

Miami-Dade County Public Schools  
Office of Evaluation and Research  
1500 Biscayne Boulevard  
Miami, Florida 33132

**Review of Charter Schools**  
**1999-2000**  
**May 2001**

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
The Annual Report.....	1
Review of Annual Reports.....	1
Academic performance of the charter students.....	3
School Reviews .....	4
Liberty City Charter School.....	5
Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School.....	6
The Mater Academy.....	7
Spiral Tech Elementary Charter School.....	8
Rosa Parks Community Charter School.....	9
Ryder Elementary Charter School .....	10
Florida International Academy .....	11
ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School.....	13
The Doral Academy .....	14
Miami Shores/Barry University Charter School.....	15
Youth Co-op Charter School.....	16
Techworld Public Charter School.....	17

## Introduction

On November 6, 2000, the Division of Schools of Choice of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS) requested that the Office of Evaluation and Research conduct an analysis of the charter school annual reports for the 1999-00 school year. The intent of the analysis is to ensure that the annual reports are in compliance with the reporting requirements of Section 228.056, (9) (d), of the Florida Statutes. In addition, the division requested an analysis of the charter schools' standardized test scores pursuant to School Board Rule 6Gx13- 6A-1.47, Charter Schools. The results of these two analyses are detailed in this report.

The report begins with a brief description of the analysis. The majority of the document, however, is devoted to the review of each of the 12 charter schools operating in Miami-Dade County during the 1999-00 school year. For each charter school, the following issues will be addressed:

1. The presence of the required items in the charter school's annual report
2. A comparison of the academic performance of the charter school students versus that of students enrolled at comparable schools.

### The Annual Report

According to Florida Statutes, each charter school's annual report must contain the following items:

1. Progress toward stated goals
2. Financial records of the charter school
3. Salary and benefit levels of charter school employees.

A fourth item, "the information required in the annual school report pursuant to Section 229.592 of the Florida Statutes," is included in by-school annual reports prepared by the district's Office of Educational Planning and Quality Enhancement. The charter schools may choose whether or not to include it in the annual reports that they prepare. Additionally, the district provides specific instructions for addressing the first item, the charter school's stated goals. These instructions include the following:

- State the charter school's specific **goals** as found in its contract, or the **objectives** from the annual School Improvement Plan (SIP). The annual objectives should be related to the contract goals.
- Describe the **progress** that has been made toward each goal or objective. Both goals and objectives should be clear and susceptible to judgment regarding attainment. If it is not possible to tell whether or not progress has been made toward a goal or objective, the report should contain a statement to that effect. Then, reword the goal or objective so that it can be properly addressed in future annual reports.
- Provide evidence or **data** in support of the statement of progress.

**Review of Annual Reports**

The charter schools' compliance with the three state-mandated items of the annual report were mixed. The results of the review of the reports are illustrated in Table 1. A review of this table reveals that only seven of the 12 schools provided data on their progress toward stated goals (i.e., the first mandated item). Of these seven, five achieved or made progress toward all of their goals. Of the two remaining schools, The Mater Academy achieved two of its four goals, and Youth Co-op achieved one of its three goals. Typically, the goals focused on academic achievement, readiness to start school, and parental involvement.

**Table 1**  
**Contents of charter school Annual Reports, 1999-00**

Charter school		Goals or Objectives			Financial Records	Salary and Benefits of Employees
Location #	Name	Focus	Achieved	Data		
0040	Liberty City Charter School	-	-	-	✓	✓ 2000-01
0070	Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School	Reading, mathematics, writing	3/3	✓	✓	✓
0100	The Mater Academy	Reading, mathematics, readiness to start school, parental involvement	2/4	✓	✓	✓ salary only
0200	Spiral Tech Elementary Charter School	-	-	-	✓	✓ salary only
0300	Rosa Parks Community Charter School	-	-	-	✓	✓
0400	Ryder Elementary Charter School	Academic achievement, parental involvement, personalized education	3/3	✓	✓	✓
6010	Florida International Academy	Reading, mathematics, writing, science, parental involvement	5/5	✓	✓	✓ salary only
6020	ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School	-	-	-	✓	-
6030	The Doral Academy	Academic performance, self-image, behavior	3/3	some	✓	✓
6040	Miami Shores/Barry University Charter School	Reading, mathematics, writing, science	4/4	✓	✓	✓ salary only
6050	Youth Co-op Charter School	Reading, mathematics, parental involvement	1/3	✓	✓	✓
7010	Techworld Public Charter School	-	-	-	-	✓ salary only

