



**Uphams Corner Charter School  
Additional Data Analysis & Federal Programs Information  
November 2008**

I. Introduction .....	2
II. Enrollment and Demographics History .....	2
III. 2007-08 Demographic Comparison: UCCS v. Boston Public Schools .....	3
IV. Student Attrition and Retention .....	4
V. Teacher Attrition .....	4
VI. Comparative Statistical Analysis of MCAS Results: UCCS v. Boston Public Schools.....	5
VII. Federal Programs Information.....	7

## I. Introduction

---

Uphams Corner Charter School (UCCS), a Commonwealth charter school, is located in Boston. The school opened in 2002 and its charter was renewed with conditions in 2007. UCCS is chartered to serve grades 5 through 8 with a maximum enrollment of 200. In 2008-2009, UCCS is serving approximately 174 students in grades 5 through 8.

## II. Enrollment and Demographics History

---

Enrollment statistics for UCCS are provided in the tables below.

UCCS Enrollment History	Total Students (Oct. 1)	Grade span	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Pre-enrolled	Waitlist	Claim form FTE Actual
2007-08	168	5-8	15	34	51	68	200	43	177.2
2006-07	187	5-8	16	46	73	52	200	106	192.5
2005-06	177	5-8	18	50	51	58	200	62	191.3
2004-05	147	5-7	64	44	39	0	160	17	138.2
2003-04	80	5-6	15	65	0	0	80	52	80.0
2002-03	74	5	74	0	0	0	75	0	77.2

UCCS Enrollment History	African American	Asian	Hispanic	White	Native American	Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic
2007-08	88.7	0.0	7.7	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
2006-07	77.4	1.5	16.6	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.0
2005-06	78.0	2.3	15.3	3.4	0.0	Classifications not available prior to 2006-07.	
2004-05	83.7	3.4	6.8	6.1	0.0		
2003-04	80.0	3.8	10.0	6.3	0.0		
2002-03	75.7	4.1	13.5	6.8	0.0		

UCCS Enrollment History	Males	Females	First Language Not English	Limited English Proficient	Special Education	Low-Income
2007-08	46.4	53.6	9.5	0.6	25.6	89.3
2006-07	51.8	48.2	12.1	1.5	26.6	83.9
2005-06	55.9	44.1	26.0	6.8	14.1	67.8
2004-05	53.1	46.9	34.0	13.6	6.1	68.0
2003-04	53.8	46.3	33.8	0.0	7.5	82.5
2002-03	51.4	48.6	33.8	0.0	9.5	77.0

### III. 2007-08 Demographic Comparison: UCCS v. Boston Public Schools

The following table compares demographic data of UCCS to that of the Boston Public Schools and to the state. This comparison is to BPS because virtually all students enrolled at the charter school come from Boston. The comparison includes 100 schools in BPS with grade levels that overlap with the charter school.

- Comparison Minimum refers to the individual school(s) among the 100 BPS schools with the lowest percentage of students in a given category.
- Comparison Median refers to the individual school(s) among the 100 BPS schools with the middle percentage of students in a given category.
- Comparison Maximum refers to the individual school(s) among the 100 BPS schools with the highest percentage of students in a given category.
- The Comparison Total represents the percentage of the total number of students in a given category in all 100 BPS schools combined.

<b>Race/Ethnicity (%)</b>		African American	Asian	Hispanic	White	Native American	Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic
Uphams Corner Charter School		88.7	0.0	7.7	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Boston (100 Schools)	Comparison Minimum	2.7	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Comparison Median	37.9	2.6	32.1	9.1	0.4	0.0	1.6
	Comparison Maximum	89.9	68.3	89.8	59.2	4.3	0.9	5.5
	Comparison Total	36.9	9.9	35.6	15.3	0.5	0.1	1.7
	State	8.1	4.9	13.9	70.8	0.3	0.1	1.9

<b>Other Demographics (%)</b>		Males	Females	First Language Not English	Limited English Proficient	Special Education	Low-Income
Uphams Corner Charter School		46.4	53.6	9.5	0.6	25.6	89.3
Boston (100 Schools)	Comparison Minimum	42.0	20.0	6.2	1.1	0.7	27.9
	Comparison Median	52.8	47.2	31.0	14.8	18.8	80.1
	Comparison Maximum	80.0	58.0	79.0	56.0	97.9	93.0
	Comparison Total	51.6	48.4	36.2	19.4	19.2	73.3
	State	51.4	48.6	15.1	5.8	16.9	29.5

#### IV. Student Attrition and Retention

A. The table below compares the number of students who started at UCCS in grade 5 with the number of those same students who are still enrolled at UCCS in grade 8, at the end of the fourth subsequent school year, based on Oct. 1 and End-of-Year SIMS data.

