



LOWELL COMMUNITY CHARTER PUBLIC SCHOOL

Learning Together to Live Together

206 Jackson Street
Lowell, MA 01852
Phone (978) 323-0800
Fax (978) 323-4600
www.lccps.org

Annual Report

2007-2008

Mr. Thel Sar, Chairman, Board of Trustees



206 Jackson Street Lowell, MA 01852

Phone (978) 323-0800

Fax (978) 323-4600

www.lccps.org

July 24, 2008

Friends,

I am pleased to submit the 8th Annual Report (2007-2008) from Lowell Community Charter Public School. This means that in this upcoming year, as we enter our 9th operational period, the school will be applying for its second 5 year re-certification. This report outlines results and progress as per our accountability plan and also changes needed for our school to remain true to its charter as we look forward to obtaining that re-certification.

We expect that the gains made in MCAS and AYP in 2006-2007 will continue through 2008-2009. The school also shows a solid demand from our community as we end the school year with full enrollment. To sustain this trend and to improve academic performance, LCCPS will start implementing Scott- Foreman Reading curriculum for grades 1st to 6th. The kindergarten will continue to use the *Kindercorner* curriculum as produced by Success For All while students in grades 7 and 8 will work with a literature program published by Prentice Hall.

In April 2008 Mr. Carlos Aponte, the school's CEO, resigned. At the end of the school year other members of the school leadership resigned as well. This includes 5-8 grades Principal Noreen McAloon and K-4 grades Principal Linda Curetty who resigned at the conclusion of this school year. To all of them we extend our appreciation for all the hard work they did to make our school better.

The Board of Trustees made a slight change to its organizational chart and structure. Instead of having two major academic principals reporting to the CEO, the school will academically be lead by one principal who will be assisted by two assistant principals. We expect that this new format will be cost effective and will improve communication and effectiveness in the interaction of staff-students-parents. The Board is committed to having this leadership in place by the time school opens in August 2008.

Hopefully, all these changes will remain transparent to our students as reflected in our third 8th grade graduation and continuous success by our school athletic programs. Our girls and boys with their contagious enthusiasm and sportsmanship reminded us the reason for which we are here.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank our students, parents, teachers, administrators, city officials, Lowell Police Department, and my fellow board members for

all their hard work involved in sustaining and making our school grow to the excellent academic institution it means to be. I want also welcome Mr. Vesna Nuon and Mr. Marcos Devers as new trustees and thank them for teaming with us in our endeavor.

The same commitment, hard work and enthusiasm will serve us well to achieve an outstanding 2008-2009 academic year in order to validate our request for the 2010-2015 re-certification. Let's do it!

Thel Sar

Chair, Lowell Community Charter Public School

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
MISSION STATEMENT	7
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY	10
<i>Curriculum</i>	11
<i>ELL Proficiency</i>	21
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE	
<i>Academic Program</i>	24
<i>Organizational Viability</i>	49
SCHOOL PROFILE	
OUR STUDENTS	56
<i>Student Demographics</i>	56
<i>Student Application, Waiting List and Turnover Data</i>	57
<i>School Report Card</i>	58
GOVERNANCE	
<i>Board of Trustees</i>	59
<i>Board Committees and Members</i>	60
<i>Major Board Policy Decisions 2006-2007</i>	61
DISSEMINATION	62
<i>Faithfulness to the Charter</i>	
OUR STAFF	
<i>Staff Profile, Staff Turnover and Summary of Teacher Qualifications</i>	66
FINANCES	
<i>Approved School Budget (Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2008)</i>	68
<i>Financial Statement</i>	72
<i>Balance Sheet</i>	73

INTRODUCTION

The Lowell Community Charter Public School (LCCPS) is presently a K-8 school servicing students of many ethnicities from Lowell and neighboring communities. LCCPS promotes students of different cultures learning together so that they can live together within their communities in the future. The school was founded in 2000, and is located at 206 Jackson Street in Lowell, Massachusetts. At the time of its founding, LCCPS was a K-3 school; in accordance with the charter, one additional grade has been added each year until grade 8, the highest grade permitted under the charter, was added during the 2005-2006 school year. LCCPS instructed students in grades K-8 again during 2007-2008, with LCCPS providing separate areas of its building for elementary and middle school students. As of June 19, 2007, the number of students enrolled at LCCPS was 984. The enrollment cap for the 2007-2008 school year was 900, and will remain at 900 through the end of the current charter, 2010.

During the past year, LCCPS expanded enrollment by adding two classrooms at the seventh grade level and a Kindergarten/grade 1 transitional class. Additionally, two counseling areas for the Office of Student Support Services were added and our library was renovated due to a faulty pipe over this area. Space was converted on the primary school side to house a computer lab for the students in kindergarten through grade 3 and space on the second floor added an administrative space for the Curriculum Director and the Reading Coordinator. Presently, LCCPS has maximized the full capacity of its current lease space (110,000 square feet). We have been working with the building owner to convert space formerly used by the Middlesex County Sheriff's Office into another classroom area. A playground area behind the building has been used and equipment from Project Adventure has been recently installed which will complement our new Physical Education curriculum. The City of Lowell finished the construction of a neighboring parking garage, which allows staff and parents to park in a secure location. The Hamilton Canal District of Lowell is undergoing urban renewal giving the school opportunities for partnership endeavors.

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.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lowell Community Charter Public School (LCCPS) has completed its eighth year of preparing children from the Greater Lowell area to succeed as students and citizens. The 2007-2008 school year presented us with the good news of having attained our measurable goals for Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) in MCAS testing. It is our sincere hope to continue this trend each year in order to reach the goals of proficiency as set forth by *No Child Left Behind*. To further this endeavor, we took a serious look at the testing data in order to bolster instructional practice and student learning. Additionally, we organized an MCAS Academy staffed with qualified tutors who worked with identified students in need of supplemental educational services. Likewise, we further prepared our students by hosting a series of practice MCAS tests in Math and English Language Arts/Reading in order to measure the data for student performance and to accommodate special needs students in need of small group administration. Through all of these measures, we are hoping for continued progress in improvement.

We continued our efforts with using Acceleration Teachers in grades 1-4 who can assist classroom teachers in assisting classroom teachers with students who need remediation and/or re-teaching key curricular components. Acceleration Teachers have also assisted in the assessment of students in kindergarten through grade 2 in Reading as well as in administering DIBELS testing so as to identify our students who are struggling with reading. Our ELL program continued to service our students whose first language is not English by providing Reading instruction in the morning, sheltered instruction in all the core academic areas and co-teaching with teachers in the regular classroom setting. This year, we added a K/1 transitional class staffed with a highly qualified teacher and teaching assistant in order to carefully monitor student progress socially, emotionally and academically.

In order to enrich and promote the advancement of our gifted and talented students, the ALPS program has been established as an integral part of our academic program. Through the efforts of Ms. Carey Reeve, a substantial grant from the Aemelia Peabody foundation has bolstered this program for attaining a gifted and talented library, a Prometheus interactive learning board, a portable computer lab and many other enriching academic materials for the benefit of this under identified population. Through the Title V and Javits grants, we offered enrichment clusters in order to expose our faculty and students to areas of interest. These areas included: forensic science, sewing, cooking, photography, journalism, origami, drama and creative writing. Both students and staff looked forward to these weekly classes on Friday afternoons. This program will be further expanded during the next academic year while during the summer, identified gifted students took part in a four-week summer program in which students explored themes in science, art and math along with exciting off-site learning experiences.

Our athletic program also had a successful year while competing in the Greater Lowell Ecumenical League. League championships were garnered in basketball and track and

field and, most noteworthy, some of our track and field stars participated in the state-qualifying meet for the Hershey Track and Field competition. For our physical education program, teachers had received training during the summer of 2007 in Project Adventure. During this past school year, we successfully wrote a grant and received monies from the Edson foundation in order to purchase all the equipment for full implementation of this viable program. Project Adventure provides supplemental instructional programming for building teamwork and goals. For the past two years, our eighth graders have had the experience of a weekend retreat with an integral part being the use of a high ropes course that again highlights the importance of team building and goal orientation.

Our School Improvement Plan for 2007-08 saw the fruition of the piloting of the Scott Foresman reading program. During professional development time in May and June, all staff received training so that full implementation of the program will begin in August. The hiring of highly qualified tutors will allow for small group instruction using the Sidewalks intervention program so as to target those students who show up as exhibiting the need for core remediation from the DIBELS testing. Another area that will continue to evolve is the mapping of all curricular areas using TechPaths software. This will provide us with both a horizontal and vertical picture of the areas of instruction critical to the education of the whole child. Along with data analysis of student performance on the 2008 MCAS testing, we should be well on our way for continued forward progress in having more students attain proficiency.

We look forward to beginning our ninth year at LCCPS as we will have reached our full capacity at each grade level. The class of 2009 will have students who have been with us since kindergarten. We will also be preparing documentation as we enter the critical period for charter renewal. The 2008-2009 academic year appears to be one of great growth and importance for the LCCPS learning community.

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

Lowell Community Charter Public School is a school where we strive to develop the whole child to become a lover of learning and a valid contributor to society. We believe in high expectations for our children as we continuously develop their emotional, social and intellectual well being. It is important to provide enriching learning experiences that stimulate deeper and broader scholarship. Primary to our educational focus is the development of a child's reading and writing ability, which has wide implications as a student embarks in the study of mathematics, science, social studies, language, art, music, physical education and health.

Lowell Community Charter Public School provides a longer school day as well as a longer school year. Students in all grades are required to read for twenty minutes each day and to complete writing and math homework daily. Our student's day is devoted to academics. The teaching schedule is designed for large, uninterrupted blocks of instruction in reading, writing, math, science, and social studies. Additionally, all students receive 30-45 minutes of instruction daily in Khmer or Spanish. Other "specials" include music, art, computer technology, library science and physical education. Additionally, we have developed an educational program for our gifted and talented students as it is well known that urban, minority youth tend to be an under identified population

District Curriculum Accommodation Plan

The vision 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. Our highest priority is the promotion of academic achievement for all students and the acknowledgement that each student is an individual with unique learning styles and needs. We realize that the education of our children is comprehensive and must support the physical, emotional, intellectual, artistic and social development of each child. Accessible and equitable education for all students must provide students with the opportunities to have their educational needs met within a regular educational setting. In order to provide all students with these opportunities, Lowell Community Charter Public School acknowledges that by giving teachers and students the proper strategies and tools, they will be able to work to achieve high and rigorous academic goals. It is the school's responsibility to provide assistance in the following areas:

- Training for staff so that they will be able to analyze and accommodate the diverse learning styles of all students.
- Support services that are attentive to the needs of students whose behavior may put them at risk for making academic progress.