Five of the 12 charter schools failed to properly report their progress toward stated goals. Three schools, Liberty City, ASPIRA Youth Leadership and Techworld Public, did not even address it. And, two schools, Spiral Tech and Rosa Parks Community, reported on school progress, but they neglected both to identify their stated objectives and to provide data on their progress toward these objectives.

Table 1 also reveals that with regard to providing school financial records (i.e., the second mandated item), 11 of the 12 charter schools complied. Only Techworld Public did not. Finally, only one school failed to comply with the third mandated item. ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School did not submit the salary and benefit levels of school employees.

### **Academic performance of the charter students**

To assess the academic performance of the students in the charter schools, it was necessary to identify schools that were deemed “comparable” to serve as the control in a comparison. These control schools were selected based on the following variables: the racial/ethnic mix of the student body, the percentage of students on free or reduced-price lunch (FRL), the percentage of students designated limited English proficient (LEP), and the percentage of students classified as gifted. However, the identification of the control schools revealed that none of the schools in the district are truly like the charter schools. For example, each of the charter schools serves a very small population in comparison to other district schools. Specifically, the enrollment of the charter schools ranged from 16 at The Doral Academy to 392 at The Mater Academy. In contrast, the enrollment of the control schools ranged from 458 to 3102.

The assessment of the students’ academic performance was primarily based on the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the *Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Norm-Referenced Test (NRT)* that was administered in the 1999-00 school year. Since this test is not administered in grade 2, the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the *Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Ninth Edition* were used for this grade level. To gauge the performance of the charter students, the median percentile scores of each tested grade were compared to the corresponding composite scores of the control schools (i.e., the median of the medians).

The analysis of the test scores, like the review of the annual reports, yielded mixed results for the 12 charter schools. Two of the schools, Miami Shores/Barry University and Youth Co-op, had scores that were consistently higher than those of the control schools across all grades and subject areas. On the other hand, four of the schools, Rosa Parks Community, Ryder Elementary, The Doral Academy, and Techworld Public, had scores that were consistently lower. The remaining six schools had scores that were higher than those of the control schools in some grades and subject areas and lower in others. The specific test results are illustrated in the next section of this report, School Reviews.

## **School Reviews**

## Liberty City Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Liberty City Charter School's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary and benefit levels of its employees. However, the latter information is for the 2000-01 school year, rather than for the year of the report. In addition, the report does not address the school's progress towards achieving its objectives.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, four elementary schools in the district were deemed comparable to Liberty City Charter School. These control schools are Brentwood, Floral Heights, Parkview, and Parkway. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 205 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 458 students. In addition, while the charter school had a free or reduced-price lunch rate of 76.6%, there were no control schools that had less than 84.2%.

**TABLE 1**  
**Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00**

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Liberty City Charter School	K-5	205	0	99	0	76.6	0	<1
Four control schools	PK-5/6	458-1016	0-1	94-99	1-5	84.2-90.2	0.0-3.9	1-4

*Note.* The control elementary schools are Brentwood, Floral Heights, Parkview, and Parkway. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the SAT for grade 2 and the FCAT-NRT for grades 3 to 5. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students in reading was better than that of the students in the control schools in grades 2, 3, and 5. In grade 4, however, the performance of the students in the control schools was better. The performance of the charter students in mathematics was better than that of the students in the control schools in grades 3 and 4. In grades 2 and 5, however, the performance of the students in the control schools was better.