Grade 5 Cohorts, 4-year cohorts	Grade 5	Grade 8	% Starting grade 5 students remaining at end of grade 8
Oct. 2002 - Jun. 2006	74	34	45.9%
Oct. 2003 - Jun. 2007	15	3	20.0%
Oct. 2004 - Jun. 2008	63	15	23.8%

B. The table below provides a profile of the length of enrollment for students in each UCCS 8<sup>th</sup> grade class, based on Oct. 1 and End-of-Year SIMS data.

Length of Enrollment of UCCS 8th Grade Class (June 2008)		
Enrolled During*	#	%
2004-08	17	28%
2005-08	16	26%
2006-08	16	26%
2007-08	12	20%
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100%</b>
* Student was reported as enrolled at UCCS in Oct. 1 and/or End-of-Year SIMS of each school year during this period.		

Length of Enrollment of UCCS 8th Grade Class (June 2007)		
Enrolled During*	#	%
2003-07	4	8%
2004-07	13	25%
2005-07	26	51%
2006-07	8	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100%</b>
* Student was reported as enrolled at UCCS in Oct. 1 and/or End-of-Year SIMS of each school year during this period.		

Length of Enrollment of UCCS 8th Grade Class (June 2006)		
Enrolled During*	#	%
2002-06 <sup>^</sup>	35	56%
2003-06	4	6%
2004-06	5	8%
2005-06	19	30%
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>100%</b>
* Student was reported as enrolled at UCCS in Oct. 1 and/or End-of-Year SIMS of each school year during this period.		
<sup>^</sup> Includes a student who was reported as enrolled in the first and last school year during this period, but not in the middle years.		

#### V. Teacher Attrition

The following teacher attrition information is based on data provided by UCCS in their annual reports and site visit documents.

School Year	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total number of students	147	177	187	168	174
Total number of full-time equivalent teachers during school year.	12	21	18	20	15
Number of teachers who were asked to leave during the school year.	0	1	1	1	2 (as of the 10/7/08 site visit)
Number of teachers who left during the school year, or did not return the next school year.	6	7	10	8	NA
<b>Total attrition rate</b>	<b>50 %</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>NA</b>

## **VI. Comparative Statistical Analysis of MCAS Results: UCCS v. Boston Public Schools**

---

Because UCCS draws virtually all of its students from Boston, the school's annual performance, as measured by the Composite Performance Index (CPI), was compared to that of the Boston Public Schools (BPS) in the aggregate and for all subgroups at all grade levels tested. Comparisons were made on a grade-to-grade basis; e.g., since UCCS enrolls students in grades 5 through 8, only the students in the corresponding grades in the BPS were included for each comparison. Statistical analyses, two-tailed *t* tests for the equality of means, were performed to determine if any differences in performance between UCCS and BPS students were statistically significant at a 95% confidence level. Consistent with AYP determination minimum sample size rules for reliability, consistency, and validity, comparisons are only made and reported if there were at least 40 students tested in the charter school for a given grade/subgroup. In subgroup analysis, the UCCS low income, special education, and African American subgroups had at least 40 students tested in some years and grades and are presented as appropriate. Full data tables for each subject are provided below.

### **English Language Arts**

The performance of UCCS students on the grade 6, 7, and 8 English Language Arts (ELA) exams as measured by CPI was analyzed in the aggregate and for subgroups with at least 40 students in comparison to that of the BPS in 2006 through 2008. Grade 5 results are analyzed when combined with other grades due to small sample size.

Of the 11 ELA aggregate, grade-to-grade comparisons conducted, there were no statistically significant differences in performance except in one instance; in 2006, the BPS performed at a statistically significantly higher level than UCCS when all tested grades are combined; and

Of the 20 ELA subgroup, grade-to-grade comparisons conducted, there were no statistically significant differences in performance except in one instance; in 2007, UCCS performed at a statistically significantly higher level than the BPS in grade 7 for the low income subgroup.

