

Renewal Inspection Report

LAWRENCE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT
CHARTER SCHOOL
LAWRENCE, MA

SchoolWorks 

NOVEMBER 15-18, 2004

Table of Contents

	Page
About the renewal process	3
How to read this report	3
Team members	4
Setting	5-6
Findings	7-26
Appendix A: Schedule of the visit	27

About the renewal process and site visit report

Beginning in the spring of the third year of its charter (and ending August 1st following its fourth year), a school may apply for renewal of its charter for another five-year term. Following guidelines set forth in the *Application for Renewal of a Public School Charter*, an application for renewal should be an articulate, affirmative response, based on clear, credible evidence, to the questions that guide charter school accountability. It must also offer compelling answers to questions about the school's plans for the future. The application should be a sound, well-supported explanation of why the Board of Education should renew a school's charter.

Once this application has met a minimal review of its clarity and coherence, the Department of Education will appoint an evaluation team to conduct a 3-4 day visit of the school to corroborate and augment the school's application for renewal. This report is the result of one such evaluation.

The renewal inspection process and report provide a detailed and current portrait of a public charter school at the time of its application for renewal. While the renewal inspection report itself is a vital source of information within the renewal process, it is most effective when used in conjunction with the longitudinal school performance data available to the Department of Education. The combination of more general long-term data with the detailed information gathered by the renewal inspection constitutes an evidence base rigorous enough to inform decisions about the future of public charter schools responsible for the education of students in the Commonwealth. In keeping with Massachusetts Board of Education's commitment to a public charter school accountability system that is based in robust and diverse performance data, the renewal inspection visit report does not make recommendations about whether or not a school should be renewed. It presents a detailed picture of the present state of the school as one of several key sources of information to be considered by the Board of Education in its renewal decision.

How to read this report

The first section of this report describes the school's setting. Included in this section are information on the origin and history of the charter, student demographics, staffing and the school's educational program. This is also an opportunity to include any organizational history, such as changes in the board and leadership or challenges the school has faced, and its response to those challenges.

The core of the report is the Renewal Inspection Team's findings. Findings are the team's assessment of the school's strengths and areas for improvement that, in their judgment, have the greatest bearing on the school's achievement of its defined goals. Findings are organized under each of the renewal questions: *Is the academic program a success? Is the school a viable organization? Is the school faithful to the terms of its charter?* The team's comments on the fourth question, *If the school's charter is renewed, what are its plans for the next five years?*, reflect their judgment of the quality of the school's proposed new goals and their assessment of the school's capacity to fulfill those goals. Each finding is a bolded statement followed by explanatory paragraphs reporting the evidence supporting the team's judgments. Finally, **Appendix A** illustrates the team's schedule during the inspection visit.

RENEWAL INSPECTION TEAM

Emilys Peña, Project Manager, SchoolWorks: Emilys worked for Boston Public Schools for ten years as a bilingual special needs teacher for grades K-6, a literacy specialist at the middle school level, and at the high school level as Assistant Headmaster in charge of Teaching and Learning.

Ann Dinsmoor, Consultant, SchoolWorks: Ann is a consultant to schools and nonprofit organizations in areas of effective leadership, administration and strategic planning. She was a speech therapist and special education administrator in the Wellesley Public Schools.

Carole Forbes, Consultant, Massachusetts Department of Education: has been an educator for thirty- eight years as a teacher, principal for private and public schools, an adjunct faculty member and Founder of a Faculty Development Teaching Effectiveness Center.

Zita Samuels, Consultant, SchoolWorks: Zita is a professional grant writer and program evaluator. Formerly, she had a long career as a program administrator in the areas of Title I, adult education, preschool, reading and libraries in the public schools of Somerville, MA.

SETTING

Lawrence Family Development Charter School (LFDCS) opened in 1995 with 180 students in grades K-3. The school subsequently added a grade each year until it arrived at its current configuration of a K-8 school serving 514 students. LFDCS shares space with Lawrence Family Development Education Fund for its K-4 program, and leases space two blocks away for the upper school program – grades 5-8. Lawrence Family Development Charter School recruits students from various neighborhoods in the city with a concentration from North Lawrence. There are currently 272 students on the school’s waitlist.

LFDCS mission is: *“Strong families, working in partnership with the school as advocates for academic achievement, will create an environment where every child has the opportunity to acquire the foundation skills and habits of mind that foster life-long learning, citizenship participation, and personal fulfillment.”*

The majority of students who attend LFDCS are Latino (98.8 percent). Asian, African American and Native American students make up small groups in the school, with each representing 0.4 percent. Thirteen percent of students at LFDCS receive special education services. Although Lawrence Family Development Charter School uses an inclusion model as the primary way to provide services to students with special needs, some special education students receive pullout services.

The school’s instructional program in English Language Arts utilizes the Harcourt *Trophies* reading program for grades K-6 and received a Reading First Grant to support its implementation in K-3. TERC *Investigations* and *Connected Math* are used in K-8 and thematic units are used to teach social studies and science. All students (K-8) receive Spanish instruction to promote dual language competencies. School leaders, with the help of consultants, have aligned their instructional materials to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. LFDCS provides students with opportunities to participate in programs that expose them to music, art, computer and physical education, both at the school and off site, through partnerships with Philips Andover Academy, Essex Art Center and Adelante Youth Center. Students also have access to science lab instruction at Northern Essex Community College.

The administrative management team at LFDCS includes the Principal, Heads of Lower and Upper School, Special Education Director, Title I Director, and Math Coordinator. The Principal and the Heads of School meet weekly with the Superintendent as the administrative team for the school. To support its academic program, school leaders recently expanded the role of the heads of school to include instructional leadership. In addition, the school has hired coaches to support the instructional program, as well as volunteers to work with teachers and students on a regular basis. The recruitment and hiring of new teachers is done by the superintendent with input from principal, heads of school, teachers and Board members. The school shares a comptroller and director of development with Lawrence Family Development Education Fund, a nonprofit organization established in 1992 whose motto is “strengthening families and building communities through education.”

There are 51 teachers, five of whom are special educators, ten instructional aides, five Spanish teachers, and eight special subject teachers. LFDCS also employs an English as a Second Language (ESL) coordinator, five Title I staff—two for reading, one for English Language Arts, and two math teachers, and a Reading First specialist. Lawrence Family Development Charter School has an after-school coordinator, parent coordinator, math coordinator, special education coordinator, a nurse and nursing assistant, two student support personnel, a guidance counselor, a placement counselor, two administrative assistants, a business manager who is also responsible for managing personnel files and benefits.

Approximately 90 percent of the teaching staff at LFDCS meets the highly qualified teacher requirements as outlined by No Child Left Behind. Lawrence Family Development Charter School experiences, on average, a 22 percent turnover in its staff annually. Currently there are nine teachers who are in their first year at LFDCS.

