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## I. Sources of Evidence for this Document

The charter school regulations state that “[t]he decision by the Board [of Elementary and Secondary Education] to renew a charter shall be based upon the presentation of affirmative evidence regarding the success of the school’s academic program; the viability of the school as an organization; and the faithfulness of the school to the terms of its charter” 603 CMR 1.12. Consistent with the regulations, recommendations regarding renewal are based upon the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s (Department) evaluation of the school’s performance in these areas. In its review, the Department has considered both the school’s absolute performance at the time of the application for renewal and the progress the school has made during the first four years of its charter. Performance is evaluated against both the [Massachusetts Charter School Common School Performance Criteria](http://www.doe.mass.edu/charter/acct.html?section=criteria) and the school’s accountability plan. The evaluation of the school has included a review of the following sources of evidence, all of which are available from the Charter School Office:

* the application for renewal submitted by the school,
* the school’s annual reports for the term of the charter,
* site visit reports generated by the Charter School Office in the second, third, and fourth years of the school’s charter,
* independent financial audits,
* coordinated program review reports,
* the year five renewal inspection report and federal programs renewal inspection report, and
* other documentation, including amendments to the school’s charter.

The following sections present a summary from all of these sources regarding the “school’s progress and success in raising student achievement, establishing a viable organization, and fulfilling the terms of its charter” (603 CMR 1.05).

## II. Summary of Findings

Listed below are the findings contained in the review of the school’s performance in the three areas of accountability. Further evidence to support each finding can be found in the body of the report.

**A. Faithfulness to Charter Findings**

*LCCPS has consistently implemented the cultural aspects of its mission.*

*LCCPS has not operated in a manner consistent with its mission of achieving high levels of academic achievement for it students.*

*Most administrative systems and structures continue to be under development.*

**B. Academic Program Findings**

*MCAS performance has been low over the term of the charter, with 67 percent of students failing to reach proficiency in ELA and 74 percent failing to reach proficiency in mathematics in 2009.*

*In 2009, LCCPS has an NCLB status of Restructuring Year 1 for subgroups in ELA, and Corrective Action for subgroups in mathematics.*

*LCCPS uses a number of standardized assessments to gather baseline data on students, to evaluate student progress, and to group students for instruction.*

*LCCPS uses commercially produced curricula that are aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for all of its core subject areas.*

*Special education services are largely delivered through a co-teaching inclusion model.*

*The school uses its Title I funds to provide academic support to students.*

*English language development classes for English language learners are appropriate and effective. Additional staff training is needed in the area of providing sheltered English instruction.*

*A curriculum mapping project, launched during the 2006-07 school year, is still a work in progress.*

*This year, LCCPS has formalized its lesson planning document. Teachers are required to develop and submit standardized weekly lesson plans.*

*Data is used to identify students who need academic support, but LCCPS has not developed a comprehensive system for analyzing and utilizing assessment data. This year, the school has implemented a data resource center.*

*LCCPS lacks a school-wide system for evaluating the curriculum. Curriculum planning, modification, development, and evaluation are done informally.*

*The school has not implemented a systematic, school-wide response to low MCAS performance.*

*Visiting teams have observed that the classroom and school environment at LCCPS is calm, safe, and orderly. Over the term of the charter, administrators and teachers have intermittently reported that there are issues concerning student behavior.*

*Over the term of the charter, the predominant form of observed instruction has shifted towards whole class, teacher directed instruction combined with by independent or paired practice.*

*Site visit teams and the renewal inspection team have observed that instruction has been mixed with respect to the quality of the delivery and content.*

*The principal and assistant principals supervise and evaluate teachers. Teachers are measured against goals that they set at the beginning of each school year.*

*Teachers receive some support from their peers, but formal mentoring has been discontinued. A newly hired mathematics coach provides assistance in this area.*

**C. Organizational Viability Findings**

*LCCPS has an effective financial management and budget development system in place. The school hired a new controller in the spring of 2008 to help manage the finances at the school. LCCPS has not developed a long-range financial plan.*

*The board has worked towards achieving an appropriate level of oversight over the term of the charter.*

*The board closely monitors financial and operational issues, but is less engaged in oversight of academic progress.*

*The school did not renew sixteen teachers’ contracts for the 2009-10 school year because the teachers were not highly qualified under NCLB.*

*The school had significant turnover in leadership prior to the 2008-09 school year, but maintained continuity between 2008-09 and 2009-10. A new CEO is expected to be hired in the fall of 2009.*

*Over the term of the charter, LCCPS has put into place and dismantled various systems for academic planning. Conditions to support academic planning have been put into place this year, but effective academic planning has not yet begun.*

*Parents and students interviewed by site visitors and the renewal inspection team have been very satisfied with the school’s program. A recent parent survey, completed by 148 parents, indicated that parents were satisfied with the school’s academic performance and would recommend the school to others.*

*LCCPS is a physically safe environment. The school has established clear, anti-harassment policies, and has encouraged a supportive and positive school environment.*

*The LCCPS facility is adequate for delivering the school’s programs and the school uses the space efficiently. The school’s board is currently engaged in negotiations to finalize the purchase of a new building.*

*LCCPS has not disseminated any models for replication to other schools. It has established a relationship with one school within the Lowell public schools.*

*LCCPS is in compliance with the requirements of the Coordinated Program Review.*

**D. Accountability Plan Objectives and Measures**

*LCCPS has met three, has made some progress towards meeting two, and has not met two of the seven measures in its accountability plan related to faithfulness to charter.*

*LCCPS has not met any of the seven measures in its accountability plan related to academic achievement.*

*LCCPS has met twelve of the measures and has not met two of the measures in its accountability plan related to organizational viability.*

## III. School Profile

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Lowell Community Charter Public School (LCCPS)* | | | |
| Type of Charter | Commonwealth | Location | Lowell |
| Regional/Non-Regional | Non-Regional | Districts in Region | NA |
| Year Opened | 2000 | Year Renewed | 2005 |
| Maximum Enrollment | 900 | Current Enrollment | 947[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| Students on Waitlist | 77 | Grades Served | K-8 |

### Mission Statement

“The purpose of the Lowell Community Charter Public School is to prepare a diverse cross section of Lowell children for success as students, citizens, and workers by providing them with a comprehensive curriculum in a supportive, challenging, multicultural learning environment. The school’s highest priority is the promotion of academic achievement for all students in each of the areas addressed by the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, including: English, reading and language arts, writing, mathematics, science, health and fitness, world languages, art, and music, as well as character and ethics. The Lowell Community Charter Public School will place special emphasis on the contributions that immigrants have made to American life and to Lowell’s development over the years, and on the culture, language, and history of the Southeast Asian and Latino peoples who comprise a substantial portion of Lowell’s present day population.

The school will actively promote the joy of discovery and creativity in the learning process, and will integrate the use of technology into aspects of instruction. The opportunity for learning will be enhanced through a longer school day and an extended year. Student achievement will be demonstrated in measurable terms to parents, students, and the community at large.”

### Major Amendments

In June 2005, shortly after the first renewal of the school’s charter, the Board of Education approved LCCPS’ request for the non-renewal of its contractual relationship with an educational management organization (Imagine Schools, formerly known as Beacon, then Chancellor-Beacon) and a change of its governance and leadership structure. This approval constituted a major amendment to the material terms of the school’s charter.

In February 2006, LCCPS requested a major amendment to its charter to expand the grade span it served from kindergarten through grade eight to kindergarten through grade twelve. The decision to grant this amendment was deferred by the Board of Education and never acted upon.

### Demographics

The following table compares demographic data of the charter school to the Lowell Public School District from which its draws most of its students, and to the state. The comparison includes 20 schools in the district with grade levels that overlap with the charter school.

* Comparison Minimum refers to the school(s) among the 20 schools with the lowest percentage of students in a given category.
* Comparison Median refers to the school(s) among the 20 schools with the middle percentage of students in a given category.
* Comparison Maximum refers to the school(s) among the 20 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 20 schools combined.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Race/Ethnicity (%)** | African American | Asian | Hispanic | White | Native American | Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander | Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic |
|  | Lowell Community Charter Public School | 13.7 | 29.5 | 41.7 | 11.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
| (20 Schools) | Comparison Minimum | 2.5 | 5.4 | 14.1 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Comparison Median | 5.6 | 24.3 | 23.9 | 41.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
| Comparison Maximum | 13.3 | 56.0 | 44.5 | 66.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 5.0 |
| Percentage of Total | 6.0 | 27.5 | 25.6 | 39.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
|  | State | 8.2 | 5.1 | 14.3 | 69.9 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Other Demographics (%)** | Males | Females | First Language Not English | Limited English Proficient | Special Education | Low-Income |
|  | Lowell Community Charter Public School | 46.6 | 53.4 | 55.7 | 25.1 | 8.7 | 76.7 |
| (20 Schools) | Comparison Minimum | 46.7 | 42.8 | 23.6 | 14.8 | 7.0 | 52.1 |
| Comparison Median | 52.3 | 47.8 | 42.2 | 30.4 | 15.6 | 70.7 |
| Comparison Maximum | 57.2 | 53.3 | 74.3 | 72.7 | 21.1 | 89.4 |
| Percentage of Total | 52.2 | 47.8 | 43.2 | 33.8 | 16.1 | 69.1 |
|  | State | 51.4 | 48.6 | 15.4 | 5.9 | 17.1 | 30.7 |

## IV. Areas of Accountability

### A. Faithfulness to Charter

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Consistency of school operations with the school’s charter and approved charter amendments**

**The school operates in a manner consistent with the mission, vision, educational philosophy and governance and leadership structure outlined in the school’s charter and approved charter amendments.**

*Finding: LCCPS has consistently implemented the cultural aspects of its mission.*

LCCPS has maintained a focus on the multicultural community that it serves. It celebrates the culture of its Latino and Cambodian students by sponsoring cultural celebrations such as the Khmer New Year and Hispanic Heritage month. All students study either Khmer or Spanish, either as a second language or to enhance their native language abilities. In addition, families are provided with a number of services such as translation of documents and on-site translators for parents. The renewal inspection team found that LCCPS also incorporates the history of the City of Lowell into the school’s program, providing instruction on the history of the mills, rivers and industrial development of the area.

