well a lot of walkthroughs in classrooms in which she used America’s Choice observation instruments for observing readers and writers workshop. She says, “When I see something I’m concerned about, I meet with [the primary and intermediate literacy coaches] and ask them to either model for the teacher or accompany that teacher to another classroom, or sit and plan the lesson.” If it was a literacy coach who was observing informally, it was often in the role of mentor and the comments often involved the use of Open Court or the reading and writing workshops.

The formal observation of teachers was regular and timely. At the time of the inspection visit in May, teachers reported having been formally evaluated two to three times. The teachers interviewed indicated that the school leader provided a written summary after each formal observation, but did not regularly conference either before or after the event. The teacher was provided with an end of the year evaluation that was based upon the sum of the previous reviews. It also included a recommendation for continued employment and a brief narrative.

The principal relies on the America’s Choice instruments as the core of the teacher evaluation system. The America’s Choice observation instruments focus on structural aspects of the lesson. The teacher evaluation documents that were reviewed were generally designed to gather data and provide reaction to the constructs of a lesson (i.e., standards listed, class environment, use of focus mini-lesson, group work closure) and such things as work habits, attendance, and participation in

professional development. Utilizing observation tools that focus on the content or the quality of the delivery of the content could enhance the school's teacher evaluation system.

Pedagogy and Instruction

Teachers used a variety of instructional methodologies to engage students in purposeful learning activities. The teachers observed in all settings were engaged in purposeful instruction. Over the course of the day, inspectors saw teachers utilize a variety of approaches and methodologies to engage students, including peer review, mini-lessons, guided practice, independent work, small group instruction, computer-aided instruction, and listening stations. The class activities appeared to be guided by the America's Choice instructional delivery system and were consistent with the lesson plans reviewed. The teachers had created environments that had reasonable rapport and exhibited strong classroom management. With few exceptions, students were engaged.

As an example, in a 3rd grade mathematics class, the teacher used questioning to help students clearly think about and articulate their individual "strategy" for solving a problem regarding how many pieces of a brownie each person would receive (depending on how it was cut). The teacher pushed students to answer questions regarding "how" they arrived at an answer. She asked the class how many other students agreed with a particular student's answer and who had used the same strategy; if students employed a different strategy, the teacher asked them to explain what it was. In another mathematics class, an effective and efficient lesson focused on the variables related to the area of a circle. The teacher made good use of the time allotted and exploited the rituals and routines associated with the instructional model. When asked about the lesson, the teacher indicated that the only shortcoming was her inability to find timely opportunities for reteaching when needed.

Paraprofessionals are trained and utilized to support the instructional program provided in the classroom. It appears that the school has made a commitment to ensuring that paraprofessionals contribute to the instructional quality offered to students. They must have either a 2-year degree or be state certified as a paraprofessional (a Teacher's Assistant certification from the state). They receive the same professional development as teachers do during the school's 6-day cycle. In addition, paraprofessionals are specifically trained to teach the remedial programs Math Navigator and Corrective Reading. According to one teacher, there are clear descriptions for the role of the paraprofessionals who are expected to take attendance, help prepare lesson materials, and grade papers as well as provide instruction. Despite these positives, there has been no training as to how teachers and paraprofessionals are to work together. As one teacher said, "You have to work it out individually." As such, the success of these pairings has varied.

Classroom observations suggest that most teachers and paraprofessionals work together productively and that the paraprofessionals were integral to the instructional setting. Inspectors observed paraprofessionals engaged in purposeful instruction, such as leading the daily language review, conferencing with a pair of students on their most recent writing assignment, and conducting guided reading groups. However, this was not always true. For example, in one case, the paraprofessional had minimal interaction with students and engaged in activities that distracted students from learning. According to the teacher, this paraprofessional does not participate in planning instruction in any way.

Pedagogy and At-Risk Students

The school has identified and put into place multiple resources to aid students at-risk of academic failure. These resources include additional instructional time and extra adult staffing.