**TABLE 2**  
**Student performance on the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Grade 2) and the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test (Grades 3-5), 1999-00**

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:							
	Reading				Mathematics			
	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
Liberty City Charter School	52	39	32	28	34	47	46	39
Four control schools	41	29	34	23	36	38	29	46

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary and benefit levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving its three objectives. Data are presented that adequately demonstrate the achievement of all the objectives.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, two elementary schools in the district were deemed comparable to Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School. These control schools are David Fairchild and Whispering Pines. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 116 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 600 students. In addition, while the charter school had a free or reduced-price lunch rate of 27.6%, there were no control schools that had less than 30.8%.

**TABLE 1**  
**Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00**

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School	K-4	116	41	28	27	27.6	2.6	0
Four control schools	PK/K-5	600-855	29-50	12-15	31-57	30.8-32.0	6.4-11.8	8-11

*Note.* The control elementary schools are David Fairchild and Whispering Pines. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the SAT for grade 2 and the FCAT-NRT for grades 3 and 4. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students in reading was better than that of the students in the control schools in all three grades. In mathematics, however, the performance of the charter students was better than that of the students in the control schools only in grade 3. In grades 2 and 4, the performance of the students in the control schools was better.

**TABLE 2**  
**Student performance on the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Grade 2) and the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test (Grades 3-4), 1999-00**

Median Percentile Scores:	Reading			Mathematics			
	Schools	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4
Coral Reef Montessori Academy Charter School		77	81	73	64	83	53
Two control schools		70	62	66	75	68	67

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.



**The Mater Academy**

**Review of Annual Report**

The Mater Academy’s Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school’s progress towards achieving its four objectives. Data are presented that adequately demonstrate the achievement of two objectives dealing with mathematics and readiness to start school. However, two objectives dealing with reading and parental involvement were not achieved.

**Academic performance of the charter students**

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, three elementary schools in the district were deemed comparable to The Mater Academy. These control schools are Henry M. Flagler, Kensington Park, and Mae Walters. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district’s schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 392 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 810 students. In addition, while the charter school had a limited English proficient rate of 67.3%, there were no control schools that had more than 51.0%.

**TABLE 1**  
**Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00**

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
The Mater Academy	K-5	392	3	2	95	82.4	67.3	0
Three control schools	PK-5	810-1468	2-4	1-2	92-97	83.9-86.2	49.5-51.0	4-5

*Note.* The control elementary schools are Henry M. Flagler, Kensington Park, and Mae Walters. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the SAT for grade 2 and the FCAT-NRT for grades 3 to 5. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students in reading was better than that of the students in the control schools in grade 5. In grades 2, 3, and 4, however, the performance of the students in the control schools was better. In mathematics, the performance of the charter students was the same as or better than that of the students in the control schools in grades 2, 3, and 5. In grade 4, the performance of the students in the control schools was better.

**TABLE 2**  
**Student performance on the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Grade 2) and the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test (Grades 3-5), 1999-00**

Schools	Reading				Mathematics			
	Scores:				Scores:			
	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
The Mater Academy	38	39	47	42	49	51	46	63
Three control schools	43	40	53	38	49	47	49	55

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## Spiral Tech Elementary Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Spiral Tech Elementary Charter School's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving its objectives. Yet, the objectives are not stated, and the data presented are not adequate to support the claim that the objectives were achieved.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, four elementary schools in the district were deemed comparable to Spiral Tech Elementary Charter School. These control schools are Coral Park, Wesley Matthews, John I. Smith, and Tropical. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 84 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 663 students. In addition, while the charter school had a free or reduced-price lunch rate of 3.6%, there were no control schools that had less than 30.7%.