*Finding: LCCPS has not operated in a manner consistent with its mission of achieving high levels of academic achievement for it students.*

LCCPS has not been successful in meeting what is described in its mission statement as its “highest priority,” the promotion of academic achievement for all students in the areas addressed by the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. As will be discussed below on page 8 of Section B, Academic Program, it has not met any of its accountability plan objectives and measures concerning academic program success, and has failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the aggregate and for all statistically significant subgroups in three of the four years of the current charter term.

*Finding: Most administrative systems and structures continue to be under development.*

In April 2007, the year seven site visit team found that LCCPS had experienced several major transitions in a short period of time. The Board and the administration described the school’s transition from working with a management company to self-management as difficult. Both groups reported that the school had to develop and implement policies and procedures for the administration of the school. The year eight site visit, conducted in February 2008, echoed the same findings, concluding that “the school’s administrative structure continues to be a work in progress.” Shortly after the year eight site visit, the school’s chief executive officer (CEO), who had been appointed in March 2006, resigned. The lower school principal resigned shortly after the departure of the CEO, and the upper school principal and special education director were not rehired for the 2008-09 school year. The chief operating officer (COO) assumed the role of interim CEO, leaving the COO role vacant.

The year nine site visit, conducted in December 2008, found that the organizational chart had been restructured to eliminate several of the top management positions and reduce the number of direct reports to the interim CEO. School leaders, teachers, and board members described the departure of the former CEO as contentious and fractious. The changes in organizational structure and personnel resulted in the need to redevelop basic systems and structures, such as a school-wide approach to discipline and behavior management, and a mechanism for curriculum development and review.

The renewal inspection team found that the administrative structure and staff established for the 2008-09 school year remained in place at the start of the 2009-10 school year while the board continued to search for a permanent CEO. Board members, teachers, and administrative team members noted that the school now had greater stability and a positive school culture. Board members stated that stability, one of their key goals for the school, had been achieved.

Board members informed the renewal inspection team that they had retained a consulting firm to assist them in hiring a new CEO and that they would be concluding their search shortly, with the expectation of bringing in a new, permanent CEO in October 2009. During the year nine site visit, the school’s board members informed site visitors that once a new CEO is hired, the administration may need to be restructured again.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Accountability plan objectives and measures**

**The school meets, or shows progress towards meeting the faithfulness to charter objectives and measures set forth in its accountability plan.**

*Finding: LCCPS has met three, has made some progress towards meeting two, and has not met two of the seven measures in its accountability plan related to faithfulness to charter.*

A charter school creates an accountability plan to set objectives in each of the three areas of charter school accountability for the charter term and to show growth through time. LCCPS has reported against an accountability plan that was approved in November 2005. The plan includes two objectives related to faithfulness to charter. The first objective concerns the school’s intention to place an academic emphasis on the culture, language, and history of the Southeast Asian and Latino peoples. There are four measures associated with this objective, all of which the school has met or partially met. The second objective concerns the school’s efforts to disseminate its best practices relative to English language learners, urban, and economically disadvantaged students and communities. There are three measures associated with this measure. The school has not met or has made minimal progress towards meeting these measures. A summary of the school’s success in meeting the objectives and measures contained in its accountability plan can be found in Section IV of this report.

### B. Academic Program

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: MCAS performance**

**Students at the school demonstrate Proficiency, or progress toward meeting proficiency targets on state standards, as measured by the Massachusetts Comprehensive Accountability System (MCAS) exams in all subject areas and at all grade levels tested for accountability purposes.**

*Finding: MCAS performance has been low over the term of the charter, with 67 percent of students failing to reach proficiency in ELA, and 74 percent failing to reach proficiency in mathematics in 2009.*

During this charter term, LCCPS students annually completed the MCAS grade three reading assessment, the grades four through eight English language arts (ELA) assessments, the grades three through eight mathematics assessments, and the grades five and eight science and technology assessments. The following analyses present MCAS performance data on the tests in reading, ELA, and mathematics utilized by the Department for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability purposes. Section V summarizes MCAS performance by grade level and provides data for tests that do not count towards AYP determinations in 2009.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Key:** N = # of students tested; CPI = Composite Performance Index | | | | | | | |
|  |  | Warning/Failing % |  | Needs Improvement % |  | Proficient % |  | Advanced/Above Prof. % |
| ^ Indicates performance above the district at a statistically significant level | | | | | | | | |
| \* Indicates performance below the district at a statistically significant level | | | | | | | | |
| Percentages without a symbol indicate no statistically significant difference between the charter school and district. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                    3 3 2 4 %  Proficient                     28 32 30 29 %  Needs Improvement 43 42 41 47 %  Failing                        27 24 26 21 N                                  394 422 446 463 CPI                                  63.8 66.9 64.5 66.6 | 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                      4 5 9 8 %  Proficient                     13 22 20 18 %  Needs Improvement 36 35 35 37 %  Failing                          47 37 36 37 N                                  397 420 448 463 CPI                                 49.4 56.5 58.9 57.1 |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | | % Proficient | 28 | 32 | 30 | 29 | | % Needs Imp. | 43 | 42 | 41 | 47 | | % Failing | 27 | 24 | 26 | 21 | | N | 394 | 422 | 446 | 463 | | CPI | 63.8\* | 66.9\* | 64.5\* | 66.6\* | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 4 | 5 | 9 | 8 | | % Proficient | 13 | 22 | 20 | 18 | | % Needs Imp. | 36 | 35 | 35 | 37 | | % Failing | 47 | 37 | 36 | 37 | | N | 397 | 420 | 448 | 463 | | CPI | 49.4 | 56.5 | 58.9 | 57.1\* | |

District comparisons

The CPI of LCCPS has been compared to that of the Lowell because LCCPS is currently in NCLB status: Restructuring Year 1 for subgroups in ELA and Corrective Action for subgroups in mathematics.

Statistical analyses, two-tailed *t* tests for the equality of means, were performed to determine if any differences in performance between LCCPS and Lowell students were statistically significant at a 95 percent confidence level. Comparisons were made only if there were at least 40 students tested in a given grade or subgroup.

* Twenty-seven grade-to-grade and aggregate comparisons were conducted in ELA and in mathematics.
  + ELA: LCCPS did not perform at a statistically significant higher level than Lowell in any instances.
    - Lowell performed at a statistically significant higher level than LCCPS in twelve instances.
    - There were no statistically significant differences in performance in the other fifteen comparisons.
  + Mathematics: LCCPS did not perform at a statistically significant higher level than Lowell in any instances.
    - Lowell performed at a statistically significant higher level than LCCPS in six instances.
    - There were no statistically significant differences in performance in the other twenty-one comparisons.
  + Section VI of this document provides detailed information.
* Forty-seven subgroup grade-to-grade and aggregate comparisons were conducted in ELA and mathematics.
  + ELA: LCCPS performed at a statistically significant higher level than Lowell in one instance. Lowell performed at a statistically significant higher level than LCCPS in fourteen instances. There were no statistically significant differences in performance in the remaining thirty-two comparisons.
  + Mathematics: LCCPS performed at a statistically significant higher level than Lowell in four instances. Lowell performed at a statistically significant higher level than LCCPS in seven instances. There were no statistically significant differences in performance in the other thirty-six comparisons.
  + Section VI of this document provides detailed information.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

**The school makes Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in the aggregate and for all statistically significant sub-groups. The school is not identified for accountability purposes (not designated as in Needs Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring).**

*Finding: In 2009, LCCPS has an NCLB status of Restructuring Year 1 for subgroups in ELA, and Corrective Action for subgroups in mathematics.*

* LCCPS did not make AYP in the aggregate in ELA in 2006, 2008, and 2009. LCCPS did not make AYP for all statistically significant subgroups in ELA in 2005-2009. The school has an NCLB status of Restructuring Year 1 for subgroups in ELA.
* LCCPS did not make AYP in the aggregate or for all statistically significant subgroups in mathematics in 2006, 2008, and 2009. The school has an NCLB status of Corrective Action for subgroups in mathematics.
* For 2009, the school’s ELA performance rating was Low, and its mathematics rating was Very Low.
* LCCPS’ ELA and mathematics improvement rating was No Change.
* The AYP summary in Section VI includes full details.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Adequate Yearly Progress History** | | | | | | | | | | | **NCLB Accountability Status** |
|  | | **2001** | **2002** | **2003** | **2004** | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** |
| **ELA** | **Aggregate** | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Restructuring Year 1 - Subgroups |
| **All Subgroups** | - | - | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| **MATH** | **Aggregate** | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Corrective Action - Subgroups |
| **All Subgroups** | - | - | No | - | No | No | Yes | No | No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting state targets LCCPS’ performance on ELA exams between 2006 and 2009 was below state CPI performance targets each year.  *Meeting school improvement targets*  LCCPS did not meet its own improvement targets in ELA in any year between 2006 and 2009, except 2007. | Year   State Math    Charter Math  Charter Math            Perf Targets    Annual CPI Gain    Targets 2004 75.6             70.4  2005 80.5              64.2 74.3 2006 80.5               63.8 76.3 2007 85.4               66.9 68.4 2008 85.4               64.5 71.6 2009 90.2              66.6 70.4 2010 90.2               76.3 2011 95.1               82.3 2012 95.1                88.2 2013 100.0               94.1 2014 100.0               100.0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting state targets LCCPS performance on math exams between 2006 and 2009 was below state CPI performance targets each year.  *Meeting school improvement targets*  LCCPS did not meet its own improvement targets in math in any year between 2006 and 2009, except 2007. | Year   State Math    Charter Math  Charter Math            Perf Targets    Annual CPI Gain    Targets 2004 60.8              57.2  2005 68.7              53.2 62.9 2006 68.7              49.4 65.8 2007 76.5               56.5 55.8 2008 76.5               58.9 62.7 2009 84.3                57.1 65.8 2010 84.3               72.6 2011 92.2                79.5 2012 92.2              86.3 2013 100.0               93.2 2014 100.0            100.0 |