- Direct and prescribed instruction in Reading along with interventions provided for students at risk.
- Encouragement of active participation and involvement of parents in their children's education.
- Alignment and continuous review of all curricular areas in relation to the standards set forth in the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks.
- Teacher mentoring and high quality professional development in content areas, instructional practice and the affective domain of education.

Curriculum

The mission of the LCCPS curriculum is three-fold: cultural, academic, and behavioral. We treat the multilingual and multicultural aspects of the student as assets to be valued and strengthened as vehicles in the development of self-awareness, self esteem, self-confidence and strong character. Throughout this process, we develop in students a love of learning toward the end of achieving the highest possible academic performance.

All academic programs and planning at LCCPS are guided by the standards of learning as set forth in the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Through our efforts in curriculum mapping, we are ensuring that our curricular units of instruction are aligned with the frameworks in all subject areas. Because reading is the foundation for learning, it is an area of major focus across all subject areas and grade levels.

Overview

Kindergarten

Kindercorner (produced by *Success for All*) The following thematic units represent a comprehensive kindergarten program.

Units: Welcome to School
 I Am Amazing! I Feel Fine!
 Those Nearest and Dearest
 Head to Toe
 Cornucopia
 What's on the Menu?
 Sing a Song-Paint a Picture
 Winter Weatherland
 Day & Night, Dark & Light
 Words & Roads Take Us Places
 Safe & Sound
 Fur & Feathers
 Water Wonders

Reading K-6 Success for All

Reading Roots provides a strong base for successful reading by providing systematic phonics instruction supported by decodable stories, as well as instruction in fluency and comprehension. *Reading Roots* also fosters students' love of reading by providing rich literature experiences, extensive oral language development, and thematically focused writing instruction. These objectives are embedded in a fast-paced, engaging, and effective instructional process. Students are assessed and regrouped according to their reading level every quarter to ensure they are receiving the most focused instruction.

FastTrack Phonics

Colorful mnemonic pictures are integrated with alliterative phrases, sounds, and letter cues to provide phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in six skills: letter-sound correspondence, auditory sound blending, word-level blending, writing sounds, auditory segmentation of sounds, and sound spelling. Entertaining puppets, chants, and games add fun to the fast-paced systematic instruction that is designed to review and introduce sounds and their written representations. Teachers decide to review or accelerate lessons based on informal monitoring and diagnostic assessments.

Reading Wings is a 90-minute daily comprehensive program that targets the needs of students reading at the 2nd through 6th grade levels to ensure their consistent growth as proficient readers. *Reading Wings* is based on scientific principles and proven, through control-group research, to improve students' reading comprehension. Students are assessed and regrouped according to their reading level every quarter to ensure they are receiving the most focused instruction possible.

Students in grades 2-6 who have successfully learned to decode need more sophisticated reading skills to become proficient readers. These skills include vocabulary development, reading comprehension, fluency, oral language development, and written expression. Students also need ample opportunities to read both narrative and expository text.

Reading Wings teaches students comprehension strategies, such as summarization, clarification, graphic organizers, story structure, and prediction, so that students can become confident, strategic readers.

Reading Wings lessons feature the following parts:

Listening Comprehension

Teachers use fiction or nonfiction text to model strategic reading and engage students in interactive dialogue about story elements, author's craft, or expository text structure. The teacher reads the selection interactively with the students, asks higher-order thinking questions, and involves them in discussing the story structure of narrative and expository text, literary devices, genres, and making predictions.

Teamwork

Students spend approximately 55 minutes participating in reading together. During this time, student activities are guided by "Treasure Hunts" that are created to support a variety of reading materials, from the second- through eighth-grade reading levels.

“Treasure Hunts” focus on story-related activities, which begin with teacher-directed story motivation, vocabulary, and story introduction. Partner/team practice guides students through a sequence for reading and discussing the text. Teachers closely monitor student teams to model the use of comprehension strategies.

Adventures in Writing

These activities are linked to the texts that the students are reading. They are designed to extend students’ thinking about certain concepts or skills, provide instruction in different types of writing, and engage students in working through the writing process in a cooperative setting.

The Reading Edge is a research-based and research-proven program designed to meet the unique needs of young adolescent readers. Since the range of reading achievement is extremely broad in this age group, the Reading Edge provides programs for students at beginning through 8th-grade+ reading levels. Students are assessed and placed at their appropriate reading levels. Students reading at a third-grade level or higher focus on developing comprehension strategies using both narrative and expository texts. Students reading at earlier levels use high-interest fiction, nonfiction, and *Reader’s Theatre* to develop basic decoding skills, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. All levels focus on building background knowledge and developing study skills to foster future success in school and beyond. Like all programs in the SFA family, *the Reading Edge* uses cooperative-learning techniques to engage students in their learning and to create a positive classroom environment.

Middle school students who are reading at a second and third grade level have mastered basic phonics skills, but they haven’t achieved enough reading fluency to make contact with the more advanced reading, contact that first occurs at the fourth grade reading level. The goal of these units is to give students at this level the help they need to achieve a fourth grade reading level as quickly as possible. This general goal can be broken down into the following areas:

1. The students will acquire word recognition skills. In levels 2 - 3, teachers give students direct instruction in techniques they can use to successfully decode unfamiliar words, such as using phonetic clues within the word, using other words in the text as clues, breaking down multisyllabic words, and identifying prefixes, suffixes, and base words.

2. The students will achieve greater reading fluency. Fluency is simply the ability to read smoothly at an acceptable speed with few errors and with good expression. While students can sometimes read fluently without understanding what they read, achieving fluency frees up the intellectual resources that students need to accomplish comprehension tasks.

3. The students will continue to develop their vocabulary. These students need help with both learning completely new words (a task that is particularly critical for students who are learning English as a Second Language) and with learning to read words that are already in their spoken vocabulary. Levels 2 - 3 offer activities that assist with both aspects of vocabulary development.

4. The students will learn basic comprehension strategies. While levels 2 - 3 appropriately emphasize fluency over comprehension, the students will learn that fluency is only important to the extent that it results in better and more efficient understanding. Fluency is thus always taught in tandem with guidance on and checks for comprehension. The comprehension strategies that are offered range from basic clarifying techniques (such as sounding words out, looking at other words and pictures for clues, and asking for help) to strategies that contribute to active reading, such as predicting, asking questions, making mind movies, and summarizing.

5. The students will learn to write in response to what they read. Levels 2 - 3 focus on helping students write correct and complete sentences, applying appropriate punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and spelling.

ELA Grades 7 and 8 Prentice Hall Literature (Penguin Edition)

The reading selections combine classic as well as modern/contemporary selections for students to read and discuss.

Extensive teaching support for differentiated instruction includes:

- Diagnostic and Benchmark Tests
- Leveled Tests for every selection
- Leveled Reading and Vocabulary Warm-ups for every selection
- Worksheets to support skills taught with each selection
- Worksheets to support Workshops, Communications Workshops, Spelling Workshops
- Skills Concept Maps
- Comprehensive, well organized, and easy-to-follow planning and instructional support:
- Built-in differentiated instruction, including “Accessibility at a Glance” charts with selection readability, context, language load, and concept levels helps teachers match selections with student proficiency levels
- Step-by-step teaching guide with direct instruction
- Unit level pacing plans that show you how to navigate through the program, cover all your standards, and monitor and benchmark student progress
- Extended vocabulary support

Pilot Program: *Reading Street 2008*

During the academic year 2007-2008, six teachers in grades 1-6 piloted the Reading/Language Arts program *Reading Street* published by Scott Foresman. In August, these teachers received two days of intensive training to enable them to implement the program. In October, another day of observation and consultation was conducted at the teachers' request to assist them with the program. In December, the entire staff spent two hours being introduced to the program. The focus was on the philosophy of the program and the materials available to support teaching and learning

in Reading and Language Arts. Since the decision has been made to purchase this program for the next academic year, staff received two afternoons of training in May and June by reading consultants from Scott Foresman Publishing.

Spelling

The *Words Their Way* program is a practical way to study words with students. Based on research into invented and developmental spelling, this word study program provides spelling assessments that place students into one of five stages of spelling development that align with reading development stages. *Words Their Way* complements the use of existing phonics, spelling and vocabulary curricula.

The *Words Their Way* program:

- Introduces word study as a tool for supporting individual reading styles
- Explores the five developmental phases of spelling discussed in the book: Emergent, Letter Name-Alphabetic, Within-Word Pattern, Syllables and Affixes, and Derivational Relations
- Helps educators teach phonics
- Offers strategies for helping teachers with ELL or ESL students

Writing

Empowering Writers is a comprehensive writing curriculum that supports the teaching of state standards through innovative curriculum materials for students and professional development opportunities for teachers that emphasize proven teaching methods and lessons. Accountability for both teachers and students is enhanced through the use of these strategies and materials, which are designed to promote consistency in instruction across and between grade levels.

Empowering Writers provides educators with teaching strategies and straightforward lesson plans for teaching writing in ways that promote growth of skills and understanding not only in writing, but spanning across subject areas. The skill-focused teaching methods have continually proven to be effective for students at varying developmental levels and with diverse learning strengths.

The *Empowering Writers* curriculum alignment for the elementary grades is shown across the curriculum, spanning all subject areas, indicating the strength of the materials for building student skills and competencies. Because the lessons build student skills relevant to so many subjects, teachers find that using *Empowering Writers* often helps streamline the process of addressing many skill areas across a grade level curriculum. Moving from primary to middle grades, the alignment indicates an increasingly strong emphasis in the areas of reading and language arts. The middle school alignment focuses solely on the English Language Arts and Reading skill areas.

Science **Grades 1-5**

Scott Foresman's research-based science program provides hands-on, inquiry-rich content that is linked to real life. Each grade level focuses on the four major strands: Life Science, Physical Science, Earth Science and the Human Body. An abundance of resources provide teachers with all the necessary ingredients for teachers to model experiments and for students to perform and observe labs using scientific methodology. Videos, interactive online resources, and digital media engage students. Cross-curricular connections help students with mathematics and reading. Tutorial DVD's and companion guides build professional development and help teachers plan lessons and assessments.

