



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

Child Development Center of the Hamptons Charter School

Evaluation Report 2006-2007

October 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	11
PREVIOUS YEARS’ SCHOOL PERFORMANCE REVIEW	13
ELA Performance SummaryMath Performance Summary.....	15
Math Performance Summary	16
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	17
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS AND EVIDeNCE	19
Order and Discipline	19
Instructional Leadership.....	19
Curriculum	20
Assessment.....	20
Special Education.....	21
Professional Development	22
Board of Trustees	22
RENEWAL BENCHMARKS USED DURING THE VISIT	24
CONDUCT OF THE VISIT	26

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 grades 5-8 charter school would compare only its grades 6-8 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 application for the Child Development Center of the Hamptons Charter School (“CDCH”) on January 21, 2000 and the charter was issued by the Board of Regents on July 14, 2000. The school opened in January 2001 in Wainscott, New York (Long Island) with an initial enrollment of 24 students in grades Kindergarten through four. The school was granted approval by the State University Trustees to amend its charter to allow the addition of grades five, six, and seven in 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2005-06 respectively. The school submitted an Application for Charter Renewal in the fall of 2004 and was granted a full-term, five-year charter renewal by the State University Trustees on March 1, 2005. As part of its Application for Charter Renewal, the school proposed to add grade eight and was granted authority to do so. The school served 65 students in grades Kindergarten through eight in the 2006-07 school year.

CDCH was located in leased space through the 2003-04 school year, moving into a new facility in the fall of 2004 located at 110 Stephen Hands Path in Wainscott. The building is completely physically accessible by all students and staff, and includes ten acres of land, which the school has partially developed into an enclosed play area for students. Historically, 50-57 percent of the student population at CDCH has been comprised of students with disabilities. The school continues to provide an inclusionary, community-based program where students with special education needs are instructed along with their non-disabled peers. A Student-Centered Plan (SCP) is developed for each student to ensure that the student’s educational needs are met and that student performance goals are established and measured. If a student has an Individualized Education Program (IEP), the IEP goals are incorporated into the student’s SCP.

The mission of the Child Development Center of the Hamptons Charter School as stated in the school’s renewal charter is as follows:

The mission of the CDCH Charter School is to expand school choice and enhance educational opportunities for children and families in East Hampton, Long Island and neighboring communities.

The philosophical underpinnings upon which CDCH is based center on the link between the intellectual development and academic achievement of all students, as well as personal and social development. As stated in the school’s Application for Charter Renewal, the school’s key design elements are intended to “bring together all facets of the school community in a collaboration designed to bring about educational excellence.” The emphasized key design elements include the following:

- employing a co-teaching model of instruction that implements differentiated instructional strategies;
- employing an inclusive and small classroom grouping that supports and strengthens individualized instruction for all students;
- complementing a shared instructional approach by supporting a theme-based framework to learning that allows for school-wide, family and a community-based interactions;
- employing a team-based approach in meeting each student’s and family’s needs;
- increasing parental and staff involvement in decision making;

- increasing data-driven decision making processes toward instructional approaches and school-wide issues;
- providing access to new technologies, and incorporating their use in the daily structure of the classroom;
- establishing interactive opportunities for shared instructional experiences between the school and other local public schools;
- supporting professional growth opportunities for staff and life-long learning opportunities for all;
- promoting a network of community members that are interested in bringing new ideas to public school design and practice; and
- being willing and able to develop new strategies to continue to meet the changing needs of students, their families and community.

School Year (2006-07)

186 days

School Day (2006-07)

8:30 a.m. to 2:40 p.m.

Enrollment

	Original Chartered Enrollment	Revised Chartered Enrollment	Actual Enrollment⁵	Original Chartered Grades	Revised Grades Served	Actual Grades Served	Complying
2000-01	24	24	24	K-4	K-4	K-4	YES
2001-02	36	36	47	K-4	K-4	K-4	YES
2002-03	48	72	55	K-4	K-5	K-5	YES
2003-04	60	70	70	K-4	K-6	K-6	YES
2004-05	72	85	94	K-4	K-7	K-7	YES
2005-06	110	110	107	K-8	K-8	K-8	YES
2006-07	125	70	65	K-8	K-8	K-8	YES
2007-08	135	85		K-8			
2008-09	135	85		K-8			
2009-10	135	85		K-8			

⁵ 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: 59; 2003-04: 69; 2004-05: 88. The NYSED 2005-06 database cited an enrollment of 100 students.

