

**FINAL APPLICATION REVIEW 2010-2011**

**Proposed School Name:** Lynn Preparatory Charter School

**Grades Served At Full Capacity:** K-8

**Number of Students At Full Capacity:** 324

**Proposed School Location:** Lynn

**Proposed Opening Year:** FY2012

**Public Statement:**

Lynn Preparatory Charter School (LPCS) is an academically rigorous K-8 school which offers an “exceptional education without exception” to prepare all students for success in high school and beyond. Although open to all Lynn students, the LPCS specifically targets students attending the lowest performing schools in the most economically distressed neighborhoods of the city, providing them with tailored supports to meet their individual needs.

**Mission Statement:**

Lynn Preparatory Charter School (LPCS) is an academically rigorous K-8 school which offers an “exceptional education without exception” to prepare all students for success in high school and beyond. Although open to all Lynn students, the LPCS specifically targets students attending the lowest performing schools in the most economically distressed neighborhoods of the city, providing them with tailored supports to meet their individual needs.

**Proposed Growth Plan for First Five Years of Operation:**

School Year	Grade Levels	Total Student Enrollment
First Year	K – 7	288
Second Year	K – 8	324
Third Year	K – 8	324
Fourth Year	K – 8	324
Fifth Year	K – 8	324

**Mission, Vision, and Description of the Community(ies) to Be Served**

**Primary Strengths**

- The mission statement defines clearly the purpose and values of the school. (Section I.A.)
- While reviewers had many questions about how the vision will be operationalized, the application and the applicant group discuss a compelling vision that includes a standards-based curriculum, student empowerment, school-family partnerships, and the Campus of Care Program. (Section I.B.)
- The description of the community section of the application speaks to the value of

**Primary Weaknesses**

- While in the interview, the applicant group described in greater detail how the tailored supports and Campus of Care might operate, as written however, the vision does not fully serve as an organizing principle for the application as a whole. (Section I.B.)
- The Lynn Superintendent, Catherine Latham, does not support granting a charter to this applicant group. See public comment. (Section I.C.)

the proposed school and offers a rationale for how the school will expand the educational options by offering extended learning time with smaller class sizes and a program based on a student's individual learning plan.

- During the interview, the applicant group added additional information about the needs of the student population in Lynn and the ability of the proposed school to meet those needs. (Section I.C.)

### **Educational Philosophy, Curriculum and Instruction**

#### **Primary Strengths**

- The educational philosophy offers a clear overview of the founding group's core beliefs and values: active/motivated learners, effective communicators, and school-family community partnerships. (Section II.A.)
- Reviewers had many questions about how the educational philosophy will be implemented into a comprehensive educational program. In the interview, the applicant group helped clarified the world languages program, tailored supports, enrichment, and the strategies to be used to develop students' growth mind-set. (Section II.A.)
- The application provides research on aspects of the proposed school's educational philosophy regarding multiple intelligences, growth mind-set, and the importance of health care for low-income children to effectively close the achievement gap. (Section II.B.)
- The application briefly describes how the curriculum will be identified and created, and offers a general overview of the curriculum which is linked to the mission and educational philosophy of the school. (Section II.B.)

#### **Primary Weaknesses**

- While in the interview, the applicant group indicated that the private pre-school program would simply be renting space in the building; in the application, the pre-school is described as part of the wrap-around services. Reviewers had questions and concerns about this aspect of the application. (Section II.A.)
- While the application indicates that teachers and administrators will examine student achievement data to modify the curriculum and inform professional development, the process used to evaluate whether the curriculum is effective is vague and the curricular components that will facilitate ongoing development, improvement, and refinement lack detail. (Section II.B.)

**Assessment System, Performance, Promotion, and Graduation Standards**

**Primary Strengths**

- The Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is consistently at the center of the assessment system. The assessment system provides multiple measures of student outcomes. (Section II.D.)

**Primary Weaknesses**

- While the graduation standards mention public speaking, media, and community service/advocacy projects, the information is limited. (Section II.C.)
- The performance standards provided were incomplete and it is not clear how they are aligned with the school's core values. (Section II.C.)
- The link between the assessment system and decision making about curriculum and instruction appears vague. (Section II.D.)

**School Characteristics**

**Primary Strengths**

- The application and the applicant group described how the educational program will be implemented for students and staff, including looping K/1 and 2/3 with grades 4-8 rotating in grade-level groups to content area classrooms. (Section II.E.)
- The application also described the culture of the school and offered a plan for establishing that school culture which was consistent with the school's mission and educational philosophy. The plan included strategies to build relationships, such as community meetings and mentor programs, as well as activities to highlight student achievement. (Section II.E.)
- Reviewers thought that the wrap-around services concept could potentially have a real impact alleviating obstacles to student success and achievement. (Section II. E.)