Lawrence Family Development Charter School is governed by a 13-member Board of Trustees comprised of six members elected from the Lawrence Family Development Education Fund, the founding organization, and six parents elected by the School Site Council. The parent co-chair of the School Site Council serves ex-officio and is elected annually. Board members are elected to three-year renewable terms or to complete unexpired terms. The Board is charged with providing fiscal oversight and works with the superintendent to set policies to guide the direction of the school. LFDCS is financially solvent and has positive audits each year since its last charter renewal.

FINDINGS

In preparing this report, the Renewal Inspection Team (Team) spent three and a half days at the Lawrence Family Development Charter School (LFDCS) from November 15-18, 2004. During that time the Team observed 46 classroom lessons (with most teachers being observed twice). The Team conducted focus group interviews with ten members of the Board of Trustees, 16 parents, 44 teachers, 26 students in grades 2-8 and the school's leaders. The Team also conducted interviews with the directors of development, comptroller, business manager, after-school coordinator, placement counselor, student support teacher, math coordinator, ESL coordinator, Reading First coordinator, director of Community Partners, Inc., and volunteers.

The Renewal Inspection Team also examined a variety of documents. These included financial statements, test results (MCAS, Stanford, DIBELS and Aprenda), the school's Annual Report and Accountability Plan; the Charter Renewal Application; results of the Coordinated Program Review; reports of previous site visits; the School Improvement Plan; demographic and enrollment data; the school's curriculum binders; samples of student work; the NELMS (New England League of Middle Schools) report; the Parent/Student Handbook; the school's dissemination documents; agendas of administrative team and school site council meetings; teacher and administrator evaluation instruments; samples of lesson plans and accompanying feedback; and student report cards. The team also analyzed teacher qualifications and experience, and considered the school's plans for the future including the proposed new LFDCS Accountability Plan.

RENEWAL QUESTION 1: IS THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM A SUCCESS?

- 1. The numbers of Lawrence Family Development Charter School students scoring proficient or advanced on the 2004 MCAS are below state averages: 31-39% in English language arts; 14-23% in mathematics; and 2-11% in science and technology.**

Third Grade Results

Third graders at Lawrence Family Development Charter School outperformed their peers in the Lawrence Public Schools on the MCAS in English language arts. However, students statewide outperformed them. In 2003, students made modest gains on the MCAS with 40 percent performing in the Proficient category compared to 36 percent in 2002. Student performance remained constant in 2004.

MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 3 English Language Arts

GRADE 3 ELA		Total n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2002	School	59	0	0%	21	36%	32	54%	6	10%
	District	1,016	0	0%	325	32%	478	47%	213	21%
	State		0	0%	0	67%	0	27%	0	6%
2003	School	60	0	0%	24	40%	29	48%	7	12%
	District	1,082	0	0%	271	25%	519	48%	292	27%
	State		0	0%	0	63%	0	30%	0	7%
2004	School	57	0	0%	22	39%	28	49%	7	12%
	District	1,044	0	0%	261	25%	512	49%	271	26%
	State		0	0%	0	63%	0	30%	0	7%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

Fourth Grade Results

The percentage of fourth graders performing in the Proficient categories on the MCAS English language arts assessment fluctuated during the three years of testing: 42 percent in 2002, 19 percent in 2003 and 31 percent in 2004.

There was a steady increase in the percentage of students performing in the Warning category during the period of testing: 9 percent in 2002, 21 percent in 2003 and 25 percent in 2004. Despite this, students in grade 4 at Lawrence Family Development Charter School outperformed their peers in Lawrence Public Schools.

MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 4 English Language Arts

GRADE 4 ELA		Total n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2002	School	53	0	0%	22	42%	26	49%	5	9%
	District	1,014	10	1%	213	21%	497	49%	294	29%
	State		0	8%	0	46%	0	37%	0	10%
2003	School	57	0	0%	11	19%	34	60%	12	21%
	District	1,067	11	1%	203	19%	480	45%	373	35%
	State		0	10%	0	45%	0	34%	0	10%
2004	School	52	1	2%	15	29%	23	44%	13	25%
	District	1,043	21	2%	177	17%	490	47%	355	34%
	State		0	11%	0	45%	0	35%	0	9%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

There are very few fourth graders performing in the Advanced and Proficient categories on the MCAS mathematics assessment—6 percent in 2002, 3 percent in 2003, and 14 percent in 2004. Although there was an increase in the number of students achieving proficiency in 2004, the majority of them continue to perform in the Needs Improvement and Warning categories.

MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 4 Mathematics

GRADE 4 MATH		Total n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2002	School	53	0	0%	3	6%	32	60%	18	34%
	District	1,050	21	2%	63	6%	420	40%	546	52%
	State		0	12%	0	27%	0	42%	0	19%
2003	School	58	0	0%	2	3%	33	57%	23	40%
	District	1,082	11	1%	97	9%	411	38%	563	52%
	State		0	12%	0	28%	0	43%	0	16%
2004	School	52	2	4%	5	10%	29	56%	16	31%
	District	1,051	21	2%	95	9%	420	40%	515	49%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

Fifth Grade Results

Student performance on the 2003 and 2004 MCAS science and technology assessments remained constant, with no significant increase or decrease in the number of students performing in the Advanced and Proficient categories. Although the results were comparable to those of fifth graders in Lawrence Public Schools, they were significantly below that of the state.

**MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 5 Science & Technology**

GRADE 5 SCI & TECH		Total n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2003	School	59	0	0%	5	8%	28	47%	26	44%
	District	1,107	11	1%	77	7%	354	32%	653	59%
	State		0	18%	0	33%	0	34%	0	15%
2004	School	57	0	0%	6	11%	28	49%	23	40%
	District	1,050	11	1%	147	14%	399	38%	504	48%
	State		0	20%	0	35%	0	33%	0	13%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

Sixth Grade Results

There was significant improvement in the number of students performing in the top two categories of the MCAS mathematics assessment in 2004; that is, 23 percent, compared to 8 percent in 2002 and 9 percent in 2003. During the three-year testing period, Lawrence Family Development Charter School was successful in reducing the percentage of students performing in the Warning category between 2003 and 2004, with a reduction from 57 percent to 29 percent.

**MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 6 Mathematics**

GRADE 6 MATH		Total n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2002	School	53	1	2%	3	6%	20	38%	29	55%
	District	1,145	11	1%	103	9%	263	23%	767	67%
	State		0	13%	0	28%	0	29%	0	29%
2003	School	54	0	0%	5	9%	18	33%	31	57%
	District	1,137	23	2%	80	7%	296	26%	728	64%
	State		0	16%	0	26%	0	32%	0	26%
2004	School	52	4	8%	8	15%	25	48%	15	29%
	District	1,100	22	2%	99	9%	286	26%	704	64%
	State		0	17%	0	25%	0	32%	0	25%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

Seventh Grade Results

The percentage of seventh graders performing in the top two categories in the English Language Arts assessment fluctuated during the three years of testing from 44 percent in 2002 to 47 percent in 2003 to 32 percent in 2004. The school was successful in reducing the number of students performing in the Warning category while increasing that of the students in Needs Improvement. With the exception of 2004, seventh graders at LFDCS outperformed their peers in the local public schools.

**MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 7 English Language Arts**

GRADE 7 ELA		Total n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2002	School	34	1	3%	14	41%	10	29%	9	26%
	District	1,045	10	1%	293	28%	481	46%	261	25%
	State		0	9%	0	55%	0	28%	0	8%
2003	School	55	0	0%	26	47%	23	42%	6	11%
	District	1,143	11	1%	309	27%	549	48%	286	25%
	State		0	8%	0	57%	0	28%	0	7%
2004	School	50	0	0%	16	32%	29	58%	5	10%
	District	1,113	11	1%	401	36%	467	42%	234	21%
	State		0	9%	0	59%	0	25%	0	7%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

Eighth Grade Results

There was a dramatic decrease in the number of eighth grade students achieving proficiency in mathematics between 2002 and 2003 – from 37 percent to 9 percent. In 2004, LFDCS was able to make slight gains, with 14 percent of eighth graders performing in the Advanced and Proficient categories. Lawrence Family Development Charter School was successful in significantly decreasing the percentage of students performing in the Warning categories between 2003 and 2004 – from 63 percent to 37 percent.

MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 8 Mathematics

GRADE 8 MATH		n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2002	School	29	1	3%	10	34%	11	38%	7	24%
	District	1,007	0	0%	50	5%	242	24%	715	71%
	State		0	11%	0	23%	0	33%	0	33%
2003	School	32	0	0%	3	9%	9	28%	20	63%
	District	1,145	11	1%	92	8%	218	19%	824	72%
	State		0	12%	0	25%	0	30%	0	33%
2004	School	52	1	2%	6	12%	26	50%	19	37%
	District	1,154	23	2%	92	8%	277	24%	762	66%
	State		0	13%	0	26%	0	32%	0	29%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

The majority of eighth graders are performing in the Warning category on the MCAS science and technology assessment – 63 percent in 2003 and 81 percent in 2004. There was no improvement in the number of students scoring in the top two categories on the test.

MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Comparison of School with District and State Performance
Grade 8 Science & Technology

GRADE 8 SCI & TECH		n	A		P		NI		W	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2003	School	32	0	0%	2	6%	10	31%	20	63%
	District	1,142	0	0%	34	3%	228	20%	879	77%
	State		0	4%	0	28%	0	38%	0	30%
2004	School	52	0	0%	1	2%	9	17%	42	81%
	District	1,154	0	0%	35	3%	208	18%	912	79%
	State		0	5%	0	28%	0	35%	0	31%

N= Number of students tested A=Advanced P= Proficient NI= Needs Improvement W= Warning

2. In 2004, Lawrence Family Development Charter School made Adequate Yearly Progress in mathematics by meeting its improvement target, but failed to do so in English language arts.

Lawrence Family Development Charter School made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics but not in English language arts for Cycle III. LFDCS made AYP in mathematics by meeting its improvement targets for students in the aggregate and for statistically significant subgroups; that is, Free Lunch and Hispanic. The school, however, failed to meet either its performance or improvement targets on the English Language Arts assessment.

At the end of Cycle III, LFDCS had a composite performance index (CPI) of 70.7 for students in the aggregate for English language arts. This is below the state target of 75.6 CPI. LFDCS, therefore, received a Cycle III performance rating of “Moderate” and is identified for improvement. In mathematics, Lawrence Family Development Charter School had a CPI of 49.1, which is significantly below the state target of 60.8. The school, therefore, received a performance rating of “Very Low” and is identified for corrective action.

The Cycle III results clearly show that many students at LFDCS have not acquired the skills and knowledge necessary to meet statewide achievement targets.

**MCAS
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Cycle III 2003 & 2004 AYP Report**

English Language Arts													
Student Group	2004				Cycle III combined data for 2003 and 2004					2004			AYP 2004
	Participation				Performance			Improvement		Attendance			
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target	N	CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	159	159	100	Yes	331	70.7	No	1.5	No	96.6	-0.3	Yes	No
Lim. English Prof	56	56	-	-	72	70.5	-	-	-	96.7	-0.2	-	-
Free Lunch	119	119	100	Yes	245	70.5	No	1.1	No	96.6	-0.2	Yes	No
Hispanic	158	158	100	Yes	328	71.0	No	1.9	No	96.6	-0.7	Yes	No

Mathematics													
Student Group	2004				Cycle III combined data for 2003 and 2004					2004			AYP 2004
	Participation				Performance			Improvement		Attendance			
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target	N	CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	156	156	100	Yes	300	49.1	No	7.4	Yes	96.6	-0.3	Yes	Yes
Free Lunch	120	120	100	Yes	219	49.9	No	7.8	Yes				
Hispanic	156	156	100	Yes	299	49.2	No	7.0	Yes	96.6	-0.7	Yes	Yes

3. Overall, Lawrence Family Development Charter School’s Stanford 9 reading and mathematics scores do not show a consistent pattern of improvement across the grades.

The reading and mathematics scores for students in grades 1 through 8 at LFDCS fluctuate each year of testing. As a result, there is no consistent pattern of improvement across the grades. Students in grades 1 through 3 had the strongest performance on the reading assessment with test scores near or at the national norm. Fourth graders had similar results on the mathematics assessment. With the exception of 2000, the mathematics scores of students in grade 4 are slightly above the national norm.

**Stanford 9
Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Longitudinal Tracking of All students**

Stanford 9 Reading Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE)- All Students					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Grade 1	41.3	56.6	46.8	54.7	53.9
Grade 2	42.0	46.6	51.8	48.6	45.2
Grade 3	42.8	48.4	47.1	49.0	45.6
Grade 4	37	42.6	44.6	46.5	43.3
Grade 5	44.0	37.0	42.8	42.2	40.4
Grade 6	47.0	43.0	45.5	46.9	44.3
Grade 7	39.0	44.0	41.9	42.9	33.8
Grade 8	-	45.0	49.9	41.7	37.8

Stanford 9 Mathematics Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE)- All Students					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Grade 1	39.4	51.1	35.0	43.6	48.7
Grade 2	45.2	47.5	45.9	46.7	46.8
Grade 3	46.7	50.5	51.5	48.3	49.2
Grade 4	43.0	51.0	52.5	54.4	52.0
Grade 5	43.0	31.0	45.1	45.7	45.0
Grade 6	54.0	41.0	41.5	45.9	49.1
Grade 7	34.0	63.0	36.5	44.4	37.8
Grade 8	-	39.0	64.4	46.0	46.1

4. Lawrence Family Development Charter School has developed a comprehensive curriculum aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. However, due to the lack of a system for supervision, coaching and mentoring across all subject areas, delivery of the curriculum through effective instructional practices demonstrating high expectations for student achievement were not universally observed.