	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	2	3.4%	2	2.9%	3	3.4%	5	5.0%
Black (Not Hispanic)	6	10.2%	12	17.4%	13	14.8%	16	16.0%
Hispanic	6	10.2%	8	11.6%	19	21.6%	18	18.0%
White	45	76.3%	47	68.1%	53	60.2%	61	61.0%

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

	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	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Eligible for Reduced Lunch	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

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	Moved into new facility; Granted full Charter Renewal for period of five years
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

On March 1, 2005, the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York granted Child Development Center of the Hamptons (CDCH) a full-term, five-year renewal. Prior to making this recommendation to the Trustees, the Charter Schools Institute conducted a renewal visit of the school during the fall of 2004. Based upon a review of the totality of the school's record, as well as evidence collected at the time of the renewal visit, the Institute issued several findings in its report to the State University Trustees, the key points of which are summarized below.

During the initial renewal period, CDCH met most of the goals in the outcome measures set for its academic subjects. According to limited data, the school outperformed its comparison, the Eastern Suffolk BOCES in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Because of the small size of the school and the number of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) excused from testing, these state test results were based on only a handful of students. In its absolute level of performance on the fourth grade state examinations, based on the four to eight students who had taken the exam each year, CDCH has met the criterion of success set in its outcome measures. In mathematics and science, the school came close to meeting, if not meeting, its goal in each of the three years of testing. In ELA virtually no students were proficient in the first two years, but 80 percent of the students were proficient in the third year. The State Education Department had deemed CDCH to be a *School in Good Standing*, which indicates that the school has not failed to make adequate yearly progress for two successive years under the NCLB requirements.

At the time of the renewal visit in September of 2004, the school generally had effective systems and programs in place which provided a basis for concluding (together with the outcome data noted above) that the school would likely continue to improve student learning and achievement. The Child Development Center of the Hamptons Charter School's curriculum was based on the New York State core curriculum, and implemented by classrooms staffed with two certified teachers. Teachers had developed a Student Centered Plan (SCP) for each student that incorporated academic, social/emotional and behavioral goals with assessment results. If a student had an Individualized Education Program (IEP), his or her IEP goals were also incorporated into the SCP. The SCP was the basis for the school's inclusionary approach to education where students with disabilities were educated alongside their non-disabled peers. The teaching staff included three teachers who were certified in special education, speech therapists, occupational and physical therapists, and a social worker. Other related service professionals were engaged as necessary to meet IEP requirements.

Teacher anecdotal notes regarding student observations played a key role in assessing student progress. Teachers informally assessed students by reviewing student written materials collected in 'portfolios.' This information was used to evaluate the achievement of the goals contained in the Student-Centered Plans. The evidence used, however, was not reliable and did not enable teachers to predict how well students would perform in attaining grade level competencies. Other forms of assessment included state assessments, teacher developed tests, publisher-produced unit tests and the school's value-added assessment, the TerraNova. Outside of the TerraNova and the state assessments, the school was working to develop methods of assessment that were more verifiable and reliable in predicting student achievement of grade level competencies.

The school continued to refine its professional development opportunities to more directly link the improvement of pedagogy with student achievement and attainment of state performance standards. In the renewal year, the school had extended the teachers' day by an hour to provide time for

instructional planning and meetings, including faculty meetings, committee and grade-level meetings *and* professional development. Throughout the school, teachers who were new to the profession and/or new to the school required greater support to ensure that students achieved individual goals and state standards.