**TABLE 1**

#### ***Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00***

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Spiral Tech Elementary Charter School	K-3	84	10	2	81	3.6	41.7	6
Four control schools	PK/K-5	663-1518	7-17	1-5	74-91	30.7-58.3	32.7-42.7	6-11

*Note.* The control elementary schools are Coral Park, Wesley Matthews, John I. Smith, and Tropical. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the SAT for grade 2 and the FCAT-NRT for grade 3. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students in reading was better than that of the students in the control schools in both grades. In mathematics, the performance of the charter students was better than that of the students in the control schools in grade 3. In grade 2, however, the performance of the students in the control schools was better.

**TABLE 2**

#### ***Student performance on the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Grade 2) and the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test (Grade 3), 1999-00***

Schools	Median Percentile Scores: Reading		Mathematics	
	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 2	Grade 3
Spiral Tech Elementary Charter School	76	75	75	79
Four control schools	71	60	81	65

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## Rosa Parks Community Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Rosa Parks Community Charter School's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary and benefit levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving objectives. Data are presented that adequately demonstrate the achievement of objectives dealing with reading, mathematics, and writing. However, these objectives differ from those in the contract. The objectives stated on page 35 of the contract deal with such topics as recruitment, individualized learning contracts, achievement on a variety of tests, and student behavior.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, two elementary schools in the district were deemed comparable to Rosa Parks Community Charter School. These control schools are Bel-Aire and Pine Villa. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 84 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 740 students. In addition, while the charter school had a limited English proficient rate of 1.5%, there were no control schools that had less than 9.1%.

**TABLE 1**

#### **Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00**

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Rosa Parks Community Charter School	4-5	65	8	68	25	92.3	1.5	0
Two control schools	PK-5	740-762	6-7	58-74	18-31	87.9-93.5	9.1-14.6	0-1

*Note.* The control elementary schools are Bel-Aire and Pine Villa. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students was not as good as that of the students in the control schools in any of the subject area and grade combinations.

**TABLE 2**

#### **Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00**

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:		Reading		Mathematics	
	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 4	Grade 5
Rosa Parks Community Charter School	24	19	19	32		
Two control schools	27	27	28	46		

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## Ryder Elementary Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Ryder Elementary Charter School's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary and benefit levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving its three objectives. Data are presented that adequately demonstrate the achievement of all the objectives.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, two elementary schools in the district were deemed comparable to Ryder Elementary Charter School. These control schools are Calusa and Key Biscayne. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 281 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 1013 students. In addition, while the charter school had a free or reduced-price lunch rate of 1.4%, there were no control schools that had less than 10.7%.

**TABLE 1**

#### ***Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00***

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Ryder Elementary Charter School	K-3	281	35	10	53	1.4	6.8	5
Two control schools	PK-5/8	1013-1035	36-39	6	52-54	10.7-16.6	14.3-19.8	14-15

*Note.* The control elementary schools are Calusa and Key Biscayne. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the SAT for grade 2 and the FCAT-NRT for grade 3. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students was not as good as that of the students in the control schools in any of the subject area and grade combinations.

**TABLE 2**

#### ***Student performance on the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Grade 2) and the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test (Grade 3), 1999-00***

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:		Mathematics	
	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 2	Grade 3
Ryder Elementary Charter School	58	52	62	54
Two control schools	72	68	73	68

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## Florida International Academy

### Review of Annual Report

The Florida International Academy's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving its five objectives. Data are presented that adequately demonstrate the school's progress toward the achievement of all its objectives.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, three schools in the district were deemed comparable to Florida International Academy. These control schools include two middle schools, Carol City and Westview. The third control school is a high school, Miami Central. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 126 students in grades 6-12, whereas the control middle schools served no less than 1276 students and the control senior high school served 3102. In addition, while the charter school had a free or reduced-price lunch rate of 59.9%, there were no control middle schools that had less than 74.9%.

**TABLE 1**  
**Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00**

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Florida International Academy	6-12	126	2	88	7	59.9	0	0
Two control middle schools	6-8	1276-1599	1	86	13	74.9-85.5	2.4-4.8	1-4
Control senior high school	9-12	3102	1	85	13	48.1	6.5	0

*Note.* The two control middle schools are Carol City and Westview. The control senior high school is Miami Central. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2a displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT for grades 6 to 8. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control middle schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2a reveals that the mathematics performance of the charter students was better than that of the students in the control schools in grade 8. In grades 6 and 7, however, the performance of the students in the control schools was better. The reading performance of the charter students was not as good as that of the students in the control schools in any of the grades.