Science Grades 6-8 *Science Explorer* (Prentice Hall)

This is a thematic-based program which consists of unit texts with a wealth of supplemental materials. Similar to the science program in grades 1-5, teachers and students have the opportunity to utilize the scientific method through experimentation and observation as they prepare lab reports outlining the objectives and conclusions. With the thematic-based program, middle school teachers of Science can collectively decide what topics to cover at each of the grade levels to align with the curriculum strands included in the Massachusetts Curriculum frameworks. Titles include:

<i>The Nature of Science and Technology</i>	<i>Human Biology and Health</i>
<i>From Bacteria to Plants</i>	<i>Animals</i>
<i>Cells and Heredity</i>	<i>Environmental Science</i>
<i>Inside Earth</i>	<i>Earth's Changing Surface</i>
<i>Astronomy</i>	<i>Chemical Building Blocks</i>
<i>Weather and Climate</i>	<i>Electricity and Magnetism</i>
<i>Motion, Forces and Energy</i>	<i>Sound and Light</i>

Math

Distar Math Kindergarten

The Distar Arithmetic Program is based on the concept that all children can learn if carefully taught. It attempts to provide the instruction necessary to teach basic skills and gives teachers a comprehensive guide of the requirements that will ensure that the students will master each skill.

The sequence of skills is controlled so that the children will be able to perform the skills at each step before progressing to more complicated skills. The program provides teacher-directed activities and worksheets for group work as well as independent work. The following skills are introduced:

- Manipulating the basic operations of addition, algebra addition, and subtraction
- Working simple story problems involving the aforementioned operations
- Working simple problems involving the signs $>$ and $<$
- Deriving new arithmetic facts based on an understanding of approximately 35 facts
- Applying ordinal counting to picture problems

Everyday Math

Curriculum Features

There are a number of features that distinguish the *Everyday Mathematics* curriculum. These include:

- *Real-life Problem Solving:* *Everyday Mathematics* emphasizes the application of mathematics to real world situations. Numbers, skills and mathematical concepts are not presented in isolation, but are linked to situations and contexts that are relevant to everyday lives. The curriculum also provides numerous suggestions for incorporating mathematics into daily classroom routines and other subject areas.
- *Balanced Instruction:* Each *Everyday Mathematics* lesson includes time for whole-group instruction as well as small group, partner, or individual activities. These activities balance teacher-directed instruction with opportunities for open-ended, hands-on explorations, long-term projects and on-going practice.
- *Multiple Methods for Basic Skills Practice:* *Everyday Mathematics* provides numerous methods for basic skills practice and review. These include written and choral fact drills, mental math routines, practice with fact triangles (flash cards of fact families), daily sets of review problems called math boxes, homework, timed tests and a wide variety of math games.
- *Emphasis on Communication:* Throughout the *Everyday Mathematics* curriculum students are encouraged to explain and discuss their mathematical thinking, in their own words. Opportunities to verbalize their thoughts and strategies give children the chance to clarify their thinking and gain insights from others.
- *Enhanced Home/School Partnerships:* For grades 1-3, daily *Home Links* provide opportunities for family members to participate in the students' mathematical learning. Study Links are provided for most lessons in grades 4-6, and all grades include periodic letters to help keep parents informed about their children's experience with *Everyday Mathematics*
- *Appropriate Use of Technology:* *Everyday Mathematics* teaches students how to use technology appropriately. The curriculum includes many activities in which

learning is extended and enhanced through the use of calculators. At the same time, all activities intended to reinforce basic computation skills are clearly marked with a "no calculator" sign.

In grades 7 and 8, students continue their study of Math using resources produced by McDougal Lital. This work is supplemented with units from the *Connected Math Program*, which provides enriching vocabulary along with specific practice in problem solving and practicing the format of open response questions.

Social Studies

In grades one and two, teachers create units of instruction based on the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. In grade one, units revolve around the theme of "My School and Family". They learn about traditions and the way that people interact and change. The theme of community is expanded upon in grade 2. Students study the interactive elements that make a community function and how community helpers lead in the ongoing development of their community.

Grade 3: Massachusetts, Our Home

Students study the geography, history, economy and government of their home state. Teachers have a variety of resources at their disposal for enhancing instruction:

- Correlation of Material to the Standards
- Teaching Strategies and Objectives
- Extended Learning and Multidisciplinary Activities
- Suggestions for Further Reading and Internet Exploration
- Over 100 Student Activity Worksheets (reproducible)
- Chapter Tests and Answer Pages
- Blank Diagrams and Map Masters

History Alive grades 4-8

The Teachers Curriculum Institute approach to the teaching of Social Studies consists of a series of instructional practices that allow students of all abilities to experience and understand key social studies concepts. Lessons and activities are based on five theories of learning:

- Understanding by design
- Nonlinguistic Representation
- Multiple Intelligences (visual discovery, skill builder, experiential exercise, writing for understanding, response groups and problem solving)

- Cooperative Interaction
- Spiral Curriculum

Grade 4: *Regions of Our Country* presents five regions of the United States through the prospective of the four social sciences: economics, geography, political science and history. Students have the opportunity to think and act like social scientists as they tour the various regions. They investigate the features of these regions, which make them distinct as well as similar in the formation of a united country.

Grade 5 *America's Past* This course of study covers American history from the period of early migration to America through the early 20th century. Students become keen observers of the people, places and events that helped to create our great nation.

Grade 6 *World Geography: Regions and People* This course provides challenges for students as they learn to use the tools of geography to view, analyze and understand the world around them. Mapping labs and the case-study approach allow students to think as geographers. The text has been specially designed to build content area reading skills.

Grade 7 *The Ancient World* This course introduces students to the beginnings of the human story as they explore the great early civilizations of Egypt, and the Near East, India, China, Greece and Rome. Students discover the secrets of these ancient civilizations as they continue to influence the world today.

Grade 8 *The Medieval World and Beyond* This course explores the legacy of civilizations from Europe, Africa and the Middle East to the Americas. Students discover the rich connections to the past as they read about such topics as the decline of feudalism and the revolutions in science, exploration and thought.

The Arts

Creative visual learning at LCCPS enables students to interpret their perceptions and understanding of the world in visual form. To practice the visual arts at LCCPS promotes creative problem solving, conceptual thought and self-expression. Likewise, our school prides itself in also stressing the importance of the performing arts. In the elementary school, emphasis is placed on the skills of singing and movement, playing instruments, improvisation and composition, and critical response. These same strands are expanded upon in the upper grades as they develop the voice and body as instruments of musical expression, play instruments as a means of musical expression and create music through improvising, arranging and composing.

Technology

At LCCPS, we believe that technology, properly implemented into the classroom, can significantly contribute to student achievement and can enhance a student's life-long potential. Our students have access to the knowledge and skills of technology so that they may be able to access, exchange and analyze information and develop critical thinking and problem solving skills. They will use age-appropriate technology for conducting research, analyzing data, problem solving and communicating with peers and teachers.

Specific technology objectives:

- Using and understanding basic technology vocabulary
- Selecting and using appropriate technology
- Caring for technology and using it safely
- Identifying functions and advantages of computer productivity software
- Employing basic computer management software
- Creating and saving documents
- Selecting, viewing and printing documents
- Editing texts
- Creating tables, graphs, databases and spreadsheets
- Creating multi-media presentations

World Language

Spanish

The primary years are the most effective time to acquire literacy in a second language. With [*¡Viva el español!*](#) and [*Español para ti*](#), young second-language learners build fluency through fun, age-appropriate lessons. Designed specifically for young children, Systems A, B, and C develop communicative competence in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and Hispanic cultures. The progression is gradual and linguistically appropriate. Language acquisition becomes a positive, non-threatening experience, similar to the way children learn their first language. The textbooks and their accompanying components develop and advance proficiency while promoting basic language-acquisition principles through an enthusiastic, lively, and positive approach. Students not only develop immediate language skills, but are also equipped with useful, life-long language acquisition strategies.

In the upper grades, students continue their study of Spanish with a strong emphasis on the four major components of language learning: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Students study and compare cultures of the Spanish-speaking world through readings and an integrated video/DVD program.

Khmer

As Lowell has the second largest Khmer speaking population in the United States, teachers strive to preserve this language and culture through the same language techniques and practices as used in the study of a modern foreign language. Due to the shortage of instructional materials, teachers create most of their materials for enhancing instruction. A fluid K-8 program for the development of language skills as well as a continued appreciation of the Cambodian culture are strongly emphasized.

Library Science

Students become increasingly familiar with the use of the library media center. They learn to distinguish between fiction and nonfiction and their differentiated call numbers. Students are introduced to the purpose and arrangement of the classification system and learn to identify the title page, publisher, call number and index of materials. Their appreciation of literature increases as they become familiar with different types of literature. In the upper grades, students learn the rudiments of research skills in preparation of various informational reports.

Physical Education

The Physical Education Program focuses on the development of gross motor skills while progressing toward the development of fine motor and coordination skills. Units of skill further develop eye-hand and eye-foot coordination, locomotor skills and spatial awareness.

In the middle school, students continue to focus on the development of motor and coordination skills and an understanding of the basic concepts and principles of training and exercise for lifelong fitness and wellness. Students participate in instructional units in a variety of individual, team and personal fitness activities. Sport specific skills and coordination skills are presented in a scaffolded sequence.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER – ELL - PROFICIENCY

ELL Student Initial Identification

When students are registered for admission to the school, families are asked to complete a home language survey to help identify students that may be classified as English Language Learners for proper class placement. The survey indicates whether

another language is spoken at home, or by the student and/or family. This information may also be obtained from previous school records, teachers, or language proficiency tests that the ELL department administers.

During the summer months, ELL teachers take part in the initial screening process for incoming kindergarten students by using the Pre-LAS assessment tool. The results of the screening assist in placing students particularly if there is a need for a teacher or teaching assistant who is fluent in the child's primary language. ELL students enrolled in the kindergarten program received "sheltered" instruction in structured English immersion classrooms. All instruction and instructional materials are written in English and teachers make use of specific strategies to promote development of vocabulary, literacy and English language skills. Students at the early beginning level for English language proficiency receive additional "pull out" services from members of the ELL department

State-Mandated Assessments

ELL students participate in the Massachusetts state mandated assessments. Classroom teachers who have completed MELA-O training rate an ELL student's command of speaking and listening comprehension skills once in the fall and again in the spring. For the purpose of assessing reading and writing, students complete the MEPA test in early March. For the past two years, ELL students in kindergarten through grade 2 complete the IDEA Proficiency test. A breakdown and analysis of these scores is included in this report.