Finally, in order for the school's teaching staff to access the type of support needed to improve instruction, classroom teachers require detailed, classroom-based instructional guidance. The board created and filled an educational supervisor position to work along with the school's principal to address this need. However, it was not evident, at the time of the renewal visit, that the administrative staff possessed the capacity to provide in-depth support to teachers in their daily instruction, or their review of student written materials collected in the portfolios. In addition, there was limited evidence that that new teachers were given guidance in setting grade-level expectations for student performance.

Aside from the implementation of the educational program, the school had benefited from consistent leadership at the executive director and board levels: the school's executive director had developed and submitted the original application to establish the Child Development Center of the Hamptons Charter School and five of the nine trustees had served since the founding of the school, while eight of the nine had served three years at least. The board had guided the school in the successful effort to fund and build a new facility, which the school moved into just prior to the opening of school in the fall of 2004. The school had maintained overall financial health, and was a viable and effective organization.

PREVIOUS YEARS'S SCHOOL 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: Child Development Center of the Hamptons was not meeting its goals in English language arts (ELA) or mathematics, as set forth in its Accountability Plan. It is meeting its goals in science and social studies in the lower grades but not the upper grades. Given the small number of tested students, these results should be regarded with caution. The school is in good standing under the state's NCLB accountability system.

English Language Arts: In 2003-04, when only fourth-grade students took the state ELA exam, 80 percent of students (N=5) scored at the proficient level. The next year the proportion declined to 33 percent (N=3). In 2005-06 when students in grades 3-8 took the state test for the first time, 30 percent (N=27) were proficient. The school achieved the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) established by the state's NCLB accountability system in 2003-04, but did not meet the AMO standard in the subsequent two years. Keeping the small number of test takers in mind, the school has not outperformed the local county or local comparison schools, nor has it performed as well as predicted in comparison to similar schools statewide. On its value added measure, indicating year-to-year student progress in ELA, the school's results have been mixed. In 2003-04 half of the school's cohorts met their target on the Terra Nova exam and overall the school was close to grade level (NCE=50). In 2004-05, none of the cohorts met their target and overall performance declined. In 2005-06, four of seven cohorts did achieve their target, and overall performance was slightly better. CDCH reported that, based on teacher assessments of student work, the average performance in Student Centered Plans increased by 1.1 Performance Levels, exceeding the target of 1.0. The reliability and meaning of these data could not be determined.

Mathematics: On the 2003-04 fourth-grade state mathematics test, 80 percent of students were proficient; in the following year, 78 percent of students (N=9) were proficient; in 2005-06, 23 percent of all students scored at the proficient level. In mathematics, the school achieved the AMO in 2003-04 and 2004-05 and came close to meeting it in 2005-06. Again, regardless of the small number of test results, in none of the last three years did the school outperform its local comparison or statewide comparison schools. The school's value added results mirror those for ELA. The school reported that the average performance on Student Centered Plans increased by 1.1 Performance Levels, exceeding the 1.0 target. (The same caveat about these results applies.)

Science: In 2005-06, on the fourth-grade state exam, 91 percent of students (N=11) scored at the proficient level, three points shy of the Eastern Suffolk BOCES's performance. On the eighth-grade exam 50 percent (N=8) were proficient.

Social Studies: In 2005-06, on the fifth-grade state exam, 85 percent of students (N=13) scored at the proficient level which was below the 92 percent proficient in Eastern Suffolk BOCES.

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

Optional Goals: The response rate on the parent survey was too low to address the parent satisfaction measure. The school fell just short of its daily attendance target and was below its student retention target as well. The school also reported meeting its goals for legal compliance and fiscal soundness.