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Internal measures of student achievement**

**Students demonstrate progress on internal measurements linked with the school’s promotion or exit standards.**

*Finding: LCCPS uses a number of standardized assessments to gather baseline data on students, to evaluate student progress, and to group students for instruction.*

LCCPS administers a number of standardized tests. The Developmental Indicators for the Assessment of Learning (DIAL-3), which assesses five areas of early childhood development, is used to evaluate the academic ability of students entering kindergarten. Students in kindergarten through grade five are given the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) three times per year. In the fall, all students take the Group Reading and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE), and new students take the Group Mathematics and Diagnostic Evaluation (GMADE). All students take both the GMADE and the GRADE at the end of the year. These tests are used to group students for instruction, to target students who need additional services, and to monitor progress.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Skills and knowledge expectations**

**The school’s curriculum, as implemented in the classroom, consistently addresses the skills and concepts that all students must know and be able to do to meet state standards, and supports opportunities for all students to master these skills and concepts.**

*Finding: LCCPS uses commercially produced curricula that are aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for all of its core subject areas.*

The school primarily uses commercially produced curriculum materials as its core curriculum. The renewal inspection team confirmed that these materials are aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (MCF). In ELA, LCCPS has recently transitioned to a new reading program, replacing *Success for All* with Scott Foresman’s *Reading Street*. According to the principal, *Success for All* did not meet the school's needs for teaching writing skills and answering open response questions, and its assessment system did not give the school the data it needed to improve instruction. *Reading Street* was adopted in grades one through grade six in the 2008-09 school year and is in full implementation in kindergarten through grade six for the 2009-10 school year*.* Grades six through eight continue to use *Prentice Hall Literature (Penguin Edition)* and *Empowering Writers.* English language learners continue to use *Avenues* and *High Points.*

The major texts used in the mathematics curriculum are *Everyday Math* in grades K through six and *Connected Mathematics* in grades seven and eight. In science, kindergarten uses Kindercorner thematic units; grades one through five use Scott Foresman *Science*; and *Science Explorer* is used in grades six through eight. In addition, in grades six through eight, LCCPS adopted a Prentice Hall series which is a continuation of the Scott Foresman program, but with a greater emphasis on the specific strands of scientific study. In social studies, kindergarten uses *Kindercorner* thematic units; grades one and two use teacher-created units; and grade three uses *Massachusetts Our Home*. Grades four through eight use *History Alive*. The world languages program uses teacher-created materials and units for Khmer, as well as materials developed at the University of Hawaii. Spanish teachers use *Viva el Espanol* and *Espanol Para Ti* in grades one through five and *En Espanol* in grades six through eight.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Diverse learners**

**The school’s curriculum supports opportunities for all students to master established skills and concepts. The school establishes and implements an accommodation plan that addresses the needs of diverse learners.**

*Finding: Special education services are largely delivered through a co-teaching inclusion model.*

LCCPS currently enrolls 98 students who receive special education, or 10.3 percent of the overall population. Disability types served by the school include communication, neurological, intellectual, developmental delay, emotional, physical and various specific learning disabilities. Although pull-out services are available, most instruction for students with disabilities occurs within the regular education classroom. Four special education inclusion aides, one each in grades one through four, support special needs students when they are receiving their education in the general education classroom. While almost all special education students in the school receive at least some of their academics in the regular education classroom, 53 are pulled out to receive their services 21 percent or more of the school day.

*Finding: The school uses Title I funds to provide academic support to students.*

Before-school help is provided to students who are able to arrive to school early. The school also offers a daily summer school program for the month of July that contains both enrichment and remedial components. During the summer of 2009, the program served 87 students including six special education students and eight English language learner (ELL) students.

The school provides a Title I funded program including Supplemental Educational Services as required by NCLB Program. It is staffed by four acceleration teachers and seven tutors. The acceleration teachers work with students in grades one through four, and are focused on instruction in reading and mathematics. The tutorial program is in its second year of operation. Tutors provide in-class support and small group instruction for students in grades one through four. Tutoring support is delivered during the school’s daily directed study period, after school in daily 90 minute blocks, and on Saturday mornings. Tutorial services are coordinated with the classroom instruction; the tutors receive lesson plans from the regular education teachers in advance of the lesson’s presentation. Students are selected for participation in the program based on their performance on weekly assessments.

Instructional staff reported that improved access to educational technology is an area in which there had been significant improvement since the beginning of the past school year, including an increase in the number of laptops, Smartboards, Alphasmarts and the addition of Channel 1 programming in class. Administrators reported, however, that the availability of types assistive technology directed specifically at addressing the needs of students with disabilities continues to be an area in need of improvement at the school.

*Finding: English language development classes for English language learners are appropriate and effective. Additional staff training is needed in the area of providing sheltered English instruction.*

LCCPS has 243 students presently identified as ELL, or 25.6 percent of the school population. Incoming students are tested for English language proficiency during the summer prior to their entry. One hundred eighteen students who were potentially ELL were tested in this manner during the summer of 2009, and as a result of their activities, the school identified 111 new kindergarten students as being in need of ELL services. An additional twenty students entered at the school in other grades for a total of 131 newly enrolled students who were determined by the school to be in need of ELL services. Since the fall of 2008, a total of 113 students have been re-categorized from ELL to formerly limited English proficient.

Students who require English language support are provided with English language development classes in small group settings. The school reports that until this year, the number of hours provided to students in the language developments classes did not meet required minimums as described in the Department’s *Guidance on Using MEPA Results to Plan SEI Instruction*. Two additional instructional staff were hired for the current year, and the recommended number of hours are now being delivered. Classes observed by the federal programs review team included age and skill level appropriate instruction which emphasized a variety of vocabulary building and comprehension development activities.

The school also provides sheltered English immersion instruction through the use of ten instructional staff who have received some or most of the recommended sheltered English immersion (SEI) training, and three staff who have completed all required components of the training. Instructional staff in focus groups uniformly indicated that there was an ongoing need for additional staff development training in the area of SEI instructional techniques. ELL specialist staff reported that there is occasional ongoing resistance amongst some regular education staff to making accommodations needed for limited English proficient students to access the curriculum. They speculated that those attitudes might change with the provision of additional language acquisition training.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Implementation of the curriculum**

**The school’s curriculum is documented, and teachers plan and deliver lessons directed by the school’s curriculum guidelines.**

*Finding: A curriculum mapping project, launched during the 2006-07 school year, is still a work in progress.*

During the 2006-07 year seven site visit, site visitors were told that the school had launched a school-wide initiative to develop comprehensive curriculum maps for all grade levels, aligned with the MCF, which would ensure the horizontal and vertical alignment of the curriculum. During the 2007-08 year eight visit, the administration reported that it planned to have the curriculum mapping completed and uploaded to TechPaths, an online curriculum mapping program, by fall 2008. During both the 2008-09 year nine visit and the renewal inspection visit, visitors were informed that the curriculum mapping was unfinished. The renewal inspection team found that “curriculum mapping continues to be a work in progress at LCCPS…The teachers stated that they had not yet done significant work to align the documentation vertically, but instead rely on sequential curricula by publishers to ensure vertical alignment of the instruction” (Renewal Inspection Report, p. 28). Further, the principal told the renewal inspection team that they had given up on TechPaths because the teachers found the program too cumbersome. Curriculum mapping documents reviewed by the renewal inspection team showed a lack of consistency in format and completeness; some subject areas included pacing guides, alignment to the MCF, and a scope and sequence and others did not. The renewal inspection team learned that the principal was in the process of developing a template for curriculum mapping that will include categories such as essential questions, content, skills, assessment, and alignment to standards. The template was scheduled to be introduced to the staff at a half-day professional development session scheduled for the month following the visit, October 2009.

*Finding: This year LCCPS has formalized its lesson planning document. Teachers are required to develop and submit standardized weekly lesson plans.*

Beginning in 2007-08, teachers were expected to develop weekly lesson plans and submit them to their supervisor, but they did not receive feedback on those submissions. There was no standard lesson plan template, and the year nine site visit team found that teacher-created planning documents varied widely in format and level of detail. The renewal inspection team found that in 2009-10, the requirement that teachers use a standard lesson planning instrument had been implemented. All teachers received training in the use of the GANAG approach to lesson planning (Goal setting objectives, Access prior knowledge, New information, Apply new knowledge, Generalization/summations). In addition to these categories, the new lesson plan template contains blocks to record MCF standards, homework, and assessments. Teachers submit lesson plans to the primary and middle school assistant principals, who provide the teachers with oral feedback. Lesson plans reviewed by the renewal inspection team were aligned with the lesson goals displayed on classroom whiteboards and were consistent with the curricula in use in the school.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Program evaluation and planning**

**The school has systems and structures in place to regularly and systematically review the quality and effectiveness of the academic program. Teachers and school leaders use qualitative and quantitative evidence to inform and guide instructional planning and practice**.

*Finding: Data is used to identify students who need academic support, but LCCPS has not developed a comprehensive system for analyzing and utilizing assessment data. This year, the school has implemented a data resource center.*

During the charter term, LCCPS developed the practice of assembling and distributing data binders to teachers. The binders contained results from MCAS examinations, the GRADE assessment, the GMADE assessment and the DIBELS for both current and the previous year’s students. The year nine site visit team found that the binders had not yet been distributed to teachers as of the date of the visit (December 11, 2008). They also found that data did not appear to be used to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching and learning, or to revise the educational program. At the renewal inspection visit, the principal reported that the binders were cumbersome to use and that teachers needed more in-depth analysis of test results to inform instruction. The renewal inspection team found that “a school-wide process for evaluation of the data and implementing systematic improvement is not in place” (Renewal Inspection Report, p. 24).

Beginning in 2009-10, the school created the Teacher Resource and Assessment Center (TRAC). The TRAC is staffed by an assessment director and an assessment specialist. Starting this year, teachers will be sending all test results to the TRAC, including baseline tests, unit assessments, weekly selection tests, quarterly writing samples, mid-year assessments, and end of year assessments. The TRAC will analyze the data and provide data packages for administrators, teachers, acceleration teachers, and tutors to use in their curriculum, instructional planning, and targeted assistance. The TRAC will also perform MCAS analyses by student and grade level, and do cross comparisons with other districts and the state.