The curriculum of LFDCS has been aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and includes, in addition to English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics scope and sequence, science and social studies binders that contain interdisciplinary units and grade-by-grade alignment with standards. (These units were completed over the past two years with the expectation, according to the school's leaders, that all teachers will implement the units this year.) In mathematics, teachers use *Math Investigations* in grades K-5 and the *Connected Math Program* in grades 6-8. In reading, the Harcourt *Trophies* series is used both in English and Spanish. K-2 Spanish teachers use their own curriculum, which parallels the English curriculum, to develop Spanish literacy through phonics, decoding, vocabulary building and reading. Starting in grade 3, teachers use the Spanish *Trophies*, which is not a translation of the English version but contains its own authentic literature. The daily teaching of Spanish language and literature, including grammar and writing through all grades, is a unique feature of the curriculum at LFDCS. It enables students to develop parallel competencies in Spanish and ELA, and is valued by all stakeholders. The practice of looping (where teachers have students for two years: grades 1-2; 3-4; 5-6; and 7-8) also helps to ensure that teachers are familiar with the continuity of the curriculum, particularly with respect to the needs and accomplishments of their students. Teachers did, however, express a desire for opportunities for vertical planning across grade levels.

Members of the Team conducted 46 classroom observations. Since the goal was to observe ELA and math at all grade levels, this resulted in some overlap where certain teachers were observed twice. Classes in social studies and science were also observed. Of the 46 observations, 21 (45.7 percent) were rated strong; 18 (39.1 percent) were rated adequate; and 7 (15.2 percent) were considered weak. A larger number of strong lessons were observed in the lower school than in the upper school.

In the most highly rated lessons, members of the Team observed the following features: a high degree of student engagement; posting of objectives and standards; high expectations for good student behavior; use of manipulatives such as cuisenaire rods and number charts in math and hands-on experimental materials in science; effective use of wait time; and, a balance of teacher directed instruction, teacher modeling and group work. In the weaker lessons, the Team noted a lack of clear directions and teacher modeling; pacing that was not matched to student attainment; lack of accommodations to support all learners through differentiated instruction and learning centers; lack of challenging content; and, low expectations for student learning, particularly in cases where students could benefit from a more challenging curriculum.

From observations, the Team concluded that teaching is not consistently strong. From the information gained in interviews with staff and administration, the Team learned that there is no history or culture of strong and systematic supervision at the school in the form of practices such as mentoring, peer coaching or regular classroom visits and feedback by the school's leaders.

Support for teaching is wanted and needed but has not been available or sufficient to meet needs. High staff turnover results in the need to continually orient new teachers to the school's curriculum but this cannot be accomplished with the limited amount of supervision generally provided.

Teachers have two-and-a-half hours per week to plan together by grade level. Teachers reported that these meetings include the special education inclusion teacher for the grade, the Title I teacher, the math coach and, occasionally, administrators. The common planning time creates the opportunity to plan interdisciplinary work and, in some cases, helps to ensure consistent delivery of the curriculum by teachers addressing the same subject at the same grade level. For example, the social studies and English teachers recently worked together to implement a unit on the national elections. The ELA and math teachers are working on similar standards for written responses.

In an attempt to monitor instruction, school leaders created a new template for school-wide lesson plans that contain objectives and standards. Upcoming weekly lesson plans are submitted to the heads of school via e-mail each Friday and are returned to teachers with feedback from administrators. While LFDCS always had a policy that required the weekly submittal of lesson plans to school administrators, it was not standard practice across the school. This is the first year that school administrators have systematically collected, reviewed and returned lesson plans with feedback to teachers. This information was confirmed in interviews with teachers and administrators; the Team reviewed several lesson plans that had been submitted and returned with feedback. Teachers work together during the weekly two-and-a-half-hour common planning block to develop lesson plans. Most teachers had standards and/or objectives posted in class and the majority were seen to be teaching to the Frameworks.

In interviews, teachers indicated that they do not receive the feedback about their instruction that they need to make them more effective in the classroom or to simply validate their efforts. This is particularly important, especially since several teachers at the school have had no prior teaching experience. The math coach did receive praise from several teachers for her role in supporting math instruction and advocating on teachers' behalf. This coach was brought on board as part of the school's effort to address its corrective action plan in mathematics. The math coach is charged with facilitating implementation of the math curriculum materials, providing instructional guidance to teachers and supporting improvement in MCAS scores. In addition to the math coach, the school hired that a Reading First Coordinator who provides teachers support in literacy instruction by modeling lessons and helping with testing.

Aside from MCAS scores that are analyzed and presented to the school by Community Partners, Inc. (CPI) and Reading First program assessments (GRADE and DIBLES), the teachers do not appear to systematically use other assessments to inform their instruction. Teachers interviewed mentioned other assessments used such as unit tests, journals, running records and writing samples. The school also administers the MELA-O to determine English language proficiency for students whose first language is not English. Evidence from teacher interviews revealed that the degree to which assessments inform instruction varies greatly from teacher to teacher. Some teachers will use assessment data for placement in and out of reading groups while others will use it to target instruction toward specific student weaknesses. Even the use of MCAS binders

provided by CPI varies from teacher to teacher. Some use it to address standards in which students were deficient, while others hardly use it due to the volume of information and their difficulty in managing or understanding it. In general, upper school teachers (more than lower school teachers) felt that the binders were useful.

Teachers informed the Team that cumulative folders are kept for each student. Teachers complete them at the end of the year and pass them on with the student to the next teacher. Third grade teachers reported that the box with the cumulative folders for incoming students from the second grade was misplaced. According to them, they could not plan effectively at the start of the school year because, without the cumulative folders, they did not know what the learning needs of their prospective students were. When the folders are received, teachers reported that they are very helpful.

Teachers use rubrics to evaluate projects; students reported in interviews that they find rubrics helpful to know what is expected of them. Report cards are geared to the language of the MCAS: student grades are advanced, proficient, needs improvement or warning. In the upper grades, numeric grade averages are also given for each subject area. Some teachers indicated that the report cards are not completely effective and that they are in the process of being revised. An examination of student report card grades show that they are a composite of student effort, homework, class work, quizzes and projects.

RENEWAL QUESTION 2: IS THE SCHOOL A VIABLE ORGANIZATION?