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 for full definitions of the measures used and details about the tables themselves.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

English Language Arts

Child Development Center Of The Hamptons Charter School



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

	2003-04 Grades Served: K-6			MET	2004-05 Grades Served: K-7			MET	2005-06 Grades Served: K-8			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)		All Students % (N)		2+ Years Students % (N)		All Students % (N)		2+ Years Students % (N)	
	Grades				Grades				Grades			
	4	80.0 (5)	80.0 (5)	YES	4	37.5 (8)	33.3 (3)	NO	3	50.0 (4)	66.6 (3)	
									4	23.1 (13)	16.7 (6)	
									5	38.5 (13)	33.3 (3)	
									6	28.6 (14)	50.0 (4)	
									7	15.4 (13)	28.6 (7)	
	8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)		8	25.0 (8)	0.0 (4)	
									All	27.7 (65)	29.6 (27)	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		Grades	PI	AMO		Grades	PI	AMO	
	4	180	123	YES	4	125	131	NO	3-8	111	122	NO
	8		107		8		116					
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.	Comparison: (East Hampton Free Schools)				Comparison: (East Hampton Free Schools)				Comparison: (East Hampton Free Schools)			
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District	
	4	80.0	91.3	NO	4	33.3	96.5	NO	3-8	29.6	71.7	NO
	8				8							
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).					Effect Size				Effect Size			
					Grades	Actual	Predicted		N	Actual	Predicted	
					4			--	61	26.2	78.0	4.20
					8							
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.	Assessment: TERRA NOVA				Assessment: TERRA NOVA				Assessment: TERRA NOVA			
	Grades	Cohorts	Making Target		Grades	Cohorts	Making Target		Grades	Cohorts	Making Target	
	1-6		3 of 6	NO	1-7		0 of 7	NO	2-8		4 of 7	NO
	N	Base	Target	Result	N	Base	Target	Result	N	Base	Target	Result
	40	47.7	48.9	48.9	38	48.6	49.3	42.1	39	46.0	48.0	46.3

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Mathematics

Child Development Center of the Hamptons Charter School



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

	2003-04 Grades Served: K-6			MET	2004-05 Grades Served: K-7			MET	2005-06 Grades Served: K-8			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)				All Students % (N)				All Students % (N)			
	Grades				Grades				Grades			
	4	80.0 (5)	80.0 (5)	YES	4	77.8 (9)	33.3 (3)	NO	3	50.0 (4)	33.3 (3)	
									4	23.1 (13)	11.1 (9)	
									5	53.8 (13)	40.0 (10)	
									6	14.3 (14)	0.0 (9)	
									7	0.0 (9)	0.0 (9)	
	8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)		8	0.0 (7)	0.0 (6)	
									All	23.3 (60)	13.0 (46)	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.	PI				PI				PI			
	Grades		AMO		Grades		AMO		Grades		AMO	
	4	180	136	YES	4	167	142	YES	3-8	85	86	NO
	8		81		8		93					
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.	Comparison: (East Hampton Free Schools)				Comparison: (East Hampton Free Schools)				Comparison: (East Hampton Free Schools)			
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District	
	4	80.0	99.0	NO	4	33.3	100.0	NO	3-8	10.9	75.7	NO
	8				8							
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).					Effect: Grades Actual Predicted Size				Effect: N Actual Predicted Size			
					4			--	56	21.4	80.8	-4.26
					8							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.	Assessment: TERRA NOVA				Assessment: TERRA NOVA				Assessment: TERRA NOVA			
	Grades	Cohorts Making Target			Grades	Cohorts Making Target			Grades	Cohorts Making Target		
	1-6	3 of 6		NO	1-7	0 of 7		NO	2-8	4 of 7		NO
	N	Base	Target	Result	N	Base	Target	Result	N	Base	Target	Result
	40	45.6	47.8	47.5	38	47.1	48.6	37.9	39	40.3	45.1	46.5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Charter Schools Institute conducted the present visit to the Child Development Center of the Hamptons (CDCH) on May 22, 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, which follows.

Based on the data available at the time of the visit, CDCH had not been meeting its goals in English language arts (ELA) or mathematics, as set forth in its Accountability Plan. It was meeting its goals in science and social studies in the lower grades but not the upper grades. Given the small number of tested students, these results should be regarded with caution. The school was in good standing under the state's NCLB accountability system.