*Finding: LCCPS lacks a school-wide system for evaluating the curriculum. Curriculum planning, modification, development, and evaluation are done informally.*

The year nine site visit team found that “currently, there is no school-wide system for evaluating curriculum to ensure quality and effectiveness” (Year 9 Site Visit Report, p.5). The team found that the positions of curriculum coordinator and lower and middle school principals had been eliminated, and that the new assistant principals did not have curriculum related responsibilities. They also found that although teachers met weekly as grade level teams, there was no set agenda for these meetings and no expectation that the meetings would be used to review or revise curriculum. Similarly, the renewal inspection team found that “LCCPS has no formal system for evaluating, developing, or modifying the curriculum” (Renewal Inspection Report, p. 28). The school continues to lack a curriculum director or subject area teams. An action plan, written during the 2008-09 school year in response to findings made by the 2008-09 year nine site visit report, identifies curriculum mapping and further alignment with the MCF as areas for improvement, and names a curriculum subcommittee as responsible for overseeing these developments. The renewal inspection team found that a curriculum subcommittee had not been established and states in its report that “currently no systematic processes exist for selecting new curricula or for evaluating or improving the current curricula, no comprehensive plan exists for improving instruction to improve student performance” (Renewal Inspection Report, p. 29).

*Finding: The school has not implemented a systematic, school-wide response to low MCAS performance.*

During the 2008-09 year nine site visit, in response to questions from site visitors about the school’s response to its persistently low performance on MCAS examinations, administrators discussed the tutoring services that would be made available to students through an outside vendor, as is required by the NCLB Act. Teachers explained that MCAS data was presented to them at the beginning of the school year, and was then used to identify which students would need additional tutoring from Club Z tutors. Stakeholders did not mention any systemic efforts to boost academic performance by reviewing or modifying current teaching strategies or curriculum. The renewal inspection team found that data is discussed at grade level team meetings during which teachers discuss possible resolutions to identified problems. They concluded, however, that “systemic processes for improvement are not in place” (Renewal Inspection Report, p. 24).

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Classroom and school environment**

**The classroom and school environment is orderly and supports the goal of student understanding and mastery of skills and is consistent with the school’s mission**

*Finding: Visiting teams have observed that the classroom and school environment at LCCPS is calm, safe and orderly. Over the term of the charter, administrators and teachers have intermittently reported that there are issues concerning student behavior.*

During the term of the charter, site visitors have consistently observed the classroom and school environment at LCCPS to be calm, safe and orderly, with only a few instances of problematic student behavior. However, during every site visit, teachers and administrators have reported that student behavior has significantly disrupted the learning environment. The 2006-07 year seven site visit team observed high levels of respect between students and teachers, and no disruptive behaviors, but heard from teachers and administrators that discipline had been an ongoing issue at the school. During the 2007-08 year eight visit, administrators reported that the school had developed an Office of Student Support (OSS), staffed with a coordinator, three adjustment counselors, and one clerical assistant, and that consequently, the student behavior problems that had affected staff morale last year “were gone”(2007-08 Year 8 Site Visit Report, p. 5). However, teachers reported that discipline continued to be one of the school’s biggest challenges. Procedures for responding to student misbehavior were reported to be inconsistent, and the capacity for handling misbehavior was thought to be insufficient*.* Teachers reported that the OSS was overwhelmed and did not have the necessary staff to handle behavior issues effectively. Students reported that some students misbehave frequently, and that teachers are not always aware of the extent of the misbehavior.

During the 2008-09 year nine site visit, site visitors learned that the OSS had been eliminated.

Instead, disciplinary support was provided by the two new assistant principals, two discipline assistants, and two adjustment counselors. The assistant principals reported that most of their time was spent addressing disciplinary issues. Teachers reported that behavior issues are still not addressed consistently or systematically. The assistant principals were working with a committee of teachers that was meeting weekly to develop a systematic approach to addressing behavior issues. Also, the school continued to train teachers to take increasing responsibility for managing behavior within the classroom by adopting the Responsive Classroom model of classroom management, an initiative that was launched during the 2007-08 school year. Teachers reported mixed results with the use of this model, stating that it is difficult to implement without support from home. Despite the lack of a systemic approach to discipline, many teachers reported that an increased emphasis on managing discipline within classrooms had resulted in some improvement. Students, too, reported that behavior had improved because teachers give consequences more regularly.

The renewal inspection team found that there is no school wide approach to behavior management at LCCPS, and that each classroom teacher designs his or her own rules, which the team observed to be posted in the classrooms. Teachers continue to receive training in the Responsive Classroom and also in Second Step, another classroom management technique. According to the principal, these systems have not yet been fully implemented by the school, and additional teacher training is needed. The principal also reported that school leadership is focused on improving classroom instruction so that teachers can keep students fully engaged in the lesson, thereby eliminating some errant behaviors.

Despite this need for additional training and the lack of school wide systems, the principal and assistant principals reported that current student behavior was improved. Teachers told the team that they felt more supported. The students interviewed by the team said that discipline at LCCPS was fairer and more enforced this year. School leaders reported having implemented some changes that have reduced behavioral problems, such as eliminating the practice of having students gather in the cafeteria when they arrived at school, and instead requiring students to go directly to their classrooms.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Instruction**

**School-wide instructional practice is aligned with the school design and student learning objectives, is consistently and effectively delivered, and conveys clear expectations to students. Teachers are purposeful in their lessons and students are engaged in meaningful learning.**

*Finding: Over the term of the charter, the predominant form of observed instruction has shifted towards whole class, teacher directed instruction combined with by independent or paired practice.*

The 2006-07 year seven site visit team observed a range of instructional practices including direct, whole-group small group, individualized and project-based instruction. Prior to the 2008-09 site visit, school leaders were asked by site visitors to detail, in advance, the instructional practices that visitors could expect to see. During that visit, the principal identified eleven characteristics of the instructional program. Many of these characteristics, such as collaboration and cooperative learning, student centered learning, and hands on learning, were not observed by the site visit team. In contrast to the instructional practices that were described to the team, the predominant form of instruction observed by the year nine site visit team was independent practice by students followed by whole-class, teacher-directed review of completed work. In most classes, students were completing worksheets or using textbooks.

The list of expected instructional practices conveyed to the renewal inspection team was significantly different and included only four components:

* the posting of an instructional goal for each lesson, the use of various classroom resources;
* the use of technology, such as Smartboards and overhead projectors;
* the teacher moving around the room to assist students with their assignments rather than remaining at the front of the classroom; and
* co-teaching between regular and special education teachers.

All of these practices were observed by the renewal inspection team, though some, such as the use of technology and the co-teaching model, were observed to be in an early stage of implementation. Similar to the year nine site visit team, the renewal inspection team observed classes in which lessons were presented and then students worked on worksheets individually, in pairs, or, less frequently, in small groups (Renewal Inspection Report, p. 31).

*Finding: Site visit teams and the renewal inspection team have observed that instruction has been mixed with respect to the quality of the delivery and content.*

Instruction at LCCPS has increasingly focused on the acquisition of basic skills and content, such as spelling and vocabulary words, and arithmetic algorithms. While the year seven site visit team observed activities that foster the use and acquisition of higher level critical thinking skills (Year 7 Site Visit Report, p. 3), the renewal inspection team observed that the effective promotion of high order thinking skills was infrequent in classes other than those in the gifted and talented program. The renewal inspection team found that most lessons communicated learning effectively to students, though some classes were less effective because the lesson was paced too slowly. Student engagement was observed to be high, with an engagement rate of over 70 percent in most classrooms. The team noted that lessons within the gifted and talented program were more effective, with higher levels of engagement, faster pacing, more compelling lesson topics and an expectation that students would use higher order thinking skills. The gifted and talented program is offered to 37 students in kindergarten through grade seven. These students receive instruction in mathematics and ELA in a separate classroom with one of the two gifted and talented teachers.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Instructional leadership**

**School leaders provide teachers with feedback and guidance that leads to improved instructional practice and student achievement.**

*Finding: The principal and assistant principals supervise and evaluate teachers. Teachers are measured against goals that they set at the beginning of each school year.*

A new system for teacher supervision and evaluation was implemented during the 2008-09 school year. The teacher supervision and evaluation responsibilities at LCCPS are divided, with the assistant principals observing and evaluating regular education teachers, the principal evaluating the ELL teachers and the acceleration teachers, and the special education director evaluating the special education staff. Every teacher meets with his/her supervisor at the beginning of the school year to engage in a goal setting process. The goal setting process requires teachers to identify their strengths and weaknesses, to identify two goals for the school year that tie to student learning, to outline a plan for attaining the goals, and to explain how progress towards goals will be assessed. Their performance is then assessed through their progress on these goals, as well as on a number of teaching competencies such as standards and professional practice, classroom environment and instruction, professional development activities, planning and preparation and lesson goals. New teachers receive two formal observation and evaluations per year while more senior teachers receive one. Observations include a pre-conference and a post conference with formal feedback. Teachers are also informally evaluated two to three times a year, with a focus on the level of student engagement and understanding.

*Finding: Teachers receive some support from their peers, but formal mentoring has been discontinued. A newly hired mathematics coach provides assistance in this area.*

Grade level teams meet weekly during common planning time. The year nine site visit team found that there was no common expectation for the agenda or format of these meetings and that they varied widely in content and duration. A peer mentoring and coaching program, described in the school’s accountability plan, was discontinued in 2006-07.

This year, the school hired an almost full-time mathematics coach. This coach fills a standard coaching role: modeling instruction, assisting teachers in planning lessons and providing content and pedagogical advice before, during, and after mathematics lessons. There is no analogous reading coach for reading or ELA.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Accountability plan objectives and measures**

**The school meets, or shows progress towards meeting the academic achievement objectives and measures set forth in its accountability plan.**

*Finding: LCCPS has not met any of the seven measures in its accountability plan related to academic achievement.*

LCCPS’ approved accountability plan includes two objectives, one concerning ELA and one concerning mathematics. Each objective has multiple measures related to student performance on MCAS examinations and other assessments. Based on the school’s performance on the 2009 MCAS tests and other academic assessment data information reported in the school’s 2008-09 Annual Report and Application for Renewal, LCCPS has not made progress towards meeting those objectives and measures. A summary of the school’s success in meeting the objectives and measures contained in its accountability plan can be found in Section VII of this report.