**Primary Weaknesses**

- During the interview the applicant group discussed in greater detail how the Campus Core program will operate, but questions still remain about how the program is managed and evaluated and how it interacts with the academic schedule. (Section II.E.)
- The application lists a number of external programs that will be brought into the proposed school, but it is unclear how they will support student achievement and how they align with the educational programming. (Section II.E.)
- While the school provided components of a partnership strategy to involve families (ILP process, wrap-around services, and extended learning time) it is not clear how these aspects of the program involve all parents on an ongoing basis. (Section II.E.)

**Special Student Populations and Student Services**

**Primary Strengths**

- The application describes team teaching strategies, targeted professional development for general education faculty, and special education and English

**Primary Weaknesses**

- The application does not provide a complete description of the processes and procedures that the proposed school will use to serve English language learners

<p>as a Second Language (ESL) staffing levels to meet the needs of diverse learners. During the interview, the applicant group emphasized the integration of special education and ESL services within general education classrooms and pull out services during enrichment time when student needs require it. (Section II.F.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application states that Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) procedures will be used in classes to meet the needs of ELLs. During the interview, the applicant group stated that all teachers will receive SIOP and Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) category training. A proposed board member, Lorraine Lentini, is an SEI category trainer. (Section II.F.)</li> </ul>	<p>(ELLs). The application is unclear regarding English Language Development instruction for ELLs. (Section II.F.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application does not provide a complete description of the processes and procedures that the proposed school will use to students in need of special education services. (Section II.F.)</li> </ul>
--	---

**Enrollment and Recruitment**

<p><b><u>Primary Strengths</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed enrollment process is open, fair, and in accordance with the charter school statute and regulations. (Section III.A)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Primary Weaknesses</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the rationale for 36 students per grade is clear, there is no growth strategy. They intend to open with grades K-7, although in the future the school will only accept students K-6. While it could be potentially challenging for a new school to open with a K-7 grade span, the founders and proposed board of trustees assert that they have the curriculum in place and believe that there is an urgent need for a middle school in Lynn. (Section III.A.)</li> </ul>
--	---

**Capacity and School Governance**

<p><b><u>Primary Strengths</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant group and proposed board of trustees include members with a variety of skills and experiences, including educational leadership in charter, district, and private-not-for profit school settings, private-not-for profit school development, business, finance, real estate, social services, and law. (Section III.B.)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Primary Weaknesses</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application includes information about why the proposed board of trustees selected Dr. Joanne Civitarese to serve as the Executive Director (ED) and Mark Hathaway as the Chief Operating Officer (COO). However, they did not identify the criteria for their selection of both school leaders and do not provide any information about how they will evaluate</li> </ul>
--	---

- While reviewers had concerns about the Executive Director (ED) and Chief Operating Officer (COO) being married, the application and the applicant group described a governance model with an appropriate reporting structure and relationship among the board of trustees, school leader, and administrative staff. The applicant group stated explicitly that the board will be responsible for evaluating the ED and COO. (Section III.C.)

the COO position. (Section III.C.)

**Management**

**Primary Strengths**

- The staffing plan in the application is accurately reflected in the budget. (Section III.D.)
- The application provides information about working conditions for faculty, including 1 ½ hours of lunch/common planning time, opportunities for professional development, and advancement from within. (Section III.D.)
- The application, applicant group, and the present Hathaway School board chair report that the Hathaway School will remain open indicating that this private school is not converting to a charter school. A letter from the present board chair specifically states that the Hathaway School will remain open for the 2011-12 school year, though this raises potential concerns that the school will eventually fold. During the interview, the applicant group stated that 70% of the revenue of the Hathaway School is related to the pre-school and after-school programming which is unrelated to what the proposed school will do. We have no information about the Hathaway School’s long-term stability.
- The proposed school is the same grade span as the Hathaway School, less the pre-school option. The two schools do have different governance and

**Primary Weaknesses**

- The roles and responsibilities of administrators and coordinators within the management structure require further clarification. (Section III.D.)

management structures; however, the founders and proposed board members overlap in a number of ways. The founders of the Hathaway School hope to be school leaders at the proposed school. If chartered, two individuals who are connected to the Hathaway School, one as an employee and the other as a parent will serve as founding board members of the proposed school.

**Facilities, Transportation, and Finances**

**Primary Strengths**

- The application and applicant group described a viable process for a facility search and have indicated that they are looking at a number of options in the city of Lynn. (Section III.E.)
- While reviewers had questions about the budget because of the limited narrative, the applicant group was able to provide clarification during the interview. (Section III.D.)

**Primary Weaknesses**

- No primary weaknesses.