Elementary/Middle School, Structured English Immersion Program

In Grades 1-8, English Language Learners also receive sheltered instruction in structured English immersion classrooms. The nature of instruction varies according to the English proficiency levels of the English Language Learners. Such instruction might include one or more of the following:

- Daily English Language development class that focuses on developing oral and literacy skills in English. These classes occur during the traditional literacy block, which are 90 minutes in length for students in grades 1-4 and 60 minutes for students in grades 5-8. These classes are taught by highly qualified ELL teachers. Currently, our teachers employ the *Avenues* series published by Hampton Brown.
- Daily sheltered content instruction that focuses on vocabulary and skill development in one or more of the following subject areas: math, science, and social studies. New materials have been purchased which are sensitive to the vocabulary and background knowledge that need to be explained for student comprehension of key concepts.
- Daily in-class support from a qualified ELL teacher and/or acceleration teacher using an inclusionary model for instruction.
- After school ELL tutoring and/or homework help.

Professional Development

As part of our charter, teachers return one week prior to the opening of school in August. This past summer, new staff reported three days prior to the return of veteran staff. New teachers received training in ELL teaching techniques. Due to monies from an Aemelia Peabody grant, all teachers received Category 1 training in sheltered immersion instructional practices. Part of the training requires teachers to compose a lesson with attention to the elements of the Massachusetts Instructional Objectives for English Language Learners (ELPBO). A sample lesson plan follows at the end of this segment.

LCCPS has partnered with the Hampshire Educational Collaborative in providing professional development opportunities for teachers. We currently have approximately 10 staff members who are enrolled in either coursework for licensure or are matriculating toward an advanced degree. Of these 10 teachers, four teachers will be earning a Master's degree in ELL under the auspices of Fitchburg State College. Through the Hampshire Collaborative's federal Transition to Licensed Teaching grant, three of our teachers are able to pursue their studies tuition-free. Another LCCPS teacher is receiving tuition funding at the University of Massachusetts at Boston as he pursues a Master's degree in ELL.

To further open the channels of communication among teachers, parents and students, teachers were offered the opportunity to study Spanish and Khmer. Two of our teachers taught useful vocabulary and phrases that relate to school topics to approximately 15 teachers.

Parent Academy

In the fall of 2007, LCCPS received an educational grant from a local credit union for the purpose of providing financial literacy courses for our parents. Teachers interested in becoming instructors for this program received training and instructional materials from the credit union. These materials were provided in English, Spanish and Khmer as those languages are representative of our student population. Along with funding from the Peabody grant, English classes for adults were offered two evenings per week. The English classes were well subscribed to by both parents and a couple of our janitorial staff. We are hoping to offer these classes during the 2008-09 school year as it is difficult to find available Adult Education classes within the city of Lowell.

Sheltered English Lesson Plan 7th grade Social Studies Developed by Mr. Peter Crowe

Content Objectives:

Students will be able to understand:

1. The key arguments in Socrates' trial
2. The concepts of oligarchy and democracy

Language Objectives

Students will be able to:

1. Vocabulary: Understand the vocabulary relating to the trial of Socrates and Athenian society
2. Spelling: Spell the new vocabulary words.
3. Discourse: Write two paragraphs explaining why they think the Athenians were angry with Socrates.
4. Paragraph: Write a topic sentence plus three more sentences explaining why Socrates was unpopular.
5. Topic Sentence: Develop the topic sentence based on the premise that the citizens of Athens were angry with Socrates.
6. Functional Language: Explain how Socrates' teaching caused young men to question their fathers.

Procedure: The teacher and students will read together aloud a short passage on the trial and execution of Socrates. There will be an activity sheet in which the students will be asked to match a series of statements with the correct missing vocabulary word. Students will be allowed to refer to the reading in order to aid their retrieval of information.

Day 1

1. Ask the students if they have ever heard of Socrates or Plato. TO encourage discussion, ask them if they have ever heard the quote: "The unexamined life is not worth living." And what they think that this quote means. (*Life without the freedom to think what you want is not a life worth living.*) Allow time for questions and/or discussion.
2. Read (as a class) the passage about Athenian society, the trial of Socrates and its outcome. Allow time for further questions and discussion about what the class has just read. Ask if they can think of examples from their own lives or of someone who has chosen suffering for what they believe to be right, rather than just going along to get along. How does that make them feel?
3. Have the students match the vocabulary words to the matching concepts. (Language Objectives 1 and 2)

Vocabulary: dialogue, Sophists, democracy, oligarchy, polis, hemlock, verdict, Athens, Plato

Day 2

4. Have the students work in groups and write notes on the following:
 - Why were the Athenians angry with the Sophists?
 - Why were the Athenians angry with Socrates who was not a Sophist?

Using their notes, students will write two short paragraphs on the reasons for Athenian anger with Socrates. (Students at MELA-O levels 3-5 should do this independently while students with the MELA-O levels 0-2 should be given the exercise with the introductory topic sentence. These latter students may also use sequencing maps and paragraph templates in order to organize their writing.) (Language Outcomes 1,2,3,4,5)

Lowell Community Charter Public School Annual Report Summary of Performance

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

1. Academic Program

Following the renewal of its charter, Lowell Community Charter Public School (LCCPS) established the following academic goals in its revised Accountability Plan for 2005-2010, as approved by the Massachusetts Department of Education (DOE) in October 2005:

❖ **Academic Goal 1**

Students at LCCPS will be proficient readers & writers of the English language.

Measure 1:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

In 2003, LCCPS competed for and was awarded a 5-year, \$1.2M Reading First Grant. The purpose of this federal grant is to ensure that all students read at grade level by the end of third grade. The grant has provided the school with over \$200,000 worth of reading and teaching materials, new test instruments, technical support, and targeted professional development in the teaching of reading. The assessment tools employed within the Reading First initiative are the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE). The DIBELS assesses different skills at different grades. Oral Reading Fluency is assessed in the second through fifth grades. In Kindergarten and first grade, subtests include: Initial Sound Fluency, Letter Naming Fluency, Phonemic Segmentation Fluency, and Nonsense Word Fluency. Student achievement is reported in three levels: Low Risk (students are meeting benchmarks through core reading program), Some Risk (students are slightly below benchmark and need supplemental instruction to progress) and High Risk (students are not progressing through the core and supplemental instruction and may require an intervention program to meet benchmarks and progress).

When looking at the DIBELS data, it is important to note that the subtests sometimes change or are not administered throughout the year. At a certain point, students are expected to have mastered that skill and are working on a different skill; therefore, you may see "N/A" (Not Administered) listed in a table. Also, the benchmark continually

changes with each administration. The bar is set higher for that skill. As a result, data occasionally decline between benchmark dates as some students may have reached the benchmark in one administration, but not in the next one.

Table 1: DIBELS 2007-2008 Subtests (Kindergarten)

	<u>Initial Sound Fluency</u>	<u>Letter Naming Fluency</u>		
FIRST SCREENING	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>		
At Risk (Intervention)	<u>25%</u>	<u>40%</u>		
Some Risk (Supplemental)	<u>24%</u>	<u>14%</u>		
Low Risk (Core)	<u>51%</u>	<u>46%</u>		
	<u>Initial Sound Fluency</u>	<u>Letter Naming Fluency</u>	<u>Phonemic Segment Fluency</u>	<u>Nonsense Word Fluency</u>
SECOND SCREENING	<u>Winter 2008</u>	<u>Winter 2008</u>	<u>Winter 2008</u>	<u>Winter 2008</u>
At Risk (Intervention)	<u>19%</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>9%</u>
Some Risk (Supplemental)	<u>49%</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>9%</u>
Low Risk (Core)	<u>32%</u>	<u>69%</u>	<u>71%</u>	<u>82%</u>
		<u>Letter Naming Fluency</u>	<u>Phonemic Segment Fluency</u>	<u>Nonsense Word Fluency</u>
THIRD SCREENING		<u>Spring 2008</u>	<u>Spring 2008</u>	<u>Spring 2008</u>
At Risk (Intervention)		<u>11%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>7%</u>
Some Risk (Supplemental)		<u>18%</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>14%</u>
Low Risk (Core)		<u>70%</u>	<u>77%</u>	<u>79%</u>

As shown in Table 1, Kindergarten students achieved the Accountability Plan goal for the subtests of Nonsense Word Fluency (82% low risk) during the Winter 2008 assessment. Results for the other two tests were somewhat below the target, but showed improvement over the results from Spring 2007. LCCPS' Kindergarten teachers and assistants will continue to place greater emphasis on Initial Sound Fluency and Letter Naming Fluency to improve these scores. It may be necessary to document further development in these two areas going into the spring season in order to ensure that these two important areas are strengthened as students move to first grade.

Table 2: DIBELS 2007-2008 Subtests (Grade 1)

	<u>Letter Naming Fluency</u>	<u>Phonemic Segment Fluency</u>	<u>Nonsense Word Fluency</u>	
FIRST SCREENING	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	
At Risk (Intervention)	<u>19%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>13%</u>	
Some Risk (Supplemental)	<u>29%</u>	<u>26%</u>	<u>24%</u>	
Low Risk (Core)	<u>53%</u>	<u>63%</u>	<u>64%</u>	
		<u>Phonemic Segment Fluency</u>	<u>Nonsense Word Fluency</u>	<u>Oral Reading Fluency</u>
SECOND SCREENING	<u>Winter 2008</u>	<u>Winter 2008</u>	<u>Winter 2008</u>	<u>Winter 2008</u>
At Risk (Intervention)		<u>2%</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>17%</u>
Some Risk (Supplemental)		<u>7%</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>30%</u>
Low Risk (Core)		<u>91%</u>	<u>54%</u>	<u>53%</u>
		<u>Phonemic Segment Fluency</u>	<u>Nonsense Word Fluency</u>	<u>Oral Reading Fluency</u>
THIRD SCREENING		<u>Spring 2008</u>	<u>Spring 2008</u>	<u>Spring 2008</u>
At Risk (Intervention)		<u>2%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>24%</u>
Some Risk (Supplemental)		<u>5%</u>	<u>29%</u>	<u>25%</u>
Low Risk (Core)		<u>93%</u>	<u>69%</u>	<u>51%</u>

Table 2 shows that Grade 1 students showed consistent progress during the school year and have mastered Phonemic Segmentation Fluency, but continued emphasis is needed for Nonsense Word Fluency and Oral Reading Fluency. As indicated in last year's report, LCCPS completed DIBELS assessments on three occasions during 2006-2007 school year (in previous years, DIBELS assessments were administered twice) to further assist teachers in targeting instruction by providing additional and more timely data. LCCPS will continue to target additional instruction in these areas in the coming 2008-2009 school year through its Accelerated Learning Teachers/Tutors program. During the 2007-2008 school year, LCCPS retrained teachers in how to correctly and effectively administer the DIBELS test.