1. Although school leaders have unflinchingly championed the mission to attract families as partners in education, they do not have a history of providing strong instructional supervision and evaluation.

At the time of the visit, the school's leadership was in transition. The leadership team at Lawrence Family Development Charter School consists of the superintendent (who has been with the school since its founding); the interim principal (the fourth person to hold this position since the school opened in 1995); the head of lower school (who has been working in the school since it opened); and the new head of upper school (the fifth one since the school's founding). The school is currently conducting a search for a new principal.

Until this year, the principal was instructional leader and solely responsible for the supervision and evaluation of teachers. The heads of school focused primarily on operations and student discipline. A review of school documents and staff interviews revealed that there was not sufficient instructional support on the part of the previous principal who had difficulty meeting the supervisory needs of teachers at the two sites. This year, the interim principal has attempted to develop increased accountability by mandating the weekly submission of lesson plans either to her or the heads of school for feedback. This is accomplished through e-mail. Some teachers felt that face-to-face conversation would be more helpful for communication, but others praised the e-mailed feedback. In addition, the task of teacher observation and supervision has now been assigned to the heads of the lower and upper school. Despite this, teachers reported that instructional support is not sufficient and most have not yet been formally observed this year.

They also mentioned that, although the heads of school have been in classrooms for short visits, they do not always receive feedback about the lessons that were observed. (According to school leaders, formal teacher evaluation will take place in January 2005). Teachers stated clearly that they have not changed their instructional practice as a result of the feedback they receive from school administrators. Some teachers reported that they would like to participate in peer observations, but it is challenging to schedule such opportunities due to limited classroom coverage.

The new head of the upper school worked as a public school principal before joining the staff at LFDCS. According to teachers, since his arrival, he has been successful in tightening up management of student behavior and improving the climate in the upper school. He has also facilitated a more effective schedule and is reviewing and providing feedback on lesson plans. He rearranged classrooms so that teachers with common disciplines are now located near each other. One of his next tasks will be to provide strong instructional supervision and evaluation of teachers. The head of the lower school has been a constant presence since the school's founding. Although she lacks credentials in education, she has a graduate degree in human services administration and is attempting to take the necessary courses to meet the challenges of her new role as a supervisor of classroom instruction. School leaders reported that they are aware that consistent and quality staff supervision is an area that needs to be addressed in the school and that they are taking steps to address it.

The administrative team meets regularly. The Team survey of agenda topics for the fall of 2004 noted the following: assessment program; curriculum overview; progress reports; budget; and SPED compliance. The topic of instructional supervision (including coaching and mentoring) did not appear. Teachers informed the Team that in previous years they were not required to create agendas for team meetings. They now have to do so as a result of a recent school-wide policy.

Another issue that school leaders have not addressed in an effective way is the high turnover of teachers. Although salary was mentioned as one consideration by teachers, school leaders and the Board, some interviewees felt that the lack of effective supervision was another issue that has impacted high teacher turnover. Others mentioned the "extra work" that teachers have to do (such as portfolios and write-ups of student performance for report cards) as contributing to the staff turnover rate. The Team learned that there is no effective system for supporting new teachers. Although new teachers are required to participate in trainings prior to the start of the school year, many reported that the trainings are not **sufficient** to enable them to acquire the skills necessary to effectively implement school-wide policies and daily classroom management. Furthermore, the lack of a systematic process for monitoring the implementation of staff training in the classroom makes it difficult for some of them to be truly effective with students. For example, some teachers reported that they do not think there is enough training for the implementation of the grades 5-8 curriculum. As noted earlier in this report, some teachers – especially those who are new – struggle with using student performance data, such as those found in the MCAS binder, to inform their instructional practices.

With respect to teacher evaluation and supervision, the Board reported that it is aware that these important tasks were not sufficiently accomplished in the past. According to them, they learned about this deficiency from consultants and during the exit interviews they conducted with representative staff who left the school. One Board member described this situation as “alarming.” They mentioned that there is a mandate to the superintendent and interim principal advising them to make sure that ongoing teacher supervision and evaluation is implemented through the systematic inspection of lesson plans and classroom observations.

2. The school’s financial systems and procedures appear sound, but gaps in other key management, decision-making and communication practices negatively impact the success of the school.

Lawrence Family Development Charter School has a history of sound fiscal management and clean audits. The Board meets regularly to consider fiscal and policy issues to ensure that the goals of the charter are met and approves all new hires, including consultants. The Board reported that it evaluates the superintendent’s work every three years, based on defined performance goals. According to the Board, it monitors the progress of the school by receiving regular curriculum updates at each meeting and by reviewing scores, audit reports and the capital improvement plan.

A full-time director of development is responsible for implementing and maintaining a resource development program, which includes state and federal entitlement and competitive grants, foundation grants and cultivation and solicitation of funds from corporate and individual donors. These funds have steadily increased each year from \$846,443 in 2000 to \$1,443,041 in 2004. Planning for a new building is underway; this includes arrangements for a six million dollar bond. As of June 2003, more than \$800,000 was put in reserve to help cover the cost of the new facility. School leaders reported that they expect enrollment to increase once the new building is completed.

The Team concluded that the following systems are not well implemented at LFDCS. School leaders at LFDCS have made a substantial investment in professional development by providing teachers with six days of training during the summer and three days during the school year. In addition, teachers may receive a stipend of up to \$500 to enroll in a course or workshop of their choosing. The school, however, failed to develop a system that would allow school administrators to monitor the impact of all this professional development on classroom instruction and student outcomes.

Although the superintendent evaluates the principal who, in turn, evaluates the heads of school, it is not clear that they consistently use the Administrator Evaluation Instrument that had been developed to help them with this process. The head of lower school has been evaluated only twice in the past four years. As noted earlier, the Board reported that it evaluates the work of the superintendent every three years. The lack of systematic evaluation of school personnel (that is, teachers and administrators), has led the Team to question the school’s ability to make effective decisions about staffing and programmatic changes that would significantly improve student performance at Lawrence Family Development Charter School.

During an interview with the human resources manager, the Team found that the school does not have a systematic approach for managing personnel files. The Team was also not clear as to which criteria the school uses to select new staff. This is evident in the fact that, although the school seeks teachers who have prior teaching experience in urban settings and who are certified, this policy has not been consistently enforced. School leaders have not consistently enforced the school-wide policy that requires teachers to become certified in order to be re-hired. Currently, 20 percent of the teachers on staff are uncertified.

As a result of the last Coordinated Program Review conducted by the Massachusetts Department of Education, LFDCS was determined to not be in compliance on a number of special education procedures. The school is currently being monitored to ensure that school personnel address the following deficiencies that include, but are not limited to:

- The consistent selection of appropriate assessments;
- The prompt completion of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs);
- The creation of quarterly progress reports; and,
- The scheduling and completion of annual reviews and re-evaluations within the required timeline.