### C. Organizational Viability

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Financial management**

**The school demonstrates financial solvency, stability, internal controls and oversight.**

*Finding: LCCPS has an effective financial management and budget development system in place. The school hired a new controller in the spring of 2008 to help manage the finances at the school. LCCPS has not developed a long-range financial plan.*

According to independent auditor reports and associated management letters covering FY07 and FY08, the school’s net assets increased from FY07 to FY08. At the end of FY08, LCCPS had total net assets of almost $2.4 million, approximately one-half ($1,273,716) of which was invested in capital assets; the remaining net assets ($1,273,716) were unrestricted. According to the 2008 audit report, LCCPS took on new debt with Eastern Bank and Trust Company in the form of demand lines of credit. As of June 30, 2008, the school owed $490,000 on the lines of credit. According to the controller and board members, the line of credit has recently been increased to $750,000 and is viewed as a safety net in place to insure adequate funds when state or federal reimbursements are not received in a timely way. According to the controller, the amount was increased at the suggestion of the bank in relation to the planned purchase of a new school site.

A controller was hired by the school in April 2008, replacing a business consultant. According to board members, since his hiring, the controller has implemented an effective system of internal controls and sound business practices to address the concerns raised by the independent auditing firm. The board expressed high levels of satisfaction with the procedures that have been put into place. The controller works closely with the finance committee to prepare monthly financials for each board meeting. In addition, the leadership team emphasized to the renewal inspection team their understanding of, appreciation of, and adherence to the system established by the controller.

According to the Application for Renewal and renewal inspection team interviews with the controller and board members, the initial budget is developed by the school finance committee, which consists of the executive director, the board treasurer, a board director, and the controller. Once the budget is created, it is reviewed by the leadership team who may then submit changes. The finance committee selects one of the three budgets submitted and presents it to the board for approval. The board works with the leadership team to resolve any issues. The budget is approved prior to the start of the new fiscal year.

Both the executive director and the controller told the team that LCCPS currently has no long-range financial plan in place. The board is currently engaged in negotiations to finalize the purchase of a new school building in Lowell and the development and building committees are actively involved in this process.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Board governance**

**The members of the board understand their responsibilities and are engaged in oversight of the school’s academic progress and financial condition.**

*Finding: The board is working towards achieving an appropriate level of oversight over the term of the charter.*

The board consists of eleven members, and meets monthly as a full board throughout the year. There are four active committees of the board: finance, development, personnel, and building. The finance committee meets at least once a month and works closely with the controller in tracking and monitoring all financial activity. The personnel committee meets once a month. The building and development committees work closely together and are currently meeting at least weekly as they complete negotiations for the new school.

During the 2007-08 year eight site visit, board members reported that defining the board’s roles and responsibilities has been a struggle, due to the challenges of school growth and the transition away from external management. Board members stated that they would like to be more strategically focused, but often got mired in issues relating to the building or personnel. The board hired a coach to help them focus on responsibilities such as policy development, evaluating the CEO, allocating funds, and ensuring the vision and safety of the school.

During the 2008-09 year nine site visit, board members reported that in the past they had not provided sufficient oversight of school administrators. They had operated under the assumption that reasonable parameters had been set in allowing the CEO to have broad decision-making authority, but discovered that their confidence in the CEO had been misplaced and that they had failed to identify issues that existed at the school. In particular, they learned through a teacher survey that the administrative team had been inaccessible to teachers and was not involved in classroom operations. They further reported that they had spent two years working with the CEO to develop an evaluation instrument to assess his performance, and had not conducted any evaluations of the CEO during that period.

The board told the year nine site visit team that they were in the process of rebuilding the culture of the school by creating clear expectations for open communication and by ensuring that teachers feel supported and involved in decision-making. To this end, they hired a director of human resources, and established a new process for evaluating the CEO, with reviews to be conducted on an annual basis, and continued to work with a “coach/consultant”. Listening sessions for teachers to meet with board members without administrators present were implemented.

During the renewal inspection visit, board members told the team that though they had had to get more involved in operations during the time period when the past CEO left the school, they understood their responsibility is to set policy and to not become involved in the day-to-day activities of the school. They said that this had been a problem in the past, but that they had refocused themselves and now refer these issues to appropriate school leaders. They noted the role that the board “coach” plays in helping them to stay focused on appropriate tasks.

The board expressed two major goals for this year: securing a new school, and hiring a permanent executive director. They also stated that bringing stability to the school was a critical goal which they feel they have achieved in the past year and a half since the new management team has been on board. The board reported that they expected to appoint a permanent CEO in October 2009.

*Finding: The board closely monitors financial and operational issues, but is less engaged in oversight of academic progress.*

The board has an inconsistent focus on academics and assessment. The board’s academic committee, put into place by the previous CEO, has become inactive due to perceived ineffectiveness. The renewal inspection team’s review of the board meeting minutes revealed that MCAS results were discussed only annually when released. Other information on student performance was not provided to the board. As previously noted, the board told the team that it does not want to micromanage the school and that the principal is responsible for the instruction and academics at the school. The board members told the renewal inspection team that they were not satisfied with the school’s academic progress, but the team did not find evidence that the board members had sufficient information regarding the school’s academic performance to enable them to understand the school’s progress toward the academic goals.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: School leadership**

**School leader(s) are effective and have created an appropriate professional climate, resulting in a purposeful learning environment, reasonable rates of retention for effective school leadership, staff and teachers and manageable levels of overall staff turnover.**

*Finding: The school did not renew sixteen teachers’ contracts for the 2009-10 school year because the teachers were not highly qualified under NCLB.*

During the term of the charter, teacher attrition has risen from 7.5 percent to 22 percent. After the 2008-09 school year, sixteen teachers were unable to return when they failed to complete the requirements to attain highly qualified status. Teachers in danger of losing their positions signed an addendum to their contract for the 2008-09 school year and were alerted that they had one school year to complete the requirements. The human resources director worked with affected staff to see what support they needed and to check on their progress.

*Finding: The school had significant turnover in leadership prior to the 2008-09 school year, but maintained continuity between 2008-09 and 2009-10. A new CEO is expected to be hired in the fall of 2009.*

As discussed on pages 7-8 of this document, LCCPS has experienced significant changes in leadership during the 2007-08 school year. However, the leadership team that was put into place before the 2008-09 school year has remained the same for the start of the 2009-10 school year. The school’s leadership team now is comprised of the interim CEO, the principal, the two assistant principals, a special education director, and the data and assessment director, who is also a teacher in the gifted and talented program. Two other administrators that have been in place for over a year are the controller and the human resources director. As noted above, the school is on the verge of hiring a new CEO, to begin work in the fall of 2009.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Program planning**

**The school has realistic plans for program improvement, possible future expansion, and adequate facilities based on evaluation and analysis of data.**

*Finding: Over the term of the charter, LCCPS has put into place and dismantled various systems for academic planning.* *Conditions to support academic planning have been put into place this year, but effective academic planning has not yet begun.*

During the 2007-08 year eight site visit, both board members and administrative leaders cited the Strategic School Improvement Plan (SIP) for 2006-09, developed during the 2006-07 school year, as an important tool for school wide change. The SIP goals included separating management of the primary and middle schools, defining the core content curriculum items, implementing TechPath curriculum mapping software, obtaining more Title-1 funded classroom tutors, and creating a systematic approach for differentiation in the classroom. The year eight site visit team also found that the school had created three new administrative positions to review the academic program: a reading coordinator, a curriculum coordinator, and a MCAS director. The curriculum coordinator was to work with a committee to create and organize a comprehensive curriculum for the school and oversee the implementation of curriculum mapping with TechPath. Teachers and administrators identified the curriculum coordinator and the curriculum committee as important elements for greater coordination of school wide curriculum. The reading coordinator worked with a committee of teachers to select a new ELA program to pilot. The MCAS director created an academically focused after school and Saturday school program.

The year nine 2008-09 site visit team found that the positions of curriculum coordinator and MCAS director had been eliminated. The reading coordinator position was filled only in late October. The SIP, emphasized by board members and school leaders at the year eight site visit, was described as “gone” (Year 9 Site Visit Report, p. 17). The team found that “Because of these administrative shifts, the school is currently lacking the capacity for focused development and oversight of its program. In the absence of broad goals, decision-making appears to be largely reactive, and changes to the program have been implemented based on the availability of short-term funding or the initiative of individual staff members, rather than strategic planning… In addition, there does not appear to be a focus on building systematic strategies to improve teaching and learning, such as implementing standards for assessing the quality of teaching, ensuring curriculum alignment, or using assessment data to improve instruction.” (Year 9 Site Visit Report, p. 17).

The renewal inspection team found that LCCPS has entered 2009-10 with conditions established that could enable academic planning to begin to take place. As discussed above, all members of the administrative team have returned to the school in the same roles as the previous year, with the exception of the reading coordinator, who left at the end of the 2008-09 school year and appears to have not been replaced. A mathematics coach has been added to the team, who is available to assist teachers in lesson planning and execution. A new Action Plan for 2009-10 which focuses on the accountability plan measures, was developed last winter in response to the 2008-09 year nine site visit. The renewal inspection team found that the school is taking steps to use data more effectively through the implementation of the TRAC. They also observed that the leadership team had established a well-defined meeting schedule, including daily briefings between the principal and interim executive director. The school has also established a regular schedule of weekly meetings for grade level teams, though the agenda for these meetings is not highly structured or consistently focused on student outcomes. The team found that the leadership team understood that it must improve student achievement. However, the team concluded that “a clear vision, highly specific goals, and detailed steps to improve student achievement are not yet in place” and that “given the school’s continued weak performance in meeting AYP, LCCPS does not currently have the focus, specificity, or short and long-range planning required to significantly raise student performance” (Renewal Inspection Report, p. 46).