The principal is aware that the school serves children who require supplemental instruction; she says, “we have to catch kids up; we have bigger gaps.” Based on their DRA scores, students are selected to participate in additional English language arts instruction. This is possible because these students no longer receive Spanish language arts instruction. For students in fourth through sixth grades with decoding issues, trained paraprofessionals provide supplementary instruction using the Corrective Reading program during reading workshop. Kindergarten through second grade students with decoding issues are pulled out of science and social studies in order to participate in additional English language arts instruction using Reading Well.

A tutoring and enrichment program between 3:00 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. provided remedial instruction in English language arts and mathematics, although reading was the typical focus. (For students who did not need remedial tutoring, Spanish enrichment was provided.) These end-of-day tutoring sessions were conducted in the regular classrooms by teachers and paraprofessionals. There were at least three adults in each setting with no more than 20 students. Observations indicated that the students were involved and cooperative. They were grouped according to subject area. In addition, Saturday study sessions are designed to assist students in preparing for the state English language arts and mathematics exams.

During the site inspection, it appeared that the school provided extra staffing in its classrooms to decrease the teacher to student ratio. For example, in a 4th grade classroom, there were four adults interacting with 19 students. The English language arts teacher was supported by a Title 1 Teacher, the Spanish language arts teacher and a paraprofessional. The inspector concluded that the group work was targeted and highly effective. As noted above, paraprofessionals played an active role in virtually all settings observed. Across the school, teachers report that the Title 1 teacher pushes into the classroom 2-3 days a week during ELA time to work with students most in need. As an example, in a 6th grade class, students receiving Title I instructional support were being challenged by the teacher’s questions which required them to use higher order thinking skills.

The school has less than 20 students with identified special needs, mostly speech and language. The students who are learning disabled are placed in classrooms with a certified special education teacher and supported by a push-in teacher. The school has three classroom teachers that are certified in the area of special education. However, the Reading First coach also serves as the special education coordinator for the school. Some recent efforts on the part of the school leader and the Reading First coordinator have resulted in greater and more reasonable access to special education services provided by the students’ school districts of residence.

Professional Development

A variety of professional development opportunities are offered to teachers throughout the school year and in the summer. All teachers interviewed participated in staff development during the previous summer (one week plus an additional week for teachers new to the school). In addition, there had been continuing staff development for at least two hours every six school days. Professional development was offered by the State Education Department in the form of Reading First training and by America’s Choice consultants as well as created by in-house resources. The agendas and topics for the ongoing staff development— created by the school’s principal and the primary and intermediate literacy coaches —were listed on a yearlong calendar which was modified during the year as needed. The time allotted was often dedicated to the continuation of the discussions initiated the previous summer, lesson planning, curriculum mapping (especially the last several months), sharing of resources, and scheduling of events. Additional topics identified by teachers included designing and using rubrics, using data to drive instruction, analyzing and revising

questioning techniques, closings, the America's Choice model, curriculum mapping and grade level-across grade level planning.

In general, teachers felt that the professional development opportunities offered by the school were useful, and were indeed helping them become better teachers. One teacher said "They are purposeful. I don't ever feel like I'm wondering why we're there. The reason is always rooted in our students." Moreover, inspectors observed that teachers were focusing on and implementing some of their own learning in their classrooms. For example, in a 5th grade classroom students were observed using rubrics (that they had helped the teacher "create") to conference with and evaluate a classmate's writing assignment. In the same classroom, the teacher taught a mini-lesson on asking "think and search," or "inferential" (as she defined it for her students) questions, as well as "on my own," or "evaluative," questions so that they could "deepen [their] understanding."

Literacy coaches and a lead teacher provided support to new teachers as well as veteran teachers. As the school has experienced significant turnover in teaching staff, training new teachers continues to be an important need. As the principal noted, "we spend a lot of time training people." At the time of the visits, the school had two literacy coaches, one for the primary grades and one for the intermediate grades.