The school has hired a new special education director to help them address each of these areas and to bring the school into compliance with the special education law.

3. The school's commitment to parents and family has created a climate of mutual respect, safety and celebration.

The school has a high level of parental involvement and support that has evolved, at least in part, from its commitment to preserve the Spanish language and Latino culture. The daily Spanish requirement gives children an opportunity to develop strong communication skills in Spanish as they study the language and literature. Notably, the dual language program parallels the English Language Arts program as Spanish and English teachers work together to implement the same standards and learning objectives during the weekly common planning time. The students reported that they are glad they are learning Spanish and the parents are proud that the children are continuing their heritage. They believe that this helps to foster students' self-esteem. In interviews, parents praised the teachers for contacting them when anything important comes up concerning their children and they are pleased with the school's open door policy. Ninety-five percent of the parents come to school to receive and discuss student report cards.

Parents play an active role in the school. They participate as staff and volunteers and were members of the original founding group from the Lawrence Youth Commission. There is a parent-led majority on the Board and strong parental participation on the School Site Council. Parent Center workshops occur on a regular basis. For example, the workshop scheduled for November is *How to Help Your Child Do Well in School*. In December the topic is *Discipline: What Works?* There is a regular schedule for day and evening English classes at the Parent Center and are very well attended. Parents enjoy and welcome holiday celebrations and special events such as Grandparents Appreciation Day. The parent coordinator is responsible for organizing parent programming.

Student successes are celebrated. In particular, the high rate of student acceptance to competitive private high schools that include Phillips Exeter, Andover and Brooks academies is a source of great pride for the school community. Graduates are followed on a regular basis and the rate of high school graduation far exceeds that of the Lawrence Public Schools. A placement counselor works with eighth grade students to help them with their applications to high schools.

According to students and staff, there is a lot more school spirit this year than last. Upper school students reported that there are opportunities for recognition and rewards from the principal. One example mentioned is an ice cream party. After-school programs and the school's community service requirement give students the chance to demonstrate a sense of responsibility.

RENEWAL QUESTION 3: IS THE SCHOOL FAITHFUL TO THE TERMS OF THE CHARTER?

- 1. Since the school's founding, a shared understanding of its mission has created a strong culture and community that is embraced by students, families, staff, Board and many in the wider community. A powerful focus on the mission has been sustained and has driven decisions as the program developed and expanded.**

The school's mission is:

Strong families, working in partnership with the school as advocates for academic achievement, will create an environment where every child has the opportunity to acquire the foundation skills and habits of mind that foster life-long learning, citizenship participation, and personal fulfillment.

The school's mission was strongly articulated by all those interviewed, with the oft-repeated phrase that "the school is family." Parents, who comprised most of the school's founding group, are always welcome in the building; some work at the school. The school's receptionist has been told to greet each parent as though s/he is the "President of the United States." Many see the school as a second home and the Team saw evidence of parents in daily attendance at English classes in the family center and volunteering in classrooms. A training program has been established to teach parents to be aides and substitutes in the classroom, thus adding to their sense of empowerment.

In interviews, students reported that LFDCS helps them to develop as learners. Seventh and eighth grade students felt that the class work was "just right" but maybe "a little hard." Younger students interviewed thought the work was easy. One eighth grade student said, "I never thought that I could learn algebra!" Seventh grade students reported that they enjoyed conducting interviews of their parents, particularly concerning their lives in their home countries and their immigration to the United States. They enjoy learning about famous Hispanic Americans, which makes them proud of their bilingual skills and cultural heritage. Students noted the family feeling at the school, enjoy their friendships and are proud of their accomplishments. They also like the school's policy of requiring them to wear uniforms.

Services to ensure that individual student needs are met include special education and Title I. LFDCS primarily uses an inclusion model for delivering services, although there is some pullout for strategies such as Wilson reading. The school has a Student Support Center for students with behavioral modifications goals in their Individual Education Plan (IEP). Approximately 60 students have IEP's for instruction or 504 accommodations. Students with limited English proficiency are tested annually as outlined by state requirements. Currently 119 LEP students are receiving additional support in small-group pullout classes. After-school tutoring and homework assistance is available for all students. Students told members of the Team that there are ample opportunities for academic assistance either during or after school from teachers or the classroom assistants. The physical and emotional safety of youngsters at the school was communicated to the Team during the interviews of both parents and students.

Students' successes are celebrated, including the admission of graduates to selective private schools, and their progress is tracked by the Superintendent through the high school years and into college, which students from the first graduating class are attending this year. The school's mission has been a driving force since its founding and has transformed the lives of students, parents, aides, teachers and Board members. During the Team's visit, the Mayor of Lawrence was in the building to read to youngsters and, in discussion with Team members, he acknowledged that the school is well regarded and makes a significant contribution to education in the community.

2. Lawrence Family Development Charter School has substantially met the student performance objectives established in its Accountability Plan.

The student performance objectives were not quantified in the 2000-2005 Accountability Plan but were broad in scope as the school tried to capture the essence of what it was attempting to achieve. However, it should be reiterated that from the data charts above, it is clear that students at LFDCS are still not meeting statewide benchmarks in mathematics and English Language Arts and have not demonstrated consistent progress on the SAT9.

In order to meet its first student performance objective that states, "*Students will demonstrate competence in challenging subject matter in mixed ability groups in all areas of the curriculum which has been aligned with Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks throughout subject areas and grade level,*" the school did the following:

- Assessed students according to Benchmark folders in ELA, math, science and social studies;
- Adopted a looping policy of multi-grade teaching assignments;
- Required attendance at a six-week summer session for students reading more than one grade below their level;
- Opened a K-1 transition class for students who had completed kindergarten but were deemed, based on assessments, not to be ready for first grade; and,
- Introduced public evaluation of student work (such as the eighth grade portfolios) as part of its assessment process.

To help students “*achieve fluency in English and Spanish, demonstrating use of bilingual skills in all areas of language arts,*” LFDCS did the following:

- Held students to the same proficiency standards in English and Spanish;
- Provided teaching materials, library books and computer programs in both languages;
- Required native language fluency for teachers of English and Spanish;
- Increased its staffing of Spanish teachers from two to four; and,
- Monitored the needs of limited English proficient students through administration of the MELA-O assessment by a certified ESL teacher and appropriate language instruction.

The third student performance objective was:

Students will demonstrate respect for each other, for staff, and for members of the community as an integral part of valuing education and developing personal discipline and the responsibilities for citizenship.