The school continues to benefit from an established and committed board and has stabilized its operations by partnering with Services for the Underserved (SUS). With the infrastructure more firmly in place, the board, SUS and the school leadership have been able to turn their attention more fully to the educational program, which despite being in its seventh year has not gained traction in a number of important respects. With six principals in six years and notable turnover in staff, including teachers, related service providers, and the school psychologist, the school has had to address the demands of integrating new personnel into the organization rather than concentrating on developing systems for delivering the program.

At the time of the visit, the role of principal, with the title of Assistant Executive Director, had recently been filled by a highly-experienced educator. He recognized the challenges the school faces and has a clear set of priorities for moving the educational program forward. He acknowledged that the school's viability rests at least to some extent on its ability to attract a general education population by establishing itself as a school serving both general and special education students. However, the school culture has remained focused on meeting the special needs of the individual rather than concentrating on establishing a set of uniform grade-level benchmarks, reflected in the state performance standards, which all students are expected to meet.

During the visit, the Institute's inspection team found that students were actively engaged with minimal distraction. Classes were orderly and purposeful, and promoted learning. Each teacher had adapted his/her own discipline system based on a general approach for rewarding students' positive behavior. It was apparent that students had internalized the system and were focused on learning.

The school leadership was supportive of the teachers and aware of their professional needs as novice teachers. A monthly planning process and formal observations had provided them with guidance in developing their instructional practice. Despite the regular support, however, the teachers had not been coached in their day-to-day pedagogy and in particular special education instructional techniques.

Teachers generated monthly planning sheets, derived from items in the Student Centered Plans (SCPs), but the selected items were idiosyncratic to the state's performance standards and not specifically aligned to the state's core curriculum. The school had no curriculum map or scope and sequence and lacked a cross-walk between Everyday Math and various social studies texts on the one

hand, and state standards or SCP items on the other hand. Teachers used a variety of unaligned curriculum topics. At the time of the visit, there was no template for lesson plans, containing objectives and assessment information.

As one of its key design elements, the school's emphasis on differentiating instruction appeared to be a carry-over from its attention to individualization. However, teachers demonstrated limited understanding of the concept and application. The general absence of a common curriculum, aligned across the grades, presented an obstacle to putting it into practice. An exception was the school's efforts to level reading materials, whereby in kindergarten to fourth grade teachers shared materials and determined reading levels across the grades using the same set of levels.

Teachers did not formally and systematically assess student academic performance on an ongoing basis. While school leaders intended to use data to drive instruction, there was virtually no current evidence of a link between curriculum and assessment. Student Centered Plans did not include assessment data. There was no clear use of TerraNova results and limited evidence of the use of rubrics.

There was a lack of technical expertise about special education in the faculty and a lack of clarity about the roles of the special educator teacher, the classroom teachers and the teacher aides. Notwithstanding the school's desire that teachers have dual certification, they had limited knowledge of, or support in, special education. An Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) specialist was on site only once a month to provide coaching in special education instruction. The school psychologist was not used as a resource for the teachers and the teachers in turn did not take full advantage of the special education expertise of the resource room teacher.

The school had offered a variety of professional development workshop opportunities, but it was not clear how many teachers participated. More importantly, there was no articulated plan with clear priorities or expectations and no strategy to support the development of novice teachers and of teachers new to special education.

The board of trustees had helped guide the school through the transition created by the departure of the school's founder and original school leader and had established a new management and oversight structure with SUS. With SUS's management resources and expertise, a viable reporting structure, an improved relationship with the pre-school, and the school-wide leadership of a highly experienced educator, the school was poised to return to the path it was on at the time of renewal.

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS AND EVIDENCE

Order and Discipline

At the time of the visit, the Institute's inspection team found that students were actively engaged with minimal distraction. Classes were orderly and purposeful, and promoted learning. Each teacher had adapted his/her own discipline system based on a general approach for rewarding students' positive behavior. It was apparent that students had internalized the system and were focused on learning.

Earlier in the school year, the CDCH had sponsored training in the Responsive Classroom, which laid the groundwork for a structured behavior program. Inspectors observed daily rituals intended to foster courtesy and respect. Teachers of upper grade classes were engaged in instilling core values such as responsibility and integrity. Teachers reported a general absence of bullying and teasing.