### **Mathematics**

The performance of UCCS students on the grade 6, 7, and 8 mathematics exams, as measured by CPI, was analyzed in the aggregate and for subgroups with at least 40 students in comparison to that of the BPS in 2004 through 2008. Grade 5 results are analyzed when combined with other grades due to small sample size.

Of the 13 math aggregate, grade-to-grade comparisons conducted, the BPS performed at a statistically significantly higher level than UCCS in all instances except for one; there was no statistically significant difference in performance in 2004 for grade 6.

Of the 32 math subgroup, grade-to-grade comparisons conducted, the BPS performed at a statistically significantly higher level than UCCS in all instances except for three; there were no statistically significant differences in performance in 2007 for the low income and special education subgroups in grade 7 and for the low income subgroup in grade 8.

English Language Arts - Aggregate Results									Low Income			Special Ed.			African Am.		
ELA	District	n	% W/F	% NI	% P	% A	CPI	*	n	CPI	*	n	CPI	*	n	CPI	*
<b>Grade 6</b>																	
2007	UCCS	47	15	62	23	0	66.0		40	68.1							
2007	Boston	3,612	20	42	35	4	70.9		2,940	69.2							
2007	State	72,887	7	25	58	9	86.4										
2006	UCCS	53	13	64	23	0	62.3		41	64.0				45	61.1		
2006	Boston	3,785	22	42	32	4	67.7		3,086	66.1				1,732	64.1		
2006	State	73,382	8	28	54	10	84.9										
<b>Grade 7</b>																	
2008	UCCS	46	17	50	30	2	69.0		42	67.3							
2008	Boston	3,887	18	34	44	4	75.7		2,909	72.9							
2008	State	72,799	8	23	57	12	87.3										
2007	UCCS	72	15	33	51	0	77.1		63	79.4	*			57	77.6		
2007	Boston	4,072	18	33	46	3	74.6		2,992	71.4				1,725	70.3		
2007	State	73,577	8	23	60	9	86.9										
2006	UCCS	51	20	55	25	0	67.2							45	67.2		
2006	Boston	4,308	20	36	39	4	72.1							1,914	67.4		
2006	State	74,509	9	26	55	10	84.6										
<b>Grade 8</b>																	
2008	UCCS	62	19	35	45	0	73.0		53	74.1				51	74.0		
2008	Boston	4,022	15	28	52	5	79.2		2,874	76.4				1,683	75.6		
2008	State	73,268	7	18	63	12	89.3										
2007	UCCS	52	8	44	48	0	79.3		41	77.4							
2007	Boston	4,208	14	30	51	4	79.5		2,987	77.2							
2007	State	74,433	6	18	63	12	89.5										
2006	UCCS	63	10	41	49	0	75.8		55	75.9				53	74.1		
2006	Boston	4,337	16	30	49	5	77.7		3,171	75.4				1,971	75.2		
2006	State	76,243	7	19	62	12	88.3										
<b>ELA - All Tested Grades Combined (Including Grade 5)</b>																	
2008	UCCS	158					70.3		137	70.1		48	49.0		126	71.2	
2008	Boston	14,939					74.5		11,381	71.8		3,612	53.2		6,156	70.9	
2008	State	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA										
2007	UCCS	186					74.1		156	75.3		52	51.9		141	73.6	
2007	Boston	13,065					68.3		12,003	71.6		3,721	52.3		6,657	70.3	
2007	State	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA										
2006	UCCS	185					67.2		138	68.8					158	66.1	
2006	Boston	28,276					70.2	*	12,732	69.3					7,466	68.0	
2006	State	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA										

Notes:

(1) An asterisk (\*) beside a higher CPI indicates a difference that is statistically significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level; 2-tailed. This means the probability is less than 5/100 that a difference in performance of this size occurred by chance, if the two groups were randomly assigned.

(2) Comparisons are only made and displayed for a particular grade/subgroup and displayed if there at least 40 students tested. (Grade 6 results in 2008 and Grade 5 results for all years are not presented for this reason.)