The school accomplished the following strategies for attainment:

- Students participate in community service projects, such as tutoring or reading to other children; Thanksgiving food drive; neighborhood cleanup; cafeteria cleanup; Book Fair.
- Annual review of the Discipline Code.
- Student Support Centers to provide in-school academic settings for students with behavioral issues.
- A full-time school counselor works with groups of students on issues of respect, responsibility, goal setting and self-control, and also provides information to parents about community counseling services.

The fourth student performance objective was:

The school will provide opportunities for learning and cultural enrichment beyond the basic academic curriculum to expand the experiences of our students and to awaken the genius of creativity.

The school accomplished the following strategies for attainment:

- Many students participate in daily after-school programming that includes tutoring, clubs, sports, scouting, computers and community service.
- The school has developed partnerships with area colleges (Merrimack and Northern Essex Community College) for advanced science work for students.
- The school conducts an annual summer program of academic and enrichment opportunities for at-risk students.
- The school partners with Phillips Academy for student music lessons and with the Pingree School in which high achieving seventh grade students participate in a summer prep program.
- A summer pre-kindergarten readiness experience is provided for youngsters who will be entering the school in September.

2. LFDCS has exceeded its defined school performance goals in terms of services and opportunities for students, family and staff – both within the school and the larger community.

Lawrence Family Development Charter School successfully achieved its three school performance goals by instituting a variety of strategies designed to make the school a more viable organization. For example, school leaders achieved the first school performance target that states, “*The teaching and administrative staff will generate and evaluate curricula and assessment tools, and participate in professional activities to enhance their skills,*” by:

- Conducting an extensive curriculum realignment project that involved all teachers who now use this curriculum to implement unit and lesson plans.
- Getting staff to participate in nine days of school-based staff development during the summer and school year. Each teacher is also given reimbursement for up to 75 percent of the state higher education rate for individually selected graduate or undergraduate level courses. They may also attend relevant outside workshops and trainings.
- Establishing procedures and rubrics to standardize the implementation of portfolio assessment throughout the school.

The school, however, did not accomplish the following: school principal will meet regularly with grade level staff to assess student progress and to monitor the use of the Benchmarks; and teachers receiving evaluations throughout the year by the comprehensive evaluation team (comprised of the principal, the school counselor, the Special Education administrator and/or a peer evaluator) to ensure that daily, term and annual plans and teaching are directed toward the more rigorous standards for the benchmarks.

3. Lawrence Family Development Charter School has contributed to the charter school initiative in Massachusetts through dissemination activities such as developing publications, facilitating a daylong conference and creating a website.

There is no doubt that the LFDCS has carried out its responsibilities to conduct dissemination activities. Funded by a grant from the Massachusetts Charter School Office, the school (in 2003-2004) published an attractive 120-page manual entitled *The Many Faces of Parent Involvement*. This publication includes articles about parent involvement activities that can be replicated in other settings, and which are being used at six Massachusetts charter schools. The manual was featured and disseminated at a day-long statewide conference in Worcester that was attended by approximately 100 teachers, administrators and parents from district and charter schools. The six schools whose activities were highlighted in the manual provided breakout sessions for attendees. Keynote speakers also presented information on parental involvement.

Another publication, *Cornerstones for Success: Lawrence Family Development Charter School* was published and disseminated in 2002 both in hard copy and electronically. The school’s annual report also gets wide distribution.

Although the school's website is still partially under construction, some sections – including the “Cornerstones for Success,” consisting of descriptions of the academic program, family resources, leadership, community partnerships and parent partners – are complete. There is also a downloadable copy of *The Many Faces of Parent Involvement* and a complete description of the application and admissions process, including the lottery.

QUESTION 4: IF THE SCHOOL'S CHARTER IS RENEWED, WHAT ARE ITS PLANS FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS?

1. Measurable, credible and realistic goals have been set for student achievement, organizational viability and the unique features of the school's mission in the 2005-2010 Accountability Plan.

The five academic goals outlined in the 2005-2010 Accountability Plan have objective measures that are rigorous, based on clear data and have realistic targets. This is in sharp contrast with the 2000-2005 Accountability Plan, in which there were no objective measures of attainment. In particular, the academic program goals contain measurable outcomes primarily focused on improving MCAS achievement in English Language Arts, mathematics, science and technology, and history and social science. For each of the language arts, mathematics and science and technology goals, there is an MCAS objective for increasing advanced and proficient status for each year until 2010. For the language arts and mathematics goals, there are also AYP objectives. There are no academic program goals for Spanish.

Other objectives for the stated goals pertain to objective measures on internal assessments such as essays (fourth grade); persuasive essays (seventh grade); benchmark indicators on the DIBELS assessment (grades K-3); and, oral presentations in eighth grade.

There are five organizational viability goals in the newly proposed Accountability Plan. The measures for the first goal are average daily attendance rates of at least 95 percent and enforcement of policies to eliminate unexcused absences, so that at least 95 percent of students have attendance of 95 percent or better. According to the 2003-2004 Annual Report, K-8 attendance was 96.5 percent, exceeding the measure. Given the strong attendance figures, however, this is an attainable measure for LFDCS.

The second organizational goal states that, “*LFDCS will provide highly qualified educators at every level committed to a culture of high expectations for self and student achievement.*”

The school's measure of attainment is that 100 percent of all teachers will meet the federal definition of highly qualified staff. Based on the 2004-2005 staff profile presented by the school, 48 of 50 teachers and counselors (96 percent) are highly qualified according to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) guidelines. The 2003-2004 Annual Report indicates that 80 percent of teachers are certified. This figure may have changed since the Annual Report was written, due to staff changes for the 2004-2005 school year. The school does have an expectation that teachers become certified in order to be rehired, but this policy has not been strictly enforced to date.

With respect to a culture of high expectations for self and student achievement, the school has room for progress. The President of the Board expressed his belief that all students can achieve a quality education and achieve the goals of the curriculum, with no excuses about students'

homes and backgrounds. In interviews, however, some teachers did voice negative stereotypes that show limited expectations for Latino students from high poverty homes.

The next three goals – sound financial management, involving parents, and admission to high school for graduates – have been achieved during the current charter period and are indicative of some of the present strengths of the school. Financially, the school has had clean audits and is operating with a surplus that it hopes to use, along with other funds, to help achieve the goal of creating a new facility that will house the upper and lower schools at one site. The measures for parental involvement include twice annual parent-teacher meetings (85 percent attendance); response to a parent satisfaction survey (90 percent favorable); and parent participation in school-sponsored parent trainings (85 percent participation). Although 97 percent of parents responded favorably to a 2003 parent satisfaction survey, the other goals have not yet been measured but are well within the school’s reach, given the strong commitment on the part of parents. The measure for admission to high school is that at least 50 percent of all graduates will apply to selective high schools and one third will be accepted. This is a new measure for the school and one that is attainable based on past acceptance and the strong role of the school’s placement counselor.