In an upper grade class, inspectors observed students on task, actively participating throughout a lesson without disruption. In the case of two other upper grade classes, which had been combined for a lesson with the teachers co-teaching, students worked collaboratively and were on task.

Teachers utilized a variety of positive behavior support systems. For example, in an early childhood classroom, each student was wearing a card around his/her neck, which the teacher would punch when he/she was behaving and on task. When the card was completely punched, the student would earn a reward. In a middle grade, a positive reinforcement strategy was applied to the entire class: when the entire class was on task and did outstanding work, they received a point; when they earned a sufficient number of points they would be rewarded with a highly desirable group activity.

Instructional Leadership

The school leadership was supportive of the teachers and aware of their professional needs as novice teachers. A monthly planning process and formal observations had provided them with guidance in developing their instructional practice. Despite the regular support, however, the teachers had not been coached in their day-to-day pedagogy and in particular special education instructional techniques.

For monthly teacher planning meetings, teachers documented student work resulting from the instructional plans which had been developed at the previous planning meeting. They discussed their future plans in light of the identified student work, which represented a range of student performance. In addition, the school leader met with lead teachers at the beginning of each month to discuss content areas, as well as general and specific expectations, including reviewing individual student work.

Teachers reported that they found these Monthly Reflective Planning Meetings to be helpful. Despite their perceived utility, however, the plans themselves only represented a summary of activities insofar as the student work was not graded and there was no indication of how representative the samples were of group learning. The collected evidence did not show how well or how much students had learned and did not include any evaluation of the instruction to determine its effectiveness or if skills had to be retaught. The assistant executive director explained that while these teacher portfolios did not provide an evaluation of student work, teachers were getting into the habit of *collecting* evidence for portfolios and that the evidence was linked to monthly teacher observations, as a follow-up to the plan. This approach may be an effective professional

development strategy for novice teachers, but because of the *ad hoc* nature of the evidence collection, it has limited utility for determining the effectiveness of previous planning decisions.

Given the administrative and external responsibilities of the assistant executive director, he was not able to provide regular, ongoing informal coaching for the teachers. At the time of the visit, he had conducted formal subject-specific evaluations, focusing not on the content of instruction, but rather on the environment, lesson set-up, and technique. He explained that his short-term objective was to gain teacher trust and that a focus on content would be undertaken in the 2007-08 school year.

Curriculum

Teachers generated monthly planning sheets, derived from items in the Student Centered Plans (SCPs), but the selected items were idiosyncratic to the state's performance standards and not specifically aligned to the state's core curriculum. The assistant executive director reported that an SCP revision committee had been established to improve the alignment of the SCP framework with the state standards. He acknowledged that teachers were not aware, much less focused on, providing instruction based on the state standards. As such, teachers themselves reported being dissatisfied with using the topics associated with the SCPs.

The SCPs served as the curriculum map for the 2006-07 school year. Other than them, the school had no curriculum map or scope and sequence and lacked a cross-walk between Everyday Math and various social studies texts on the one hand, and state standards or SCP items on the other hand. Teachers used a variety of unaligned curriculum topics. At the time of the visit, there was no template for lesson plans, containing objectives and assessment information. Lesson plans lacked a format that gave structure to lessons, including reference to standards. They generally were limited to providing a brief outline of the topic.

Differentiation of instruction is a key design element in the school's charter, yet teachers demonstrated limited understanding of the concept and the practice. While they modify instruction for individuals, the adjustments are typically not based on a common benchmark, namely grade-level standards. Teachers understood the practice to refer to accommodations used for students with special needs, not students with advanced knowledge or special talents. They tended to identify it as giving students the opportunity to progress at their own pace without recognizing the need to set a grade-level pace or making certain that all students are challenged.

The visiting team observed numerous cases of teachers having accepted different levels of performance in student task completion -- scaffolding note-taking in a 7th grade social studies' lesson; different kindergarten students' responding to a writing assignment by using typed labels, hand-written sentences, and filled-in blanks; and spelling levels ranging in difficulty and number of words assigned, as well as reading groups structured on student ability. With the exception of the reading groups which were based on leveled reading materials, the variation in assignments was not informed by grade-level benchmarks.