Table 3: DIBELS – 2007-2008 – Oral Reading Fluency (Grades 2-5)

	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
FALL 2007 TESTING				
At Risk (Intervention)	25%	26%	22%	18%
Some Risk (Supplemental)	30%	24%	21%	29%
Low Risk (Core)	45%	50%	57%	54%
WINTER 2008 TESTING				
At Risk (Intervention)	21%	27%	17%	15%
Some Risk (Supplemental)	22%	18%	27%	36%
Low Risk (Core)	57%	55%	56%	49%
SPRING 2008 TESTING				
At Risk (Intervention)	26%	26%	16%	14%
Some Risk (Supplemental)	21%	26%	35%	32%
Low Risk (Core)	53%	48%	49%	54%

Table includes the results of the Fall 2007, Winter 2008, and Spring 2008 DIBELS for Oral Reading Fluency for Grades 2 through 5. No grade level was able to achieve the 80% benchmark objective. It is interesting to note that the percentage of students who scored in the Low Risk category increased from the fall to winter testing session, but tended to decrease from the winter to the spring testing. More examination into which students are not progressing in their fluency needs to be checked as well as observing how much time is allowed for students to practice fluency as part of the daily lesson plan for Reading class. As indicated in last year's report, LCCPS completed DIBELS assessments on three occasions during 2006-2007 school year (in previous years, DIBELS assessments were administered twice) to further assist teachers in targeting instruction by providing additional and more timely data. During the 2006-2007 school year, LCCPS trained its Lead Teachers for each grade in using Testwiz to access and analyze their classroom's data to target students at risk and to drive instruction. During 2007-2008, LCCPS continued to train other teaching staff in using Testwiz as well as piloted a new program (Scott Foresman) for a comprehensive approach to reading in Grades 1-6 that more effectively integrates reading and writing with science, mathematics, and social studies.

Measure 2:

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

Affirmative Evidence

For Grades 1-8, the GRADE exam consists of several subtests in both Vocabulary (Word Reading, Word Meaning) and Comprehension (Passage Comprehension, Sentence Comprehension, and Listening Comprehension). For Kindergarten, only the Listening Comprehension subtest is used. The GRADE is administered two to three times per year at LCCPS as another internal assessment of literacy skills. Scores on each of the subtests are combined to yield a Total Test score that is converted/scaled to a stanine unit. Stanine is short for “standard nine-point scale”, ranging from 9 to 1. Typically, stanine scores are interpreted as above average/strength (7-9), average (4-6), and below average/weak (0-3). Using only nine numbers, stanine scoring is usually easier to understand than other scoring models. Stanine scores are also used to compare a student’s performance across different content areas. For example, a 6 in Mathematics and an 8 in Reading generally indicates a meaningful difference in a student’s learning for the two respective content areas. The following tables show GRADE Total Test results for the Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 test events. As well, the scores for the subset of students representing the control groups defined in Measure 2 above are also provided for each grade level.

Table 4: GRADE – Listening Comprehension (Kindergarten)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	39 %	24 %	22 %
Average (4-6)	42 %	32 %	35 %
Strength (7-9)	19 %	44 %	43 %
6th Stanine or Higher	19 %	44 %	43 %

Of the 142 kindergarten students who took both the fall and spring GRADE test, one student decreased by 4 stanines, 4 students decreased by 3 stanines, 7 students decreased by 2 stanines and 7 students decreased by 1 stanine. 52 students remained at the same stanine level. On the improvement side, 15 students increased by 1 stanine level, 31 students increased their stanine level by 2, 10 students increased their stanine level by 3, 13 students increased their stanine level by 4 and 2 students increased their stanine level by 5.

As can be seen by the above data table, we did not meet the objective of 80%. However, at the stanine 7 level, there was a significant increase of 42%, which represents 38 students who moved up to this stanine/strength level. Also, 71 students showed growth in their stanine level from the fall to spring test administrations. This represents close to 50% of the kindergarten population.

Table 5: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 1)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	52 %	27 %	23 %
Average (4-6)	40 %	50 %	50 %
Strength (7-9)	8%	23 %	27 %
6th Stanine or Higher	12%	25 %	40 %

162 first grade students took the fall and spring GRADE test. 3 students decreased their stanine level by 3 (2%), 7 students decreased their stanine level by 2 (4%). 17 students dropped by one stanine (11%). 35 students remained at the same stanine level (22%). 29 students increased their performance by 1 stanine (18%) while 25 students increased their performance by 2 stanines (15%). 31 students increased their performance by 3 stanine levels (19%) while 11 students increased their performance by 4 stanines (7%). 4 students improved their test performance by 5 stanine levels (2%).

Table 6: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 2)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	36 %	13 %	13 %
Average (4-6)	53 %	70 %	73 %
Strength (7-9)	23 %	17 %	14 %
6th Stanine or Higher	39 %	33 %	30 %

Of the 108 students who took both the fall and spring GRADE test, one student decreased by 2 stanines (1%), one student decreased by one stanine (1%), 12 students decreased by one stanine (11%), 29 students remained at the same stanine (27%), 45 students increased by one stanine (42%), 18 students increased by 1 stanine (16%) and 2 students increased by 2 stanines (2%).

Table 7: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 3)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	39 %	29 %	29 %
Average (4-6)	56 %	53 %	58 %
Strength (7-9)	5%	18 %	13 %
6th Stanine or Higher	20 %	35 %	33 %

Of the 85 students who took both the fall and spring GRADE test, one student decreased the total test stanine by 2 (1%), four students decreased by one stanine (5%), 32 students remained at the same stanine level (38%), 33 students increased by one stanine (39%), 14 students increased by 2 stanines (16%) and 1 student increased by 2 stanines (1%).

Table 8: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 4)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	32 %	37 %	33 %
Average (4-6)	40 %	46 %	50%
Strength (7-9)	15 %	17 %	17 %
6 th Stanine or Higher	26 %	30 %	31 %

Table 9: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 5)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	34 %	24 %	30 %
Average (4-6)	50 %	55 %	57%
Strength (7-9)	16 %	21 %	13 %
6 th Stanine or Higher	30 %	35 %	25 %

Of the 79 students in grade 5 who took both the fall and spring sessions of the GRADE test, 2 students went down two stanines (3%), 13 students went down by one stanine (16%), 30 students remained at the same stanine (38%), 21 students increased by one stanine (27%), 10 students increased by 2 stanines (12%) and 3 students increased by 3 stanines (4%).

Table 10: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 6)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	39 %	31 %	28 %
Average (4-6)	50 %	51 %	53 %
Strength (7-9)	11 %	18 %	19 %
6 th Stanine or Higher	30 %	29 %	30 %

Of the 66 students in grade 6 who took both the fall and spring sessions of the GRADE test, 12 students went down one stanine (18%), 16 students remained at the same stanine (24%), 30 students increased by one stanine (45%) and 8 students increased by two stanines (13%).

Table 11: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 7)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	22 %	25 %	20 %
Average (4-6)	64 %	58 %	64 %
Strength (7-9)	14%	17 %	16 %
6 th Stanine or Higher	31 %	29 %	29 %

Of the 77 students in grade 7 who took both the fall and spring sessions of the GRADE test, 4 students went down 2 stanines (5%), 15 students went down one stanine (19%), 37 students remained at the same stanine (48%), 16 students increased their total score stanine by one (22%), 4 students increased by one stanine (5%) and 1 student increased by 2 stanines (1%).

Table 12: GRADE – Total Test (Grade 8)

	Fall 2007	Spring 2008	Spring 2008 – control group
Weak (0-3)	28%	28 %	28 %
Average (4-6)	64%	54 %	56 %
Strength (7-9)	8%	18 %	16 %
6th Stanine or Higher	26%	31 %	22%

Of the 39 students in grade 8 who took both the fall and spring sessions of the GRADE test, 1 student went down 3 stanines (3%), 7 students went down 1 stanine (18%), 16 students remained at the same stanine (41%), 10 students increased their total score stanine (25%), 4 students increased by 2 stanines (10%) and 1 student increased their stanine level by three (3%).

Overall, none of the control groups for each grade level reached the 80% mark for the sixth stanine and above level. In comparison to last year's results for this same cohort segment, there was improvement at kindergarten (12%), grade 1 (2%), grade 3 (7%), grade 7 (5%) and grade 8 (8%).

Measure 3:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

AYP Determination

Table summarizes the calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for English Language Arts (ELA) at LCCPS for Spring 2007. Although LCCPS did not achieve the state performance target at 85.4, we did achieve our CPI performance target of 66.9, which is in the target range from 65.8-70.8. However, we did not meet the performance target in 3 of our 8 subgroups, which then designate our school's accountability status as "Improvement Year 2-Subgroups".