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Family satisfaction**

**The school demonstrates that families are satisfied with the school’s program.**

*Finding: Parents and students interviewed by site visitors and the renewal inspection team have been very satisfied with the school’s program. A recent parent survey, completed by 148 parents, indicated that parents were satisfied with the school’s academic performance and would recommend the school to others.*

At every site visit during the charter term, the visiting team has interviewed six to ten parents of current students. Parents have consistently expressed approval of the academic program and particularly the gifted and talented program. They appreciate the level of support their children received from teachers. Parents also expressed that the school actively fosters respect for different cultures. The parents reported that the teachers and the administration communicated effectively with families*.* Students, too have spoken positively about the school’s celebration of its multicultural community, and enjoyed the opportunity to study world languages.

During the current charter term, the school conducted two parent satisfaction surveys, one in 2007-08 and one in 2008-09. Of the 148 surveys that were returned in 2008-09, 96 percent responded that they agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the school’s academic performance. Ninety six percent agreed or strongly agreed that they would likely recommend this school to others.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: School safety**

**The school’s environment is physically safe and free from harassment and discrimination.**

*Finding: LCCPS is a physically safe environment. The school has established clear anti-harassment policies, and has encouraged a supportive and positive school environment.*

LCCPS has established an environment that is safe for students and staff. All outside doors to the school are locked and a buzzer system is in place at the front office to allow visitors to be buzzed in. Teachers, students, and parents consistently reported that they felt safe at LCCPS.

Students have said mixed things about their emotional safety at the school over the term of the charter. During the 2007-08 year eight site visit, students reported that they were not always emotionally safe at school, especially when teachers leave the room, or turn their backs. Students also reported that in some classrooms, teachers were not able to manage student behavior, and this makes them feel unsafe. At the 2008-09 year nine site visit, students stated that there was bullying at the school and that some students like to make fun of others. The students interviewed by the renewal inspection team said that there was an anti-bullying program in place. The team observed anti-bullying signs in the corridor, and noted that an anti-bullying presentation was given to parents in the evening and a presentation was made to students in grades five through eight during the visit. The team neither saw nor heard about any instances of disruptive behavior, bullying or other forms of harassment.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: School facilities**

**The school provides facilities that meet applicable state and federal requirements, are suited to its programs, and are sufficient to serve diverse student needs.**

*Finding: The LCCPS facility is adequate for delivering the school’s programs, and the school uses the space efficiently. The school’s board is currently engaged in negotiations to finalize the purchase of a new school building.*

The school is located in a refurbished mill complex. Classrooms are well lit and well provisioned, with ample materials and books. Some rooms have Smartboards, and all had white boards and overhead projectors. The facility is adequate for delivering the school’s programs, but it lacks a gymnasium and a playground, and some of the classrooms are cramped and oddly shaped, with obstructed sight lines. The board has been seeking a new facility for some time, and is currently engaged in negotiations to purchase a building in Lowell in which to locate the school.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Compliance**

**The school is in compliance with the requirements of the Coordinated Program Review (CPR). Staff employed by the school meet all applicable state and federal qualifications and standards.**

*Finding: LCCPS is in compliance with the requirements of the Coordinated Program Review.*

The final report for the last full Coordinated Program Review (CPR) activity at LCCPS was conducted in February 2005 and included reviews of the school’s programming in the area of special education, civil rights, English language learner education and Title I. A mid-cycle review was conducted in November 2007. In response to the findings contained in the mid-cycle report, the school a submitted a progress report for Department review in March 2008 documenting the steps they had taken to address issues identified in the mid-cycle report. As a result of their submission, all issues were determined to have been fully addressed by the school, and the CPR process was closed.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Dissemination**

**The school has provided models for replication and best practices.**

*Finding: LCCPS has not disseminated any models for replication to other schools. It has established a relationship with one school within the Lowell public schools.*

LCCPS has established a relationship with an elementary school within the Lowell Public School District that uses the same ELA curriculum. LCCPS teachers have observed classes at the school and discussed with their teachers how best to implement the literacy program. Furthermore, they are exploring ways to share teaching methods. Although LCCPS has partnered with this school, it has not yet begun to share best practices with this school and has no formal dissemination practices in place.

**ESE Charter School Performance Criteria: Accountability plan objectives and measures**

**The school meets, or shows progress towards meeting the organizational viability objectives and measures set forth in its accountability plan.**

*Finding: LCCPS has met twelve of the measures and has not met two of the measures in its accountability plan related to organizational viability.*

LCCPS’ accountability plan includes four objectives related to organizational viability. The first objective concerns the school’s fiscal soundness. There are three measures associated with this objective, one of which the school has met. The second objective concerns family satisfaction with the school. There are four measures associated with this measure, all of which the school has met. The third objective concerns the strength of the school’s board of trustees. There are three measures associated with this measure, all of which the school has met. The fourth objective is related to the retention of a competent teaching staff. There are four measures associated with this objective, two have which have been met, and two of which have not. A summary of the school’s success in meeting the objectives and measures contained in its accountability plan can be found in Section VII of this report.

## V. MCAS Performance

English language arts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Key:** N = # of students tested; CPI = Composite Performance Index | | | | | | | |
|  |  | Warning/Failing % |  | Needs Improvement % |  | Proficient % |  | Advanced/Above Prof. % |
| ^ Indicates performance above the district at a statistically significant level | | | | | | | | |
| \* Indicates performance below the district at a statistically significant level | | | | | | | | |
| Percentages without a symbol indicate no statistically significant difference between the charter school and district. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Above Proficient 4 2 1 2 %  Proficient                 21 40 26 20 %  Needs Improvement 48 36 40 52 %  Warning                 27 22 32 26 N                                 85 96 87 98 CPI                                 62.6 70.8 62.6 60.7 | 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 0 0 2 3 %  Proficient                 13 16 15 13 %  Needs Improvement 48 57 43 51 %  Warning                 38 27 40 33 N                                 91 81 88 86 CPI                                 51.4 57.7 53.4 54.9 |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Above Prof. | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | % Proficient | 21 | 40 | 26 | 20 | | % Needs Imp. | 48 | 36 | 40 | 52 | | % Warning | 27 | 22 | 32 | 26 | | N | 85 | 96 | 87 | 98 | | CPI | 62.6 | 70.8 | 62.6 | 60.7\* | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | | % Proficient | 13 | 16 | 15 | 13 | | % Needs Imp. | 48 | 57 | 43 | 51 | | % Warning | 38 | 27 | 40 | 33 | | N | 91 | 81 | 88 | 86 | | CPI | 51.4\* | 57.7\* | 53.4 | 54.9\* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 7 6 1 1 %  Proficient                 29 25 23 29 %  Needs Improvement 42 37 56 59 %  Warning                 22 32 20 11 N                                 90 79 81 76 CPI                                 67.8 62.3 63.0 71.1 | 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 2 4 4 6 %  Proficient                 39 43 25 29 %  Needs Improvement 41 38 36 45 %  Warning                 18 15 35 19 N                                 44 84 72 78 CPI                                 71.6 76.2 59.7 67.3 |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | | % Proficient | 29 | 25 | 23 | 29 | | % Needs Imp. | 42 | 37 | 56 | 59 | | % Warning | 22 | 32 | 20 | 11 | | N | 90 | 79 | 81 | 76 | | CPI | 67.8 | 62.3 | 63.0 | 71.1 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | | % Proficient | 39 | 43 | 25 | 29 | | % Needs Imp. | 41 | 38 | 36 | 45 | | % Warning | 18 | 15 | 35 | 19 | | N | 44 | 84 | 72 | 78 | | CPI | 71.6 | 76.2 | 59.7\* | 67.3\* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 0 2 1 5 %  Proficient                 21 41 54 28 %  Needs Improvement 42 39 38 47 %  Warning                 37 17 6 19 N                                 38 41 78 57 CPI                                 57.2 71.3 81.1 66.2 | 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 0 0 0 4 %  Proficient                 61 24 50 63 %  Needs Improvement 28 46 28 21 %  Warning                 11 29 23 12 N                                 46 41 40 68 CPI                                 81.0 61.0 72.5 84.2 |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | | % Proficient | 21 | 41 | 54 | 28 | | % Needs Imp. | 42 | 39 | 38 | 47 | | % Warning | 37 | 17 | 6 | 19 | | N | 38 | 41 | 78 | 57 | | CPI | 57.2 | 71.3 | 81.1 | 66.2\* | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | | % Proficient | 61 | 24 | 50 | 63 | | % Needs Imp. | 28 | 46 | 28 | 21 | | % Warning | 11 | 29 | 23 | 12 | | N | 46 | 41 | 40 | 68 | | CPI | 81.0 | 61.0\* | 72.5 | 84.2 | |