Each grade level receives professional development two days a week. On the day that the grade goes to the YMCA for physical education, the two and a half available hours was typically used for planning by the literacy team, including looking at student data. While teachers expressed interest in a mathematics coach, the principal has made the decision to focus on English language arts. An intermediate teacher had been selected to serve as a lead teacher and to provide mathematics coaching as needed. Notably, teachers refer to her as the mathematics coach.

Teacher Turnover

Members of the teaching, coaching and administrative staff all mentioned teacher turnover as an area of concern. The intermediate literacy coach noted that the school had invested significant resources in the teachers and hoped that most would return next fall. One teacher attributed the high turnover to the longer teaching day, higher level of accountability, and limited time to prepare for the next day. The school's board of trustees and principal are focused on ways to hire and retain staff members, particularly at the intermediate levels, where they lost three teachers the week before school started. In addition, the board welcomed a new member whose profession was in human resources. While neither the board nor the principal had yet tapped his expertise, his recruitment was a first step in addressing this critical issue. In making hiring decisions, the principal has explicitly discussed longevity with candidates and considered it a significant factor. She has also discussed retention strategies with staff. As salary and benefits are comparable to local schools, most of the requests relate to school-based support such as instructional support, assistance with students and flexibility when family emergencies arise. However, staff have also indicated that they want tenure and philosophically school leaders were unwilling to offer tenure at the time of the school's end-of-year visit.

RENEWAL BENCHMARKS USED DURING THE VISIT

Evidence Category	Benchmarks
	Renewal Question 1 Is the School an Academic Success?
Benchmark 1A Academic Attainment & Improvement	1A.1 English Language Arts: The school meets or has come close to meeting the English Language Arts goal in its Accountability Plan over the term of its charter.
	1A.2 Mathematics: The school meets or has come close to meeting the mathematics goal contained in its Accountability Plan over the term of its charter.
	1A.3 Science: The school meets or has come close to meeting the science goal contained in its Accountability Plan over the term of its charter.
	1A.4 Social Studies: The school meets or has come close to meeting the social studies goal contained in its Accountability Plan over the term of its charter.
	1A.5 NCLB: The school has made adequate yearly progress as required by NCLB.
Benchmark 1B Use of Assessment Data	1B The school has a system to gather assessment and evaluation data and to use it to improve instructional effectiveness and student learning.
Benchmark 1C Curriculum	1C The school has a clearly defined and aligned curriculum and uses it to prepare students to meet state performance standards.

Benchmark 1D Pedagogy	1D.1 The school has strong instructional leadership.
	1D.2 High quality instruction is evident throughout the school.
	1D.3 The school has programs that are demonstrably effective in helping students who are struggling academically to meet the school's academic Accountability Plan goals, including programs for students who require additional academic supports, programs for English Language Learners and programs for students eligible to receive special education.
Benchmark 1F Professional Development	1F The school's professional development program assists teachers in meeting student academic needs and school goals, by addressing identified shortcomings in student learning and teacher pedagogical skill and content knowledge.

CONDUCT OF THE VISIT

The Charter Schools Institute conducted the Seventh-Year Visit at Eugenio Maria de Hostos Charter School on Wednesday, May 9, 2007. Listed below are the names and backgrounds of the individuals who conducted the visit:

Joanne Falinski, Ph.D. (Team Leader), is Vice President for Charter School Evaluation at the Charter Schools Institute of the State University of New York. Dr. Falinski most recently served as an Assistant Professor in the School of Education at Pace University, Pleasantville, NY. Her responsibilities included teaching both undergraduate and graduate education courses, supervising literacy practicum students in the field and conducting relevant research. She also presented at numerous regional and national conferences on topics of literacy, professional development and collaboration between special education and regular education. Dr. Falinski was actively involved in the University community, serving as a member of the Institutional Review Board and Writing Center Advisory Board. Prior to joining Pace, Dr. Falinski served as an Assistant Professor in the School of Education for Manhattanville College and Director of a NYS site of the National Writing Project. Dr. Falinski's vast experience in the K-12 community includes serving as an Elementary Classroom Teacher and Elementary Principal.