Table 13: LCCPS 2006 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - ELA

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS													
Student Group	2007												AYP 2007
	Participation				Performance			Improvement					
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target	N	2007 CPI	Met Target (85.4)	2006 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target		
Aggregate	432	432	100	Yes	422	66.9	No	63.8	4.5	65.8-70.8	Yes		Yes
Lim. English Prof.	198	198	100	Yes	189	59.9	No	56.7	5.4	59.6-64.6	Yes		Yes
Spec. Ed.	53	53	100	Yes	53	40.6	No	38.5	7.7	41.7-50.7	No		No
Low Income	334	334	100	Yes	331	65.0	No	63.8	4.5	65.8-70.8	No		No
Afr. Amer./Black	41	41	100	Yes	41	71.3	No	71.9	3.5	71.9-79.9	Yes/SH		Yes
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	136	136	100	Yes	129	63.8	No	61.8	4.8	64.1-69.1	No		No
Hispanic	175	175	100	Yes	172	64.8	No	61.5	4.8	63.8-68.8	Yes		Yes
Native American	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	79	79	100	Yes	79	74.7	No	67.9	4.0	67.9-76.4	Yes		Yes

Adequate Yearly Progress History										Accountability Status	
					2003	2004	2005	2006	2007		
ELA	Aggregate	-	-	-	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Improvement Yr. 2 Subgroups	
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	No	Yes	No	No	No		

Enrolled = students as of October 1

Assessed = # students enrolled at time of testing

N = # students tested as of October 1

CPI = Composite Performance Index

(measure of school performance based on MCAS results)

MCAS Results

The English Language Arts (ELA) Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) examinations have been administered to all third grade students at LCCPS for reading for seven consecutive years, fourth grade students for six consecutive years, seventh grade student beginning in Spring 2005, and eighth grade students beginning in Spring 2006, corresponding to the first year that each grade was offered at LCCPS and/or the MCAS exam was first administered. Please note that for the third grade as well as all other MCAS exams, results have only been posted by DESE through Spring 2007. Spring 2007 MCAS results are not expected to be officially issued until October 2008. As such, the Spring 2008 MCAS results will be presented and analyzed in the 2008-2009 annual report.

Table 14: Grade 3 - Reading - MCAS scores from Spring 2004 to Spring 2007

	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
Spring 2007	42%	34%	24%
Spring 2006	25 %	48 %	27 %
Spring 2005	32 %	43 %	25 %
Spring 2004	36 %	51 %	13 %

Table 15: Grade 3 - Reading - Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	42 %	34 %	24 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	40 %	35 %	25 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	42 %	36 %	22 %

Table 14 shows a four-year trend of Grade 3 MCAS Reading scores from Spring 2004 to Spring 2007. These results show an improvement for 2007 as more students' attained proficiency and there was a slight decline in the Warning category. Table 15 shows a comparison of the reading proficiency levels of all Grade 3 students to subgroups of students (control groups) who have been instructed at LCCPS for 2+ consecutive years and for 3+ consecutive years. The first control group performed slightly worse than the total grade 3 student body while the second control group performed about the same as the total grade 3 population. Of the 97 total Grade 3 students included in MCAS exam reporting, 72 had attended LCCPS: two students

scored in the Proficiency + category while 39 students were proficient in comparison to 20 students at High Needs Improvement, 13 at Low Needs Improvement, 22 students at High Warning and one student at Warning. However, the percentage of students at Warning in the cohort groups are above 8% and does not meet the goal set in the Accountability Plan.

A further analysis for grade 3 as it relates to the CPI target range (65.8-70.8; average 68) shows that 3 out of 5 of the third grade classrooms attained scores within or better than the CPI target range.

Grade 3 ELA MCAS	CPI Score	Met Target
Class 1	68.4	Yes
Class 2	73.6	Yes
Class 3	82.8	Yes
Class 4	65	No
Class 5	60.7	No
Average	70.1	Yes

LCCPS has taken several steps to help our Grade 3 students with reading/literacy skills, including the use of Accelerated Learning Teachers to assist classroom teachers by working with small groups of students performing below grade level and the offering of MCAS preparation sessions after school and on Saturdays. For 2007-2008, our school improvement plan included piloting a new program (Scott Foresman) for a comprehensive approach to reading in Grades 1-6 that more effectively integrates reading and writing with science, mathematics, and social studies. Additionally, as mentioned above, LCCPS teachers have received a complete disaggregation of MCAS data to assist in targeting future instruction. Each teacher received a binder, which gave detailed information on each third grade student along with an item analysis, which compared LCCPS performance with state performance for each test question.

Table 16 : Grade 4 – English Language Arts – MCAS scores from Spring 2004 to Spring 2007

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
Spring 2007	0%	16%	57%	27%
Spring 2006	0 %	13 %	48 %	38 %
Spring 2005	2 %	21 %	48 %	29 %
Spring 2004	3 %	30 %	43 %	25 %

Table 17: Grade 4 – English Language Arts – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	0 %	16 %	57 %	27 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	0 %	40%	35 %	25 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	0 %	41%	36%	22 %

Of the 81 students tested in grade 4, 13 students attained Proficient, 46 students attained Needs Improvement (27 High Needs Improvement and 19 Low Needs Improvement). Twenty-two students scored at the High Warning level with no one at the Warning level. A further analysis for grade 4 as it relates to the CPI target range shows that none of the four fourth grade classes scored within the CPI target range.

Grade 4 ELA MCAS	CPI Score	Met Target
Class 1	46.4	No
Class 2	65.7	No
Class 3	63	No
Class 4	58.7	No
Average	58.4	No

Table 18: Grade 5 – English Language Arts – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	6 %	26 %	38 %	30 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	3 %	26 %	40 %	31 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	2%	26 %	38 %	34 %

Of the 78 students who took the Grade 5 ELA MCAS test, 5 students attained Advanced status while 20 students scored at the Proficient level. Out of the 29 students who scored at the Needs Improvement level, 21 students attained High Improvement status with 13 students at the Low Improvement level. At the Warning level, 23 students scored at the High Warning level with one student at Warning. Of the five classes at the fifth grade level, only one class exceeded the CPI target range while 2 classes were within 1 point of reaching the CPI index range.

Grade 5 ELA MCAS	CPI Score	Met Target
Class 1	77.8	Yes
Class 2	64.7	No
Class 3	61.5	No
Class 4	40.4	No
Class 5	64.7	No
Average	61.8	No

Table 19: Grade 6 – English Language Arts – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	2 %	43 %	39 %	16 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	2 %	40 %	40 %	18 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	2 %	38 %	45 %	15 %

Of the four classrooms at sixth grade, 3 out of 4 attained the CPI target as can be seen by the following chart:

Grade 6 ELA MCAS	CPI Score	Met Target
Class 1	83.8	Yes
Class 2	73.2	Yes
Class 3	59.4	No
Class 4	79.4	Yes
Average	74.2	Yes

Table 20: Grade 7 – English Language Arts – MCAS scores from Spring 2004 to Spring 2007

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
Spring 2007	3%	44%	38%	15%
Spring 2006	0 %	21 %	42 %	37 %
Spring 2005	2 %	34 %	56 %	10 %

Table 21: Grade 7 – English Language Arts – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	3 %	44 %	38%	15 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	3 %	47 %	34 %	16 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	3 %	47 %	34 %	16 %

Of the 34 students tested in grade 7, one student attained Advanced status, 15 students attained the Proficient status, 6 in High Needs Improvement, 7 in Low Needs Improvement and 5 in High Warning. Both classes met the CPI target for English Language Arts with an index for each class at 71.3.

Table 22: Grade 8 – English Language Arts – Spring 2006 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	0 %	24 %	46 %	30 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	0 %	24 %	46 %	30 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	0 %	32 %	55 %	13%

Of the 41 students tested in grade 8, 10 students attained the Proficient level, 10 students attained the High Needs Improvement level, 9 students scored at the Low Needs Improvement level and 12 students scored in the High Warning range. Neither classroom scored in the CPI target index. The average CPI index score was 57 with one class having a 53.3 CPI index score and the other class having 60.7 CPI index score.

- Teachers in grades 3 –8 received student data binders which included a listing of all students with their raw scores, scaled scores and proficiency level, the range of scores per classroom with the CPI index points with the calculation for the CPI target score, copies of the individual student reports and a copy of the actual MCAS test with an item analysis. The item analysis categorized the questions by strand and standard and compared how students at LCCPS performed as to the state level.
- During the past school year, we administered three practice MCAS tests; one was the 2007 ELA MCAS test and the other two were MCAS Performance Indicator tests produced by Continental Press. Teachers double scored the open response questions and an item analysis was completed to give prompt feedback for teachers and students in preparation for this year's MCAS test.
- For grade levels 4-8, the percentage of students in the cohort groups who are in the Warning category exceeds the goals as set forth by the measure in the Accountability Plan

Measure 4:

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 [*i.e.*, students in Grades 2 – 8 who have been at LCCPS for 3+ years] will be reading at or above their reading level.

Affirmative Evidence

Success For All (SFA) is a scientifically research-based reading program that was developed at Johns Hopkins University, and is marketed and managed by The Success For All Foundation. The SFA model is an eclectic approach to the teaching of reading and incorporates whole class, small group, phonics, whole language, frequent testing, frequent regrouping, and one-to-one tutoring into its comprehensive program. SFA is used in schools throughout the United States, the UK, and Australia. The SFA model is

in place at LCCPS in grades from K through 8. The Kindergarten program is an all-day SFA program called Kinder corner that encompasses reading, writing, math, discovery and social skills. Students in grades 1 through 8 are part of a 90-minute SFA reading block. Students at the first grade level are in the Roots program, and students reading at the second grade level or above are in the Wings program.

Approximately every 9 weeks, all students in grades 1 through 8 are tested by the reading facilitators, reading staff, or classroom teachers to determine growth for regrouping as well as to identify students whose progress is lagging and would benefit from supplemental instruction. Students in grades 1 and 2 are administered SFA assessments, and students in grades 3 through 8 are administered 4Sight, a new test created by SFA that was administered for the first time at the end of the 2004-2005 school year. LCCPS made the switch to the 4Sight test as it questioned the validity of the test it had been using and its lack of correlation between internal reading levels and performance outcomes on the MCAS. 4Sight assessments are one-hour tests that have a similar format, coverage, and structure as the MCAS. 4Sight scores are supposed to be a better predictor of performance on the MCAS. Furthermore, 4Sight produces scores on key reading subskills, such as interpreting text, drawing conclusions, and purpose of text. These scores are used to tailor professional development for staff and to tailor instruction for students.