Mathematics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Key:** N = # of students tested; CPI = Composite Performance Index | | | | | | | |
|  |  | Warning/Failing % |  | Needs Improvement % |  | Proficient % |  | Advanced/Above Prof. % |
| ^ Indicates performance above the district at a statistically significant level | | | | | | | | |
| \* Indicates performance below the district at a statistically significant level | | | | | | | | |
| Percentages without a symbol indicate no statistically significant difference between the charter school and district. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Above Proficient 1 5 9 7 %  Proficient                 20 32 25 24 %  Needs Improvement 36 27 33 35 %  Warning                 42 35 32 34 N                                 85 96 87 98 CPI                                 54.7 62.8 62.4 62.2 | 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 3 5 13 7 %  Proficient                 13 11 16 10 %  Needs Improvement 43 50 38 51 %  Warning                 40 34 33 31 N                                 92 80 89 86 CPI                                 50.8 53.1 62.1 56.1 |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Above Prof. | 1 | 5 | 9 | 7 | | % Proficient | 20 | 32 | 25 | 24 | | % Needs Imp. | 36 | 27 | 33 | 35 | | % Warning | 42 | 35 | 32 | 34 | | N | 85 | 96 | 87 | 98 | | CPI | 54.7 | 62.8 | 62.4 | 62.2 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 3 | 5 | 13 | 7 | | % Proficient | 13 | 11 | 16 | 10 | | % Needs Imp. | 43 | 50 | 38 | 51 | | % Warning | 40 | 34 | 33 | 31 | | N | 92 | 80 | 89 | 86 | | CPI | 50.8 | 53.1\* | 62.1 | 56.1\* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 10 8 9 9 %  Proficient                 15 30 22 21 %  Needs Improvement 33 29 37 37 %  Warning                 42 33 32 33 N                                 91 79 81 76 CPI                                 53.8 61.7 61.1 59.5 | 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 4 7 12 8 %  Proficient                 2 25 15 17 %  Needs Improvement 49 39 27 33 %  Warning                 44 29 45 42 N                                 45 84 73 78 CPI                                 46.7 60.7 53.4 54.2 |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 10 | 8 | 9 | 9 | | % Proficient | 15 | 30 | 22 | 21 | | % Needs Imp. | 33 | 29 | 37 | 37 | | % Warning | 42 | 33 | 32 | 33 | | N | 91 | 79 | 81 | 76 | | CPI | 53.8 | 61.7 | 61.1 | 59.5 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 4 | 7 | 12 | 8 | | % Proficient | 2 | 25 | 15 | 17 | | % Needs Imp. | 49 | 39 | 27 | 33 | | % Warning | 44 | 29 | 45 | 42 | | N | 45 | 84 | 73 | 78 | | CPI | 46.7 | 60.7 | 53.4\* | 54.2\* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 0 5 3 9 %  Proficient                 13 15 24 16 %  Needs Improvement 18 45 31 30 %  Warning                 69 35 42 46 N                                 39 40 78 57 CPI                                 37.8 53.8 54.8 51.8 | 2006 2007 2008 2009 %  Advanced                 0 0 5 6 %  Proficient                 9 5 18 21 %  Needs Improvement 31 22 48 34 %  Warning                 60 73 30 40 N                                 45 41 40 68 CPI                                 40.6 32.9 57.5 55.9 |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 0 | 5 | 3 | 9 | | % Proficient | 13 | 15 | 24 | 16 | | % Needs Imp. | 18 | 45 | 31 | 30 | | % Warning | 69 | 35 | 42 | 46 | | N | 39 | 40 | 78 | 57 | | CPI | 37.8 | 53.8 | 54.8 | 51.8 | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | | % Advanced | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | | % Proficient | 9 | 5 | 18 | 21 | | % Needs Imp. | 31 | 22 | 48 | 34 | | % Warning | 60 | 73 | 30 | 40 | | N | 45 | 41 | 40 | 68 | | CPI | 40.6 | 32.9\* | 57.5 | 55.9 | |

Other MCAS Results Administered During the Charter Term

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Test/Year** | **% Advanced/ Above Proficient** | **% Proficient** | **% Needs Improv.** | **% Warning** | **Students Included** | **CPI** |
| **Science and Technology - Grade 5** | | |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 1 | 23 | 48 | 27 | 91 | 58.8 |
| 2007 | 1 | 24 | 34 | 41 | 79 | 54.7 |
| 2008 | 6 | 14 | 47 | 33 | 81 | 57.1 |
| 2009 | 1 | 14 | 59 | 25 | 76 | 60.2 |
| **Science and Technology - Grade 8** | | |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 78 | 45 | 31.7 |
| 2007 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 88 | 41 | 26.8 |
| 2008 | 0 | 8 | 43 | 50 | 40 | 42.5 |
| 2009 | 0 | 15 | 41 | 44 | 68 | 48.5 |

## VI. Comparative Statistical Analysis of MCAS Results

Data is presented comparing the performance of the charter school to its primary sending district.  Please contact the charter school office (781) 338-3227 or charterschools@doe.mass.edu for more information.Data is presented comparing the performance of the charter school to its primary sending district.  Please contact the charter school office (781) 338-3227 or charterschools@doe.mass.edu for more information.

## VI. Adequate Yearly Progress Data

Performance and improvement ratings for Massachusetts public schools are based on aggregate student performance on MCAS tests. Performance is measured using the Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the distribution of student performance relative to attaining proficiency. Ratings are used to track schools’ progress toward meeting the goal of all students achieving proficiency in English language arts and mathematics by 2014. LCCPS’ most recent AYP Data is presented below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **NCLB Accountability Status** | **Performance Rating** | **Improvement Rating** |
| **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS** | Restructuring Year 1 - Subgroups | Low | No Change |
| **MATHEMATICS** | Corrective Action - Subgroups | Very Low | No Change |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **English Language Arts** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Student Group** | **(A) Participation** | | | | **(B) Performance** | | | **(C) Improvement** | | | | **(D) Attendance** | | | **AYP 2009** |
| Enrolled | Assessed | % | Met Target (95%) | N | 2009 CPI | Met Target (90.2) | 2008 CPI Baseline | Gain Target | On Target Range | Met Target | % | Change | Met Target |
|
|
| Aggregate | 468 | 465 | 99 | Yes | 463 | 66.6 | No | 64.5 | 5.9 | 67.9-72.9 | No | 94.2 | -0.3 | Yes | No |
| Lim. English Prof. | 170 | 169 | 99 | Yes | 167 | 53.7 | No | 52.7 | 7.9 | 58.1-63.1 | No | 93.1 | -1.1 | Yes | No |
| Special Education | 70 | 69 | 99 | Yes | 69 | 44.9 | No | 37.5 | 10.4 | 43.4-52.4 | Yes | 92.5 | -0.8 | Yes | Yes |
| Low Income | 383 | 380 | 99 | Yes | 378 | 64.9 | No | 61.7 | 6.4 | 65.6-70.6 | No | 94.1 | -0.2 | Yes | No |
| Afr. Amer./Black | 46 | 46 | 100 | Yes | 46 | 65.8 | No | 70.1 | 5.0 | 70.6-79.6 | No | 96.0 | -1.6 | Yes | No |
| Asian or Pacif. Isl. | 147 | 146 | 99 | Yes | 145 | 66.4 | No | 64.8 | 5.9 | 68.2-73.2 | No | 95.2 | -0.1 | Yes | No |
| Hispanic | 193 | 191 | 99 | Yes | 190 | 61.7 | No | 60.8 | 6.5 | 64.8-69.8 | No | 93.1 | -0.4 | Yes | No |
| Native American | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| White | 64 | 64 | 100 | Yes | 64 | 77.0 | No | 70.0 | 5.0 | 70.5-79.5 | Yes | 93.8 | 0.0 | Yes | Yes |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Mathematics** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Student Group** | **(A) Participation** | | | | **(B) Performance** | | | **(C) Improvement** | | | | **(D) Attendance** | | | **AYP 2009** |
| Enrolled | Assessed | % | Met Target (95%) | N | 2009 CPI | Met Target (84.3) | 2008 CPI Baseline | Gain Target | On Target Range | Met Target | % | Change | Met Target |
|
| Aggregate | 468 | 465 | 99 | Yes | 463 | 57.1 | No | 58.9 | 6.9 | 63.3-68.3 | No | 94.2 | -0.3 | Yes | No |
| Lim. English Prof. | 170 | 169 | 99 | Yes | 167 | 49.6 | No | 49.7 | 8.4 | 55.6-60.6 | No | 93.1 | -1.1 | Yes | No |
| Special Education | 70 | 69 | 99 | Yes | 69 | 32.6 | No | 35.9 | 10.7 | 42.1-51.1 | No | 92.5 | -0.8 | Yes | No |
| Low Income | 383 | 380 | 99 | Yes | 378 | 55.4 | No | 56.5 | 7.3 | 61.3-66.3 | No | 94.1 | -0.2 | Yes | No |
| Afr. Amer./Black | 46 | 46 | 100 | Yes | 46 | 52.7 | No | 59.0 | 6.8 | 61.3-70.3 | No | 96.0 | -1.6 | Yes | No |
| Asian or Pacif. Isl. | 147 | 146 | 99 | Yes | 145 | 57.4 | No | 62.9 | 6.2 | 66.6-71.6 | No | 95.2 | -0.1 | Yes | No |
| Hispanic | 193 | 191 | 99 | Yes | 190 | 52.9 | No | 53.6 | 7.7 | 58.8-63.8 | No | 93.1 | -0.4 | Yes | No |
| Native American | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| White | 64 | 64 | 100 | Yes | 64 | 67.2 | No | 62.1 | 6.3 | 63.9-72.9 | Yes | 93.8 | 0.0 | Yes | Yes |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Adequate Yearly Progress History** | | | | | | | | | | | **NCLB Accountability Status** |
|  | | **2001** | **2002** | **2003** | **2004** | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** |
| **ELA** | **Aggregate** | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Restructuring Year 1 - Subgroups |
| **All Subgroups** | - | - | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| **MATH** | **Aggregate** | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Corrective Action - Subgroups |
| **All Subgroups** | - | - | No | - | No | No | Yes | No | No |