**TABLE 2a**  
**Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00**

Schools	Reading			Mathematics		
	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
Florida International Academy	11	11	26	18	14	31
Two control middle schools	19	23	28	26	20	28

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

Table 2b displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT for grades 9 and 10. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school and the control high school. To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2b reveals that the reading performance of the charter students was better than that of the students in the control school in grade 9. In grade 10, however, the performance of the students in the control school was better. The mathematics performance of the control students was better than that of students in the charter school in both grades 9 and 10.

**TABLE 2b*****Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00***

Median Percentile Scores: Schools	Reading		Mathematics	
	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 9	Grade 10
Florida International Academy	17	8	21	12
Control high school	13	9	24	23

*Note.* Upon releasing the test scores, the Florida Department of Education deemed the grade 9 and 10 scores for the reading subtest inconsistent with results for all other grades and subject areas. The higher scores are shaded.

## ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School's Annual Report addresses only one of the three items required by the charter school legislation. It includes the school's financial records, including revenues and expenditures. The report does not address either the salary and benefit levels of its employees or the school's progress towards achieving its objectives.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, two middle schools in the district were deemed comparable to ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School. These control schools are Jose de Diego and Lake Stevens. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 100 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 1231 students. In addition, while none of the charter school students were limited English proficient (LEP), the enrollment of the control middle schools was at least 4.3% LEP.

**TABLE 1**

#### *Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00*

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School	6-8	100	9	35	53	74.0	0.0	0
Two control schools	6-8	1231-1932	1-6	43-46	46-55	68.5-95.4	4.3-10.8	3-5

*Note.* The control middle schools are Jose de Diego and Lake Stevens. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the reading performance of the charter students was better than that of the students in the control schools in grades 6 and 7. In grade 8, however, the performance of the students in the control schools was better. In mathematics, the performance of the charter students was better than that of the students in the control schools.

**TABLE 2**

#### *Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00*

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:			Mathematics		
	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
ASPIRA Youth Leadership Charter School	30	38	29	34	44	34
Two control schools	25	27	31	29	27	33

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## The Doral Academy

### Review of Annual Report

The Doral Academy's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary and benefit levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving its objectives. The report states that the school achieved its three objectives, which deal respectively with academic performance, self-image, and student behavior. However, the data presented are only adequate to demonstrate the achievement of the objective dealing with student behavior. The data do not adequately demonstrate that the other two objectives were achieved.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, two middle schools in the district were deemed comparable to The Doral Academy. These control schools are Ruben Dario and Henry H. Filer. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 16 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 1551 students. In addition, while none of the charter school students were limited English proficient (LEP), the enrollment of the control schools was at least 12.0% LEP.

**TABLE 1**

#### ***Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00***

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
The Doral Academy	6	16	0	6	88	62.5	0.0	0
Two control schools	6-8/9	1551-1633	3-5	3-10	83-93	77.5-79.8	12.0-23.8	5-8

*Note.* The control middle schools are Ruben Dario and Henry H. Filer. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students was not as good as that of the students in the control schools in either subject area.

**TABLE 2**

#### ***Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00***

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:	
	Reading Grade 6	Mathematics Grade 6
The Doral Academy	30	34
Two control schools	35	41

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher score is shaded.



## Miami Shores/Barry University Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Miami Shores/Barry University Charter School's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving its four objectives. Data are presented that adequately demonstrate the achievement of all its objectives.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, three middle schools in the district were deemed comparable to Miami Shores/Barry University Charter School. These control schools are Arvida, G. W. Carver, and Southwood. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 180 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 955 students. In addition, while 45% of the charter school students were white, there were no control schools with an enrollment of more than 41% white.