Assessment

Teachers did not formally and systematically assess on an ongoing basis. While school leaders intended to use data to drive instruction, there was virtually no current evidence of a link between curriculum and assessment. Student Centered Plans did not include assessment data. The conclusions about the use of assessment data detailed in the summary of the previous evaluation (renewal) visit, presented above, still applied. Teachers continued to informally assess students by reviewing student written materials collected in 'portfolios' and used them to evaluate the

achievement of the goals contained in the Student-Centered Plans. Again, the evidence did not enable teachers to predict how well students would perform in attaining grade level competencies.

Recognizing the importance of assessment, teachers talked about assessment activities, including portfolios and using rubrics, but there was no evidence of commercially-produced unit tests or teacher-developed tests being systematically used across grade levels. Instead, teachers claimed to focus on more individualized assessment: “I know the kids”.

Based on classroom observations at the time of the visit, classrooms were full of learning charts, diagrams and educational support material. However, there was no evidence of students who were engaged in independent work using rubrics as a guide. Further, while teachers displayed student work, their evaluation of the work did not seem to be based on any standard scoring rubric. In assigning tasks to students, teachers gave oral instructions without providing any expectation for student performance, as would be found in a rubric.

Because teachers claimed that the New York State tests are not accurate, because they rationalized low test performance, and because they did not know how to prepare students for the tests, the assistant executive director had teachers take part in state test scoring and had teachers conduct a skill analysis of the state tests to identify areas that need special attention. In making teachers more familiar with the test content and making them more comfortable with test taking, he reported that attitudes toward the state tests have changed.

Aside from the state tests, teachers continued to express misgivings about the other standardized test being used -- the Terra Nova test, especially in the lower grades. One teacher reported using the TerraNova results to target areas in which students needed skill reinforcement, but her activity was an exception. There was no evidence that the TerraNova tests results were used to inform school-wide instructional decisions, to identify students at risk of not meeting grade-level standards, or to identify gaps in the delivery of basic skills instruction.

Special Education

There was a lack of technical expertise about special education in the faculty and a lack of clarity about the roles of the special education teacher, the classroom teachers and the teacher aides. Teachers were at times unaware of how to coordinate the activities of one-to-one aides or their responsibilities. Para-professional responsibilities varied from class to class: some had a teaching role; others simply helped students to navigate the hallways. In addition, the upper grade teachers were unfamiliar with the role of the resource room teacher.

Notwithstanding the school’s desire for teachers to have dual certification, teachers had limited knowledge of special education. Many teachers were unclear if, when, and how an IEP could be changed. They had an inadequate understanding of the state performance standards and their relationship to IEPs. More specifically, a notable number of teachers were unfamiliar with state-prescribed alternate testing and their responsibilities to fulfill this process.

An Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) specialist was on site only once a month to provide coaching in special education instruction. The school psychologist was not used as a resource for the teachers and the teachers in turn did not take full advantage of the knowledge and experience of the resource room teacher.

Professional Development

The school had offered a variety of professional development workshop opportunities, but it was not clear how many teachers participated. More importantly, there was no articulated plan with clear priorities and no strategy to support the development of novice teachers and of teachers new to special education, in addition to keeping teachers current with new instructional techniques.

Earlier in the school year, the previous principal arranged for Orton/Gillingham training on a week-end through the Peconic Teacher Center, a regional member of the New York State consortium. Teachers also received one-day workshop training in implementing the Responsive Classroom, a structured behavior program. Given teachers' positive responses to these activities and the observed instances of leveled reading materials throughout the lower grades as well as the school-wide behavioral system, these professional development experiences appear to have been particularly effective in providing teachers with tools to enhance the school's program. Notwithstanding their impact, however, these professional development activities were not part of an integrated program to meet the overall needs of the school's teacher and student populations.