Mathematics – Aggregate Results									Low Income			Special Ed.			African Am.		
Math	District	n	% W/F	% NI	% P	% A	CPI	*	n	CPI	*	n	CPI	*	n	CPI	*
<b>Grade 6</b>																	
2007	UCCS	45	56	31	13	0	45.6										
2007	Boston	3,636	41	31	20	9	57.4	*									
2007	State	72,889	20	28	32	20	75.5										
2006	UCCS	53	70	26	4	0	35.4		41	35.4					45	33.3	
2006	Boston	3,789	50	30	14	6	50.2	*	3,089	48.2	*				1,734	42.5	*
2006	State	73,470	25	29	29	17	70.5										
2005	UCCS	42	60	38	2	0	38.7										
2005	Boston	3,958	49	28	15	8	51.8	*									
2005	State	74,705	23	30	29	17	71.1										
2004	UCCS	65	35	51	11	3	51.2										
2004	Boston	4,166	54	29	12	6	47.5										
2004	State	76,662	25	32	25	17	68.6										
<b>Grade 7</b>																	
2008	UCCS	47	60	34	6	0	37.8		43	37.2							
2008	Boston	3,951	43	28	21	7	56.9	*	2,958	52.6	*						
2008	State	73,169	24	29	32	15	71.8										
2007	UCCS	72	54	36	10	0	43.1		63	44.8		57	42.1				
2007	Boston	4,095	44	30	20	6	54.2	*	3,000	50.1		1,728	46.3				
2007	State	73,592	24	30	31	15	70.4										
2006	UCCS	51	65	31	4	0	35.3								45	32.8	
2006	Boston	4,318	45	33	16	6	52.4	*							1,914	43.5	*
2006	State	74,647	28	33	28	12	66.6										
<b>Grade 8</b>																	
2008	UCCS	61	61	26	13	0	41.4		52	42.3					50	37.0	
2008	Boston	4,059	40	26	25	9	59.3	*	2,908	55.3	*				1,690	51.1	*
2008	State	73,365	24	27	30	19	72.0										
2007	UCCS	52	48	42	8	2	45.2		41	45.7							
2007	Boston	4,211	42	31	20	7	56.4	*	2,988	53.4							
2007	State	74,319	25	30	28	17	70.2										
2006	UCCS	63	70	29	2	0	34.1		55	34.6					53	35.4	
2006	Boston	4,331	48	29	16	7	51.7	*	3,185	48.1	*				1,970	44.2	*
2006	State	76,276	29	31	28	12	66.3										
<b>Math - All Tested Grades Combined (including Grade 5)</b>																	
2008	UCCS	159					39.9		138	39.1		46	25.0		128	38.1	
2008	Boston	15,085					59.4	*	11,498	56.2	*	3,634	39.3	*	6,181	51.6	*
2008	State	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA										
2007	UCCS	184					44.8		154	46.3		51	33.8		140	43.4	
2007	Boston	15,749					57.5	*	12,035	54.7	*	3,702	38.3		6,658	49.6	*
2007	State	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA										
2006	UCCS	185					35.5		138	37.1					158	34.5	
2006	Boston	16,449					52.9	*	12,759	50.1	*				7,474	44.8	*
2006	State	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA										

Notes:

(1) An asterisk (\*) beside a higher CPI indicates a difference that is statistically significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level; 2-tailed. This means the probability is less than 5/100 that a difference in performance of this size occurred by chance, if the two groups were randomly assigned.

(2) Comparisons are only made and displayed for a particular grade/subgroup and displayed if there at least 40 students tested. (Grade 6 results in 2008 and Grade 5 results for all years are not presented for this reason.)

## **VII. Federal Programs Information**

---

### Facilities

July, 2003-September, 2004

UCCS opened in the fall of 2002 and was visited by the charter school federal programs coordinator on June 10, 2003. This visit resulted in a letter to the school dated July 23, 2003 which noted certain problems with the school's first facility at 50 W. Broadway, South Boston, a former Catholic high school for girls. Issues included the lack of handicapped accessibility to any portion of the building and procedural issues regarding asbestos management. Smoking on campus, which was noted at the time of the June visit, was reported by the school to have been eliminated. The asbestos issue was resolved by implementing a staff training and filing a follow-up report.