Jennifer G. Sneed, Ph.D., is Senior Vice President at the Charter Schools Institute of the State University of New York. Dr. Sneed has worked for the Charter Schools Institute since 2001, beginning as its Vice President for Applications. Prior to joining the Institute she served as the Executive Director of Personnel for the Western Suffolk BOCES on Long Island for three years, and worked for 11 years for the New York State Education Department in a variety of areas, including special education law, regulations and policy development, special education research, development and training, school improvement/School Quality Review, and as Coordinator of BOCES District Superintendents. Dr. Sneed also has experience as a classroom teacher and school administrator. She received her B.S. and M.S. in Special Education from Illinois State University, and her Certificate of Advanced Study (C.A.S.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) from the University at Albany in Educational Administration and Policy with a focus on educational policy, politics and law.

Kim Wechtenhiser is Associate Vice President at the Charters Schools Institute of the State University of New York. Ms. Wechtenhiser has primary responsibility for the Institute's charter renewal process; overseeing a comprehensive evaluation of each SUNY authorized charter school as it comes up for renewal. Ms. Wechtenhiser joined the Institute in September 2005 as a Senior Analyst. Prior to her work with the Institute, Ms. Wechtenhiser served as the Coordinator of new Schools Development in the Charter School Office at the Massachusetts Department of Education, where she led the review of new charter school applications, provided technical assistance to newly chartered schools, participated in the ongoing review of their academic and organizational performance, and oversaw the charter amendment process. Ms. Wechtenhiser is the former Lead Teacher of Spanish at City on a hill Charter Public School in Boston, where she also served as faculty representative to the school's Board of Trustees. She taught Spanish at Westfield Public High School and English at the Universidad de Córdoba in Spain. Ms. Wechtenhiser holds a B.A. in Spanish and Secondary Education and a M.A. in Spanish Language and Literature, both from Simmons College. She earned an Ed.M. in School Leadership from Harvard University Graduate School of Education.

In addition, the Institute was pleased to have the following consultants join the school visit team:

Hillary Johnson, Ed.D. (Consulting Writer), is an independent educational consultant with 15 years experience as a teacher, staff developer and researcher. Dr. Johnson has conducted over 10 school inspections with the Charter Schools Institute, primarily as a consulting writer. Past projects include providing professional development in reading and writing instruction, analyzing the alignment between standards and curriculum, and designing video-based professional development to support principals in developing instructional monitoring skills. She began her career as a Spanish bilingual teacher and a Reading Recovery teacher in Oakland CA. Subsequently, she served as a Literacy Content Coach and Whole School Change Coach to several Boston Public Schools. Dr. Johnson earned her B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley, her M.Ed. from Harvard University and her Doctorate of Education from Harvard University with a concentration through its Urban Superintendents Program.

Joe Nicolella has more than thirty years in the field of education. At the time of his retirement, Mr. Nicolella was the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources of the Shenendehowa Central School District, and as such his responsibilities included developing and maintaining all staff rosters and procedures for a district of over 1700 employees; providing leadership and supervision of the district professional development program; recruiting, selecting and hiring staff; coordinating the development of the district teacher assessment and evaluation approach; and conducting disciplinary and other hearings, as well as contract negotiations. Prior to becoming Assistant Superintendent, Mr. Nicolella served as a principal at the junior high and middle school level for six years, as director of student services for three years, as an assistant principal for ten years, and as a science teacher at the middle and high school levels for over ten years. Since retirement from public education, Mr. Nicolella has served in the capacity of a supervisor of administrative interns and student teachers at the College of St. Rose, as an interim coordinator of special education, and as acting lead principal for three middle schools. For nearly three years, he also has been a consultant for the Charter Schools Institute, with a primary responsibility to review and critique curriculum documents submitted to the Institute as a part of the initial charter school application process, charter renewal, or change in program.