Table 23: Spring 2008 Internal Reading Assessment Results (Grades 2-8 at LCCPS for 3+ Years) Reading Below, At, or Above Grade Level

	BELOW Grade Level	Total AT or ABOVE Grade Level
Grade 2 (LCCPS 3+ yr)	21 %	79 %
Grade 3 (LCCPS 3+ yr)	16 %	84 %
Grade 4 (LCCPS 3+ yr)	35 %	65 %
Grade 5 (LCCPS 3+ yr)	51%	49 %
Grade 6 (LCCPS 3+ yr)	49 %	51 %
Grade 7 (LCCPS 3+ yr)	33 %	67 %
Grade 8 (LCCPS 3+ yr)	43 %	57 %

Table 23 shows the results of the Spring 2008 (last of five assessments) 4Sight reading assessments for students in Grades 2-8 who have consistently attended LCCPS for 3+ years. Students in Grades 3 surpassed the accountability goal while students in grade 2 just about met the goal. Students in Grades 4 through 8 did not perform as well, demonstrating the need for greater literacy instruction focus. In comparison with the results from spring of 2007, every grade level increased the percentage of students at or above grade level except for grade 7 which simply decreased by 2 percentage points. The following table shows how all students performed throughout the 4Sight assessments for this school year:

2007-2008**based on 4-Sight Testing**

	All Students		Post
	August	November	May
Kindergarten			90%
Grade 1	89%	70%	63%
Grade 2	29%	52%	77%
Grade 3	49%	53%	85%
Grade 4	56%	61%	62%
Grade 5	25%	40%	52%
Grade 6	16%	29%	47%
Grade 7	45%	60%	71%
Grade 8	46%	35%	51%

Progress 2007-2008

	Pre August	Post May
Kindergarten		90%
Grade 1	89%	63%
Grade 2	29%	77%
Grade 3	49%	85%
Grade 4	56%	62%
Grade 5	25%	52%
Grade 6	16%	47%
Grade 7	45%	71%
Grade 8	46%	51%

In the final part of the chart, one can see that significant progress was made in grades 2 (+48%), 3 (+36%), 5 (+27%), 6 (+31%) and 7 (+26%). Grade 1 students had a significant decrease of students reading at or above grade level as was also the case in the DIBELS scores. These students need to be monitored closely as they begin second grade.

Measure 5:

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).

Grade level	Increase in proficiency level	No change in proficiency level	Decrease in proficiency level
Grades 7 & 8	1	3	1
Grades 5 & 6	3	9	2
Grades 3 & 4	2	3	1

Affirmative Evidence

It is necessary to keep in mind that the scores for these students are being compared over a one-year span, from Spring 2007 to Spring 2008.

Of the six students in the grade 3 and 4 category, accounted for having been at LCCPS for two or more years, two students remained at the transitioning level while one student remained at the intermediate level. Two students advanced from the intermediate to the transitioning level while one fell from the intermediate to early intermediate level. This one student with the declining proficiency level has an Individualized Education Plan with language processing issues. When examining the overall scaled score, two students increased their score by 4 and 5 points respectively while two students increased their scaled scores by 16 and 17 points respectively. Two students had decreases in their scaled scores with a tally of -9 and -13 points.

Of the 19 third grade students who were administered the MEPA test in the fall of 2007 and the spring of 2008: 10 students advanced one proficiency level, 8 students remained at the same proficiency level and one student declined by one proficiency level.

Looking at the 15 students who were administered the MEPA test in the spring of 2007 as third graders and in the spring of 2008 as fourth graders: 2 students advanced more than one proficiency level, 5 students advanced one proficiency level, 6 students remained at the same proficiency level and 2 students declined by one proficiency level.

Of the fourteen students in the grade 5 and 6 category, accounted for having been at LCCPS for two or more years, two students advanced from the intermediate to the transitioning level and one student advanced from the early intermediate to the intermediate level. Of the nine students who remained at the same proficiency level, one student remained at the early intermediate level, five students remained at the intermediate level and three students remained at the transitioning level.

In the 7th and 8th grade span, a total of sixteen students were assessed. Six of these students were administered the MEPA test in the fall of 2007 and the spring of 2008. Four students remained at the same proficiency level (2 students at the beginning level and 2 at the transitioning level). Ten students were administered the MEPA test in the spring of 2007 and in the spring of 2008. Five students improved by one proficiency level, four students remained at the same proficiency level and one student declined by one proficiency level.

Of the five students in the grade 7 and 8 category, accounted for having been at LCCPS for two or more years, three students remained at the same proficiency level (one at the beginning level and two at the intermediate level) while two students advanced from the intermediate to the transitioning level. It is important to note that one-eighth-grade student who has lived in the United States for two years has advanced from the early intermediate level (fall, 2006) to the transitioning level (spring, 2008).

For the second year, our ELL students in kindergarten through second grade have been assessed in the spring using the IPT (IDEA Proficiency Test) that examines reading and writing. In kindergarten and grade 1, students receive a designation as having attained pre-reader (0-39 points)/pre-writer, beginning reader (40-57 points)/beginning writer or early reader (58-61 points)/early writer depending upon the raw score. For the writing component of the test, kindergarten students receive their score designation based on their abilities to copy letters, write their name, copy a sentence and their ability in descriptive or narrative writing. First grade students are assessed in the same areas plus spelling. In grade 2, the designations are as follows: Non-English Reader/Writer, Limited Reader/Writer and Competent Reader/Writer. For second grade, the writing test consists of three parts: conventions, write a story and write your own story. The following chart summarizes their results:

IDEA Proficiency Test for Early Literacy: Reading

	Pre-Reader	Beginning Reader	Early Reader
Kindergarten (106)	2%	25%	73%
Grade 1 (43)	2%	56%	42%
	Non-English Reader	Limited Reader	Competent Reader
Grade 2 (38)	24%	39%	37%

IDEA Proficiency Test for Early Literacy: Writing

	Pre-Writer	Beginning Writer	Early Writer
Kindergarten (106)	2%	94%	9%
Grade 1 (43)	2%	82%	16%
	Non-English Writer	Limited Writer	Competent Writer
Grade 2 (38)	18%	66%	16%

MELA-O Test for Listening and Speaking					
Kindergarten					
Levels	Listening	Fluency	Vocabulary	Pronunciation	Grammar
1	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
2	3%	6%	3%	6%	7%
3	10%	10%	20%	16%	10%
4	24%	26%	22%	22%	28%
5	62%	57%	55%	55%	54%
MELA-O Test for Listening and Speaking					
Grade 1					
Levels	Listening	Fluency	Vocabulary	Pronunciation	Grammar
1	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%
2	7%	2%	0%	4%	9%
3	18%	21%	28%	7%	26%
4	28%	26%	28%	42%	32%
5	47%	51%	42%	47%	30%
MELA-O Test for Listening and Speaking					
Grade 2					
Levels	Listening	Fluency	Vocabulary	Pronunciation	Grammar
1	2%	5%	2%	2%	5%
2	11%	2%	11%	16%	21%
3	32%	43%	37%	32%	29%
4	34%	26%	34%	24%	32%
5	21%	24%	16%	26%	13%

Measure 6:

75% of students with special needs will pass the MCAS at their grade level given their approved accommodations.

Affirmative Evidence

The following provides the MCAS passing rates (Needs Improvement or higher) for special needs students by grade level:

- Grade 3 Reading – 25% (2 of 8 students, 1 Proficient)
- Grade 3 Mathematics – 25% (2 of 8 students, 1 Proficient)
- Grade 4 ELA – 46% (6 of 13 students, 2 Proficient)
- Grade 4 Mathematics – 38% (5 of 13 students, 2 Advanced and 1 Proficient)
- Grade 5 ELA – 40% (6 of 15 students, 1 Proficient)
- Grade 5 Mathematics – 27% (4 of 15 students, 2 Proficient)

- Grade 6 ELA – 44% (4 of 9 students)
- Grade 6 Mathematics – 44% (4 of 9 students, 1 Proficient)
- Grade 7 ELA – 20% (1 of 5 students, 1 Proficient)
- Grade 7 Mathematics – 20% (1 of 5 students, 1 Proficient)
- Grade 8 ELA – 0% (0 of 4 students)
- Grade 8 Mathematics – 0% (0 of 4 students)

All Special Education students who did not attain proficient or advanced were invited to attend the After-School MCAS Academy or the Saturday MCAS Academy, which served as supplemental educational services provided by Title 1. It will be interesting to see if those students who attended this program will have been able to show improvement on the spring 2008 MCAS. Likewise, throughout this past academic year, all students participated in practice MCAS tests in both English Language Arts and Mathematics with full accommodations according to their IEP's along with assigning a test administrator with whom these students would feel most comfortable. The curriculum director and teachers in assessing areas of need for further remediation and re-teaching examined these scores.

❖ **Academic Goal 2**

Students at LCCPS will be proficient in Mathematics.

Measure 1:

LCCPS will make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year in the aggregate for mathematics. CPI should not be 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.

Affirmative Evidence

AYP Determination

Table , below, summarizes the calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Mathematics at LCCPS for Spring 2007, as posted on DOE's website. As shown in Table 24, LCCPS met its CPI target for improvement in the aggregate as well as in each of the subgroups. We attribute this improvement due to a concerted effort to identify areas of weakness in student MCAS performance by studying item analysis data and providing supplemental instruction to students by way of small group targeted instruction. Additionally, we administered practice MCAS tests at each grade level and reviewed the results with students along with discussing strategies and problematic areas in student comprehension as well as focus math-related vocabulary.

Table 24: LCCPS 2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Mathematics

MATHEMATICS													
Student Group	2007									2007			AYP 2007
	Participation				Performance		Improvement			Attendance			
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target	N	CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	435	434	100	Yes	420	56.5	No	6.3	Yes	94.1	-0.4	Yes	Yes
Lim. English Prof.	204	203	100	Yes	190	51.7	No	6.7	Yes	94.8	-0.4	Yes	Yes
Spec. Ed.	52	52	100	Yes	52	36.1	No	9.1	Yes	93.5	-0.3	Yes	Yes
Low Income	338	338	100	Yes	331	55.8	No	6.4	Yes	93.9	-0.6	Yes	Yes
Afr. Amer./Black	41	41	100	Yes	41	59.1	No	6.0	Yes	96.0	0.7	Yes	Yes
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	137	136	99	Yes	127	57.3	No	5.9	Yes	95.7	0.0	Yes	Yes
Hispanic	179	179	100	Yes	174	52.7	No	6.9	Yes	93.4	-0.5	Yes	Yes
Native American	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	77	77	100	Yes	77	62.7	No	6.0	Yes	92.4	-1.4	Yes	Yes

Adequate Yearly Progress History										Accountability Status
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007		
MATH Aggregate	-	-	-	-No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Improvement Year 1-Subgroups	
All Subgroups	-	-	-	- No		No	No	Yes		

Enrolled = students as of October 1
 Assessed = # students enrolled at time of testing
 N = # students tested as of October 1
 CPI = Composite Performance Index
 (measure of school performance based on MCAS results)

MCAS Results

Through Spring 2006, the MCAS exam for Mathematics was administered to students in Grades 4 and 6 each year. At LCCPS, the MCAS for Grade 6 has only been administered since Spring 2004, the first year that Grade 6 was taught at the school. Beginning in Spring 2006, the MCAS exam for Mathematics was also administered in Grades 3, 7, and 8.