Other professional development activities focused on specific techniques and technologies. The assistant executive director sent teachers to visit other schools that have an inclusion program. Teachers received professional development in inclusion strategies for Balanced Literacy in workshops held during two evenings. Other teacher training included implementing IEP Direct, hands-on activities across the curriculum, using speech augmentation devices for students with specific disabilities, and employing Applied Behavioral Analysis, as dictated by individual student IEPs.

While teachers welcomed the workshops, they expressed a strong desire to receive guidance and support in developing their ability to deliver instruction to students with special learning needs. The absence of ongoing coaching in general and more clinical supervision for students with IEPs in particular was noteworthy.

Board of Trustees

The board of trustees helped guide the school through the transition created by the departure of the school's founder and original school leader and established a new management and oversight structure with SUS. The board also focused on: aligning the mission of the separate CDCH pre-school program (from which many students are drawn) with that of the charter school; strengthening the lines of communication between the respective boards; and consolidating some services. With the stability of the board and the continuity of its membership, it has endeavored actively to communicate with parents and be more sensitive to the concerns of parents and teachers.

As a result of SUS's management resources and expertise, a viable administrative reporting structure, an improved relationship with the pre-school, and the school-wide leadership of a highly experienced educator, the school was poised to return to the path it was on at the time of renewal.

The following statements, quoted from the renewal report (see Summary of Previous Evaluation Visit, above), indicate the direction of the school's program at the time of the renewal visit and, when compared to the conclusions in the current report, attest to the fact that there has been limited subsequent movement.

- The school was working to develop methods of assessment that were more verifiable and reliable in predicting student achievement of grade level competencies.
- The school continued to refine its professional development opportunities to more directly link the improvement of pedagogy with student achievement and attainment of state performance standards.
- Finally, in order for the school's teaching staff to access the type of support needed to improve instruction, classroom teachers require detailed, classroom-based instructional guidance. The board created and filled an educational supervisor position to work along with the school's principal to address this need. However, it was not evident, at the time of the renewal visit, that the administrative staff possessed the capacity to provide in-depth support to teachers in their daily instruction, or their review of student written materials collected in the portfolios. In addition, there was limited evidence that that new teachers were given guidance in setting grade-level expectations for student performance.

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 1E Student Order & Discipline	1E The school's culture allows and promotes a culture of learning.
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.

Evidence Category	Benchmarks
	Renewal Question 2 Is the School an Effective, Viable Organization?
Benchmark 2C Governance	2C.1 The school board has worked effectively to achieve the school's mission and specific goals.

CONDUCT OF THE VISIT

The Charter Schools Institute conducted the Second Year Visit at Child Development of the Hamptons Charter School on May 22, 2007. Listed below are the names and backgrounds of the individuals who conducted the visit:

Ron Miller, Ph.D. (Visit Leader), is the Vice President for Accountability at the Charter Schools Institute of the State University of New York. After teaching for seven years in New York City public schools, Dr. Miller joined the central offices of the New York City Department of Education, where he conducted evaluative research and organizational studies. As Director of the Office of School Planning and Accountability, he served as the educational accountability officer for the Department. In that capacity, he developed school accountability reports for all city schools and coordinated staff development on the use of the reports for district administrators in the high school and community school districts. In addition, he worked with school leaders to develop their capacity to use data for school improvement. In this role he developed PASS, a school performance review system which was adopted in 600 city schools. Dr. Miller has regularly presented papers at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association and has served as Adjunct Assistant Professor at Teachers College Columbia University and Pace University. He holds an AB degree from the University of California at Berkeley and a Ph.D. in Applied Anthropology from Columbia University.

Joanne Falinski, Ph.D., is the Vice President for 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.

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

Roberta Wiener, Ed.D., is an Assistant Professor of Education at Pace University. Previously she spent over twenty years as a public school teacher and over a decade as a Director of Special Education. Dr. Wiener received her undergraduate degree from Mills College of Education and Master's degree from William Paterson University. She earned her Ed.D from Teachers College, Columbia University in the area of technology in special education. She has a post doctorate degree in school administration.