In regard to the handicapped accessibility issue, the school was required to submit a plan by September, 2003 which would make the school facilities fully programmatically accessible no later than September 2004. The school ultimately resolved the facilities issues by moving within the 50 W. Broadway building to floors which were accessible, and then to a new location at 7 Elkins Road prior to school opening in 2004.

### Coordinated Program Review

February, 2004

UCCS underwent a full, Coordinated Program Review (CPR) activity in February 2004, which included reviews of the school's programs of special education, English language learner education, and civil rights methods of administration. Significant findings contained in the 2004 CPR report include the school failing to perform comprehensive and timely assessments for students who were referred for special education or for students enrolled in special education who were due for a triennial reevaluation. Referral procedures for students suspected of having a disability were not consistent with legal requirements in that some of the forms used by the school did not contain all required information, progress reports documenting student progress toward meeting the goals and objectives contained in their IEPs were not sent to parents as required, and discipline data for students with disabilities provided to the onsite team contained contradictory information. Special education notices sent home to parents were not translated into the native language of the home as required.

### CPR follow-up activities

January, 2006-September, 2007

In response to findings contained in the CPR, the school developed a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) which was reviewed and approved by the Department on January 19, 2006. The school was required to submit progress reports documenting implementation of required corrective actions in March 2006, but follow-up progress reports due in September 2006 were not received by the Department. A late notice was issued to the school and the progress reports were subsequently received. The Department's review was issued on January 25, 2007, with additional reports required in March 2007. The March reports were not received, prompting a second late notice issued in June 2007. The overdue progress reports were received later in June 2007, for which the Department issued a review in September 2007.

### Mid-Cycle Review and Follow-up

August, 2008-October, 2008

A mid-cycle review was conducted by Program Quality Assurance (PQA) in spring 2008. On August 5, 2008, PQA issued a Mid-Cycle Review (MCR) which indicated that, since the time of the full CPR activity, five special education issues cited in the original report continued to be “partially implemented” and one issue continued to be rated “not implemented.” However, in addition to the items contained in the original 2004 report, an additional 14 new areas of special education non-compliance were identified in the MCR, which had not existed at the time of the full CPR.

In the area of civil rights, one issue remained uncorrected from the original report, plus one new issue identified through the MCR, and in the area of English language learner education out of a total of 18 criteria, 13 were rated as “not implemented” and one was “partially implemented.”

The most recent compliance review activity at this school was the timely submission of a progress report on October 3, 2008, which, according to the Program Quality Assurances reviewer, indicates that the school is showing progress in addressing the issues raised previously through the compliance review system.

#### Charter School Office Federal Programs Site Visit Activity                      October, 2007

In October 2007, the Charter School Office conducted a site visit at UCCS which contained a federal programs component. The primary findings of the federal programs component of that report included:

- UCCS had no means in place to identify, assess or serve limited English proficient students. The school had no capacity to provide either sheltered English immersion or English language development instruction as required. This was the case despite having been specifically cited for that deficiency in the 2004 CPR. The school reported four limited English proficient students attending at the time of the review.
- The school serves students with a wide range of disabilities in placements which include full and partial inclusion settings, and an available resource room.
- Inclusion support services were not effectively integrated into the regular education classroom. Most regular education classes observed by the team were largely teacher lecture with questions and answers between teacher and students. As a consequence of that instructional practice, special education inclusion staff operated mostly at the periphery of the classroom activities, limited to student check-ins, and reminders to stay on task.
- The special education coordinator at the school did not function as the direct supervisor for the special education teachers, who were instead supervised by a school administrator who had no training in special education or the provision of specialized instruction.

- A review of the school’s district curriculum accommodations plan showed that limited classroom accommodations were available through the regular education program to meet the needs of diverse learners. Available accommodations listed were generic, i.e., “Provide for all students to have access to materials,” or simply restatements of good instructional practices, rather than individualized accommodations to be made based on the particular needs of the child.
- Staff training on the topic of accommodating the needs of diverse learners was limited. A single, three hour training had been conducted prior to the start of the year and no in depth trainings had been conducted on any specific disability areas.
- The school’s summer school program, to which special education students were sometimes referred, had not included the availability of any special education services up to the time of the review.