**TABLE 1**

#### ***Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00***

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Miami Shores/Barry University Charter School	6-8	180	45	26	26	25.0	0	27
Three control schools	6-8	955-1785	31-41	12-30	25-52	22.2-31.9	1.8-7.1	9-29

*Note.* The control middle schools are Arvida, G. W. Carver, and Southwood. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students was uniformly better than that of the students in the control schools across all grades and subject areas.

**TABLE 2**

#### ***Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00***

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:			Median Percentile Scores:		
	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
Miami Shores/Barry University Charter School	71	80	74	71	80	79
Three control schools	65	66	69	65	68	73

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## Youth Co-op Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Youth Co-op Charter School's Annual Report addresses its financial records, including revenues and expenditures, and the salary and benefit levels of its employees. Additionally, the report addresses the school's progress towards achieving its three objectives. Evidence is presented that adequately demonstrates the achievement of the objective dealing with parental involvement. However, the test score data necessary for assessing the reading and mathematics objectives were not available.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, three middle schools in the district were deemed comparable to Youth Co-op Charter School. These control schools are Jose Marti, Palm Springs, and West Miami. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 199 students, whereas the control schools served no less than 1655 students. In addition, while 4.5% of the charter school students were limited English proficient (LEP), there were no control schools that had an enrollment of less than 13.2% LEP.

**TABLE 1**

#### *Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00*

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Youth Co-op Charter School	6-7	199	5	1	95	69.8	4.5	0
Three control schools	6-8/9	1655-2079	3-6	0-1	94-95	65.2-80.5	13.2-15.0	5-7

*Note.* The control middle schools are Jose Marti, Palm Springs, and West Miami. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school. For the control schools, the composite of their median percentile scores are displayed (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students was uniformly better than that of the students in the control schools across both grades and subject areas.

**TABLE 2**

#### *Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00*

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:		Mathematics	
	Reading		Grade 6	Grade 7
	Grade 6	Grade 7		
Youth Co-op Charter School	49	55	65	55
Three control schools	40	38	44	35

*Note.* Each score of the control schools is the composite of their median percentile scores (*i.e.*, the median of the medians). The higher scores are shaded.

## Techworld Public Charter School

### Review of Annual Report

The Techworld Public Charter School's Annual Report addresses only one of the three items required by the charter school legislation. It lists the salaries of charter school employees. The report does not address either the financial records or the school's progress towards achieving its objectives.

### Academic performance of the charter students

Based on the criteria delineated in the Introduction, Miami Central Senior High School was deemed comparable to Techworld Public Charter School. Still, it must be acknowledged that none of the district's schools are truly like this charter school. As can be seen in Table 1, the charter school served only 113 students, whereas the control school served 3,102 students. In addition, while the charter school had a free or reduced-price lunch rate of 80.5%, the control school had a rate of 48.1%.

**TABLE 1**  
**Characteristics of the student enrollment, 1999-00**

Schools	Grades	Enrollment	Percentage of students					
			White	Black	Hispanic	FRL	LEP	Gifted
Techworld Public Charter School	9	113	2	85	13	80.5	0	0
Control school	9-12	3102	1	85	13	48.1	6.5	0

*Note.* The control senior high school is Miami Central. FRL=free or reduced-price lunch; LEP=limited English proficient.

Table 2 displays the results of the reading and mathematics subtests of the FCAT-NRT. The table displays the median percentile scores of the charter school and the control school. To facilitate the comparison, the higher scores are shaded in the table.

A review of Table 2 reveals that the performance of the charter students was not as good as that of the students in the control school in either subject area.

**TABLE 2**  
**Student performance on the FCAT Norm-Referenced Test, 1999-00**

Schools	Median Percentile Scores:	
	Reading Grade 9	Mathematics Grade 9
Techworld Public Charter School	9	21
Control school	13	24

*Note.* Upon releasing the test scores, the Florida Department of Education deemed the grade 9 scores for the reading subtest inconsistent with results for all other grades and subject areas. The higher scores are shaded.