2. Although the school is financially sound with plans in place for a new building, leadership, supervision and personnel issues need to be carefully addressed to ensure that the school achieves the goals of the 2005-2010 Accountability Plan.

As noted earlier in the report, LFDSC is financially solvent and has the capacity to raise the funds necessary to cover the cost of its academic programs as well as the other areas of need, such as the building of a new facility.

School leaders’ failure to systematically conduct performance evaluation of teachers and administrators might impact the school’s ability to significantly raise student performance. The lack of consistent performance evaluation makes it difficult for school administrators to assess the quality of classroom instruction and its impact on student learning. Despite this, there is evidence of best practices being implemented in the school. It is not clear, however, if the principal and heads of school have a process in place to build on these best practices as a way of strengthening the school’s instructional program.

At the end of its second charter, LFDSC is still faced with the challenge of recruiting and retaining effective staff. This is important due to chronic attitudes and perceptions of some teachers that students’ language, family background and culture are barriers to high achievement and sometimes result in low expectations and, consequently, low achievement for students.

In general, it is the opinion of the Team that Lawrence Family Development Charter School has sufficient financial and human resources to support its mission and achieve its goal to “create an environment where every child has the opportunity to acquire the foundation skills and habits of mind that foster life-long learning, citizenship participation, and personal fulfillment.” The intentional creation of a climate of high expectation and effective instructional leadership are key ingredients for success during the next charter period.

APPENDIX A: SCHEDULE OF THE RENEWAL INSPECTION VISIT

**Lawrence Family Development Charter School
Renewal Inspection Schedule
Team Schedule November 15-18, 2004**

DAY1 Monday, November 15, 2004

	Team Member A (K-2)	Team Member B (3-4)	Team Member C (7-8)	Team Member D (5-6)
12:00	Hotel Check In			
12:00-2:30	Team meeting, introductions, overview of process, tasks			
3:00-4:00	Team Meets with School Leaders – School Presentation (at school)			
4:00-6:00	Initial Team Meeting at School, (Team Workroom)			
6:00	Team Dinner			

DAY 2 Tuesday, November 16, 2004

	Team Member A (K-2)	Team Member B (3-4)	Team Member C (7-8)	Team Member D (5-6)
7:00-7:30	Document Review	Feedback to School Leaders	Feedback to School Leaders	Document Review
7:30-8:00	Interview Comptroller	Document Review	Interview Grant Writer	Interview Human Resources
8:00-8:30	Kinder Morning Mtg.	Gr. 4 ELA/Sped	Gr. 8 Spanish	Gr. 6 Math
8:30-9:00	Gr. 2 ELA	Gr. 3 Reading	Gr. 7 English	Gr. 5 ELA
9:00-9:30	Gr. 1 Math/Sped	Gr. 4 Math	Gr. 8 Social Studies	Gr. 5 ELA
9:30-10:00	Gr. 2 ELA	Gr. 3 ELA	SPED Pull out Upper School	Gr. 6 Math/Title I
10:00-10:30	Teacher Interview Gr. K-4		FLOAT	Gr. 5 Math
10:30-11:00			Gr. 7 Social Studies	Gr. 5 Math
11:00-11:30	Document Review	Gr. 4 Math	Document Review	Gr. 5 Math
11:30-12:00	Kinder Math	FLOAT	Gr. 4 Math	Interview Placement Counselor & Student Support Teacher
12:00-1:00	TEAM LUNCH DEBRIEF			
1:00-1:30	Gr. 1 ELA	Gr. 3 Math	Gr. 7 Math	Teacher Interview Gr. 5 & 6 (1:00-2:00)
1:30-2:00	Gr. 1 Reading Groups	Special Education Focus Group (1:30- 2:30)	Student Focus Group (1:30-2:15) Gr. 7 & 8	
2:00-2:30	K-1 Social Studies			FLOAT
2:30-3:00	Document Review	Interview: Lower School Aids	Interview Consultants & Volunteers	Document Review
3:00-3:30	FLOAT	Interview Spanish Teachers	Interview Director of Community Partners—DATA Training	Interview City CORE
3:30-6:00	Team Moderation Session			
6:00	Team Dinner			

DAY 3 Wednesday, November 17, 2004

	Team Member A (K-2)	Team Member B (3-4)	Team Member C (7-8)	Team Member D (5-6)
7:00-7:30	Document Review	Feedback to School Leaders	Document Review	Feedback to School Leaders
7:30-8:00	Document Review	Document Review	Document Review	Interview Reading First Coordinator & Teachers
8:00-8:30	Kinder Circle Time	Gr. 3 Lang. Arts/Sped	Gr. 8 Science	Gr. 6 Math
8:30-9:00	Gr. 2 Math	Gr. 4 Lang. Arts	Gr. 8 English	Gr. 5 ELA
9:00-9:30	Gr. 2 Math	Interview Phys Ed., Art, Computer teachers/aide	FLOAT	Document Review
9:30-10:00	Gr. 1 Reading/Phonics	Gr. 4 ELA	Interview ESL Coordinator	Gr. 6 Math
10:00-10:30	Teacher Interview Gr. K-4		Gr. 8 Math	Gr. 6 ELA
10:30-11:00			Gr. 7 Spanish	Gr. 6 ELA
11:00-11:30	Document Review	Gr. 3 Math	Interview Title I Teachers	Gr. 6 ELA
11:30-12:00	Gr. 1 Math	Document Review	Gr. 1 Math	Interview After School Director
12:00-1:00	TEAM LUNCH DEBRIEF			
1:00-1:30	Gr. 2 Math	Gr. 3 Math		Student Focus Group Gr. 5 & 6
1:30-2:00	Gr. 2 ELA	Interview Parent Coordinator Support Ctr. Teacher School Receptionist	Teacher Interview Gr. 7 & 8 (1:30-2:30)	
2:00-2:30	Student Focus Group Gr. 2 , 3 & 4 (2:00-2:45)			
2:30-3:00				
3:00-3:30				
3:30-6:00	Team Moderation Session			
6:00	Team Dinner			

DAY 4 Thursday, November 18, 2004

	Team Member A (K-2)	Team Member B (3-4)	Team Member C (7-8)	Team Member D (5-6)
7:00-7:30	Feedback to School Leaders	Feedback to School Leaders	Document Review	Document Review
7:30-8:30	BOARD INTERVIEW Team Workroom			
8:30-9:00	Team Deliberations			
9:00-10:00				
10:00-11:00				
11:00-12:00				
12:00-1:00				
12:00-1:00	Parent Focus Group (two parent focus groups: one Spanish, one English @ 10 parents each)			
1:00-4:00	Team Moderation			
4:00 (APPROX)	Oral Presentation of Findings to School Leaders			
5:00	Team debrief, evaluations, departure			