## VII. Accountability Plan Objectives and Measures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A. Faithfulness to Charter** | **2008-09 Performance** | **Notes** |
| **Objective**: LCCPS will place an academic emphasis on the culture, language, and history of the Southeast Asian and Latino peoples. | | |
| **Measure:** All students in grades K-8 will take either a Khmer or Spanish class daily. | Met | * K-3 receive 30 minutes/day * 4-8 receive 45 minutes/day |
| **Measure:** The academic program will be customized to include 3 Latino courses or major units each year and 3 Cambodian courses or major units each year. | Met | * School meets this measure by providing language classes and art and music classes with strong emphasis on projects reflective of these cultures. |
| **Measure:** Parents will agree that LCCPS offers their student significant opportunities to learn about the Southeast Asian and Latino cultures. | Met | * In a 2008 parent survey, 93% of 156 respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the school was fulfilling the mission outlined in the charter. * In a 2009 parent survey, 84% of 148 respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the school offered their children the opportunity to learn about Southeast Asian and Latino cultures. |
| **Measure:** The school will provide at least three activities done during the year that placed a specific emphasis on these two groups of people. | Met | * Spanish Heritage month * Cambodian New Year |
| **Objective**: LCCPS will disseminate its best practices relative to English Language Learners, urban, and economically disadvantaged students and communities. | | |
| **Measure:** LCCPS will establish a partnership with a school in Lowell to begin to share best practices. Partnership activities will include observation opportunities, leading workshops and sharing materials. | Not met | * LCCPS has partnered with the Pawtucket Memorial School to work together on implementation of Scott-Foresman Reading Streets program but has not shared best practices |
| **Measure:** Teachers, administrators, or students will disseminate at the local level two times each year. A LCCPS representative will disseminate at the state level once per year and the national level once per year. | Not met | * The LCCPS principal reported to the renewal inspection team that this measure has not been met. |
| **Measure:** Teachers, administrators, and parent liaisons will establish increasing partnerships in the City of Lowell and the surrounding area to increase awareness of the school’s mission and to provide community service opportunities for Middle School students. | Partial | * LCCPS has formed partnerships with Trader Joe’s, the local neighborhood association, the Boy Scouts, and the Angkor Dance Troupe. |
| **B. Academic Program** | **2008-09 Performance** | **Notes** |
| **Objective:** Students at LCCPS will be proficient readers & Writers of the English language. | | |
| **Measure**: Spring DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) results (K through 5) will indicate that 80% of students who started the year by October 8th at LCCPS will be scoring in the Low Risk category in all grade level specific subtests. | Not met | * Upward trend in K, with 79% low risk in PSF, 81% in NWF, and 72% in LNF * Upward trend in grade 1, with 98% low risk in PSF, 74% in NWF, and 65% in ORF * No change over time in grades 2-5, with 53% of grade 2, 48% of grade 3, 43% of grade 4, and 61% of grade 5 scoring low risk in ORF in 2009. |
| **Measure:** GRADE test results for controlled groups of students, as defined below, will indicate that 80% of students are scoring at the 6th stanine or higher.   * + Grade K control group = students who spent entire kindergarten year at LCCPS   + Grades 1 & 2 control group = students who have been at LCCPS consistently since kindergarten.   + Grades 3 – 8 control group = students who have been at LCCPS for at least three consecutive years. | Not met | 2009 results:   * K - 38% met target * grade 1 - 59% met target * grade 2 - 27% met target * grade 3 – 38% met target * grade 4 – 33% met target * grade 5 – 44% met target * grade 6 – 33% met target * grade 7 – 24% met target * grade 8 – 31% met target |
| **Measure:** AYP and MCAS results will indicate the following:   * + LCCPS will make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year in the aggregate for English Language Arts (ELA). CPI should be not less than targeted 79.9 for school year 2008-2009.   + LCCPS will make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each upper-Mid-Cycle for each of its subgroups in ELA.   + Grade 3 Reading: Students will increase MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System) scores consistently at the *proficient* level. Percentages will consistently decrease at the *Needs Improvement* level and the *Warning* level. No more than 8% of the students who have been at LCCPS for two years will score at the *Warning* level. No student who has been at LCCPS consistently for three or more years will score at the *Warning* level.   + Grades 4-8 English/Language Arts: Students will increase MCAS scores consistently at the *proficient* level. Percentages will consistently decrease at the *Needs Improvement* level and the *Warning* level. No more than 10% of the students who have been at LCCPS for two years will score at the *Warning* level. No student who has been at LCCPS consistently for three or more years will score at the *Warning* level. | Not met | * Did not make AYP in the aggregate in ELA any year except 2007. CPI for 2008-09 is 66.6 * In 2009, the special education and white subgroups made AYP and the LEP, low income, African American, Asian and Hispanic subgroups did not. * Percentage of grade 3 students scoring proficient did not increase. In 2009, 18% of students who had been at LCCPS for 2+ years scored at the warning level, and 24% of students who ad been at LCCPS for 3+ years scored at the warning level. * Percentage of grade 4-8 students scoring proficient did not increase, except in grade 8. In 2009, among 4th-8th grade students who were at LCCPS 2+ years, the percentage at the warning level ranged from 14-33%. Among those who were at the school 3+ years, the percentage at warning ranged from 11-33%. |
| **Measure:** Internal reading assessments (4SIGHT) and Success for All Reading Assessments will indicate that 80% of students who have been at LCCPS consistently for three or more years will be reading at or above their reading level. | Not measured | * Test was discontinued in 2008 * From 2006-2008, this target was not reached at any grade level except grade 3 in 2008 |
| **Measure:** 75% of ELL (English Language Learner) students who have been at LCCPS for two or more years will advance at least one proficiency level on the MEPA (Massachusetts English Performance Assessment). | Not measured | * Did not meet this measure in 2008; 23% of the EL students advanced one or more proficiency levels. * Data was not available for 2009 |
| **Measure:** 75% of students with special needs will pass the MCAS at their grade level given their approved accommodations. | Not met | * From 2005-2008, this target was not met in any grade level in any subject area, except grade 7 ELA in 2005 and grade 8 ELA in 2006. * In 2009, this measure was met only in grade 5 ELA. |
| **Objective**: Students at LCCPS will be proficient in mathematics. | | |
| **Measure:** LCCPS will make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year in the aggregate for mathematics. CPI should be not less than targeted 74.3 for school year 2008-2009.   * + LCCPS will make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each upper-Mid-Cycle for each of its subgroups in Mathematics.   + Students to increase MCAS consistently at the proficient level. Percentages will consistently decrease at the Needs Improvement level and the Warning level. No more than 15% Students who have been at LCCPS for two years will score at the Warning level. No more than 5% of students who have been at LCCPS consistently for three or more years will score at the Warning level. | Not met | * Did not make AYP in the aggregate in math any year except 2007. CPI for 2008-09 is 57.1 * In 2009, the white subgroup made AYP and the special education, LEP, low income, African American, Asian and Hispanic subgroups did not. * Percentage of students scoring proficient did not increase, except at grade 8. * In 2009, among 3rd -8th grade students who were at LCCPS 2+ years, the percentage at the warning level ranged from 36-86%. Among those who were at the school 3+ years, the percentage at warning ranged from 29-41%. |
| **Measure:** G-MADE test results for controlled groups of students, as defined below, will indicate that 80% of students are scoring at the 6th stanine or higher.   * + Grade K control group = students who spent entire kindergarten year at LCCPS   + Grades 1 & 2 control group = students who have been at LCCPS consistently since kindergarten   + Grades 3 – 8 control group = students who have been at LCCPS for at least three consecutive years | Not met | 2009 results:   * K - 42% met target * grade 1 - 30% met target * grade 2 - 19% met target * grade 3 – 49% met target * grade 4 – 30% met target * grade 5 – 50% met target * grade 6 – 29% met target * grade 7 – 35% met target * grade 8 – 25% met target |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **C. Organizational Viability** | **2008-09 Performance** | **Notes** |
| **Objective**: The school will be fiscally solvent and sound. | | |
| **Measure:** Annual expenses will not exceed total income. | Met | * FY07 and FY08 audits indicate that net assets have increased in each of the past fiscal years |
| **Measure**: The school’s annual independent audit will report no major findings. | Not Met | * The FY08 audit indicated significant deficiencies in internal control |
| **Measure:** The Board of Trustees will hold one major fund raising campaign each year, which will include annual targets recorded in the Board of Trustee meeting minutes. | Not met | * Board has not conducted fund raising campaign for several years |
| **Objective**: Families will be satisfied with the education they receive at LCCPS. | | |
| **Measure:** The school will be fully enrolled each year, based on target enrollment figures (enrollment will increase annually to 900 in 2008). | Met | * Enrollment for 2009 is 947 |
| **Measure:** The average score for each item on annual parent satisfaction survey will be 3.0 or higher (1-4 scale). |  | * 148 completed surveys collected in 2008-09 |
| **Measure:** Each year, ninety percent of LCCPS students who finish the school year will reenroll for the following academic year. This calculation will not include students moving out of the Lowell area. | Met | * 125 students (14%) left after the 2007-08 school year * AR states 92% plan to return for 2009-10 school year. |
| **Measure**: The school will lose less that five percent of its student body during the year. This calculation will not include students moving out of the Lowell area. | Met | * 17 students (2%) left during the 2008-09 school year, not including moving away. |
| **Objective:** The Board of Trustees will be a strong governing organization of LCCPS. | | |
| **Measure:** The Board of Trustees’ membership numbers will meet its by-law requirements. | Met | * There have been ten or eleven board members every year of the charter term |
| **Measure**: The Board of Trustees will provide adequate facility space for the school, including overseeing expansion plans, leases, and other necessary items. | Met | * The facility is adequate. The board is in the process of securing funding for the purchase of a new site |
| **Measure:** The Board of Trustees will complete an annual evaluation of the internal management services. | Met | * The board evaluated the interim executive director in February 2009 |
| **Objective**: LCCPS will provide its students with a competent and consistent teaching staff. | | |
| **Measure:** All teachers and teacher assistants will meet the requirements of NCLB. | Met | * The contracts of sixteen teachers who were not highly qualified were not renewed for the 2009-2010 school year. |
| **Measure**: Voluntary teacher turnover will be under 20% annually. This percentage will not include teachers who are not offered new contracts. | Met | * The rate of voluntary teacher turnover has fluctuated between 5% and 9% during the charter term |
| **Measure:** Fifty percent of teachers who are with LCCPS at the beginning of the 2005 – 2010 charter will be at the school at the end of the charter period. This percentage will not include teachers who are not offered new contracts. | Not met | * As of June 2009, 46% of the teachers who were on staff at the beginning of the charter term remained on the staff |
| **Measure:** The administration will provide appropriate oversight and support of new and returning teachers of teachers, including 3 observations per year, mentoring (new teachers), peer coaching, common planning time, grade level and lead teacher meetings, shadowing teachers and providing opportunities for teachers to shadow, and reviewing/completing the Professional Standards rubric. | Not met | * Required observations and evaluations have been conducted, but the school does not have formal mentoring, shadowing or peer coaching programs. |

1. LCCPS reported that it enrolled more than its maximum enrollment at the beginning of the school year because it expects enrollment to drop during the school year. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)