Table 25: Grade 3 – Mathematics – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	5 %	32 %	28 %	35 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	7 %	36 %	25 %	32 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	5 %	37 %	26 %	32 %

Table 26: Grade 4 Mathematics – MCAS scores from Spring 2004 to Spring 2007

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
Spring 2007	5%	12%	49%	34%
Spring 2006	3 %	13 %	43 %	40 %
Spring 2005	10 %	14 %	39 %	36 %
Spring 2004	3 %	5 %	52 %	40 %

Table 27: Grade 4 – Mathematics – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	5 %	12 %	49 %	34 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	5%	14 %	42 %	39 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	6%	16 %	42 %	36 %

Table 28: Grade 5 – Mathematics – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	7 %	30 %	30 %	33 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	7 %	33 %	30 %	30 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	6 %	36 %	28 %	30 %

Table 29: Grade 6 – Mathematics – MCAS scores from Spring 2004 to Spring 2007

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
Spring 2007	7%	30%	30%	33%
Spring 2006	4 %	2 %	49 %	44 %
Spring 2005	3 %	11 %	21 %	66 %
Spring 2004	5 %	28 %	37 %	32 %

Table 30: Grade 6 – Mathematics – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	4 %	2 %	49 %	44 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	6 %	3 %	47 %	44 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	8 %	0 %	54 %	38 %

Table 31: Grade 7 – Mathematics – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	5 %	14 %	43 %	38 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	6 %	14 %	43 %	37 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	7 %	19 %	44 %	30 %

Table 32: Grade 8 – Mathematics – Spring 2007 MCAS scores by subgroup

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
All Students	0 %	5 %	22 %	73 %
Students at LCCPS for 2+ years	0 %	5 %	27 %	67 %
Students at LCCPS for 3+ years	0 %	7 %	21 %	71 %

As per Measure 1, it is our goal to increase the percentage of students at the proficient level with a decrease at the Needs Improvement and Warning levels. There has been progress toward this goal at the grade 6 level. When examining the cut scores for determining proficiency level, we looked at those students on the cusp so as to move these students to the next proficiency level and thereby attempting to reduce the number of students in the lower two categories.

The following bullets provide the number of students included in the total student body and each control group for Grades 3-8 Mathematics:

- Grade 3 – 96 students included, 75 at LCCPS 2+ years, 60 at LCCPS 3+ years
- Grade 4 – 79 students included, 66 at LCCPS 2+ years, 58 at LCCPS 3+ years
- Grade 5 – 81 students included, 61 at LCCPS 2+ years, 50 at LCCPS 3+ years
- Grade 6 – 84 students included, 78 at LCCPS 2+ years, 63 at LCCPS 3+ years
- Grade 7 – 42 students included, 35 at LCCPS 2+ years, 27 at LCCPS 3+ years
- Grade 8 – 41 students included, 37 at LCCPS 2+ years; 28 at LCCPS 3+ years

This year, our school was assessed for making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) according to a target range, which is based on the 2006 CPI baseline. For the aggregate and each of the subgroups, there was a positive gain for CPI points: Aggregate-6.3; Limited English Proficient-6.7; Special Education-9.1; Low Income-6.4; African American/Black-6.0; Asian or Pacific Island-5.9; Hispanic-6.9; White-6.0.

Each year, higher targets need to be met as we progress to 2014 with the goal of NCLB having a high rate of students attaining proficiency.

Similar to the study done for the MCAS in English Language Arts, data was examined to determine which students were in need of supplemental educational services and parents were notified of these services to be provided in our MCAS Academy held after school as well as on Saturday mornings. Teachers also received an item analysis of each test question by category (i.e. geometry, measurement, patterns of algebra, numeration, data, probability) and strand (objectives noted in the MA curriculum framework). A comparison was made between state percentage correct and LCCPS percentage correct so that teachers could examine areas with wide discrepancy of result. Additionally, we administered practice MCAS tests (3 administrations) with accommodations for special needs students and did a similar analysis of results. Teachers also made notes of student behaviors during the testing sessions so as to provide strategies and useful suggestions in preparation for the May MCAS administration.

An examination of CPI results was done by grade level as well as by individual classrooms to see at which grade level there was either strong or weak performance and comparing the CPI with our school CPI target. The following table summarizes these results:

CPI Range: 53.2-58.2

Grade 3	Class 1	Class2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5	Average
CPI	57.1	60.5	72.4	72.4	61.3	63
Met target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Grade 4	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4		Average
CPI	42.3	47.2	58.7	60.4		52.2
Met target	No	No	Yes	Yes		No
Grade 5	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5	Average
CPI	84.7	67.7	65.4	38.3	61.1	63.4
Met target	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Grade 6	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5	Average
CPI	65	71.4	52.7	63.2	46.7	60
Met target	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Grade 7	Class 1	Class 2				Average
CPI	52.6	48.8				50.7
Met target	No	No				No
Grade 8	Class 1	Class 2				Average
CPI	31.8	33				32.4
Met target	No	No				No

Measure 2:

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

Affirmative Evidence

The *Group Mathematics Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation* (G-MADE) is a norm-referenced, standards-based assessment of mathematical skills. Due to the wide age range and multiple (9) levels, this test can be easily administered for use with kindergarten through high school students. Eight of the nine test levels contain three sections or subtests: Concepts and Communication, Operations and Computation and Process and Applications. (The “R” level for kindergarten does not contain a section for Operations and Computation.) The following data charts pertain to the total school population as well as to the control groups specified in Measure 2.

Table 33: G-MADE – Spring 2008 – total test scores by grade level and stanine level for all students

	Weak (1-3)	Average (4-6)	Strength (7-9)	6 th Stanine or Higher
Grade K	25.5%	62.8%	11.7%	39.3 %
Grade 1	44.7 %	52.2%	3.1 %	13.7%
Grade 2	33.9 %	54.5%	11.6 %	25%
Grade 3	19.3 %	54.5 %	26 %	50%
Grade 4	23.3%	41.9 %	34.9 %	46.5%
Grade 5	20.3 %	57 %	23 %	49.4 %
Grade 6	30.8%	42.6 %	26.5%	38.2%
Grade 7	29 %	47 %	24 %	35.5 %
Grade 8	27.5 %	55 %	17.5%	35 %

Table 34: G-MADE – Spring 2008 – Grade K control group: total test scores for students who spent the entire year at LCCPS.

	Stanine 6	Stanine 7	Stanine 8	Stanine 9
K=145 students	40	0	10	7

A total of 57 students in kindergarten scored at the 6th stanine or above which only represents 37% achievement in comparison to **Measure 2**, which stipulates the 80% range.

Table 35 : G-MADE – Spring 2008 – Grades 1 and 2 control group: total test scores for students who have been at LCCPS consistently since kindergarten.

	Stanine 6	Stanine 7	Stanine 8	Stanine 9
Grade 1=138 students	15	3	1	1
Grade 2=77 students	10	5	1	0

A total of 20 students in grade 1 scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 14.5% achievement. In grade 2, a total of 16 students scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 21% achievement. Both grade levels fall far short of the 80% goal stated in Measure 2.

Table 36 : G-MADE –Spring 2008- Grades 3-8 control group: total test scores for students who have been at LCCPS for 3 or more years.

	Stanine 6	Stanine 7	Stanine 8	Stanine 9
Grade 3=55 students	11	10	5	1
Grade 4=63 students	5	7	13	5
Grade 5=53 students	8	1	4	4
Grade 6=47 students	7	9	3	4
Grade 7=61 students	6	10	5	2
Grade 8=31 students	5	4	0	2

- A total of 27 students in grade 3 scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 49% of the control group.
- A total of 30 students in grade 4 scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 48% of the control group.
- A total of 18 students in grade 5 scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 34% of the control group.
- A total of 23 students in grade 6 scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 49% of the control group.
- A total of 23 students in grade 7 scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 37.7% of the control group.
- A total of 11 students in grade 8 scored at the 6th stanine or above which represents 34% of the control group.
- None of the grade levels met the 80% goal for this measure.

Additional data tables for GMADE testing by grade level and sub-test using stanine scores.

Table 37 : G-MADE – Spring 2008- All Students: Sub-test: Concepts and Communication

	Stanines: 1-3 Weak	Stanines 4-6 Average	Stanines 7-9 Strength	6th Stanine or Higher
K= 145 students	15.2%	61.4%	23.4%	43.5%
1=161 students	32.3%	58.4%	7.5%	14.9%
2=112 students	31.3%	54.5%	12.5%	16%
3=88 students	28.4%	34.1%	37.5%	47.7%
4=86 students	19.7%	59.3%	20.9%	30.2%
5=79 students	19%	58%	24%	46.8%
6=68 students	27.9%	58.8%	14.7%	38.2%
7=76 students	25%	58%	17%	40.8%
8=40 students	22.5%	55%	22.5%	45%

Table 38 : G-MADE – Spring 2008 – All Students: Sub-test: Operations and Computations

	Stanines: 1-3 Weak	Stanines: 4-6 Average	Stanines: 7-9 Strength	6th Stanine or Higher
K=145 students	NA	NA	NA	NA
1=161 students	40.1%	46.6%	12.4%	29.8%
2=112 students	20.5%	66.1%	10.7%	25%
3=88 students	12.5%	47.7%	39.7%	51.1%
4=86 students	22%	34.9%	43%	48.8%
5=79 students	3.7%	58.2%	30.4%	55.7%
6=68 students	32.3%	42.6%	26.5%	41.2%
7=76 students	38.5%	50%	11.5%	33%
8=40 students	25%	47.5%	27.5%	55%

Table 39 : G-MADE – Spring 2008 – All Students: Sub-test: Process and Applications

	Stanines: 1-3 Weak	Stanines: 4-6 Average	Stanines: 7-9 Strength	6th Stanine or Higher
K=145 students	24.8%	70%	19.3%	36%
1=161 students	21.7%	70.2%	8.7%	18.6%
2=112 students	29.5%	49%	18.8%	32%
3=88 students	31.8%	45.5%	22.7%	38.6%
4=86 students	26.7%	46.5%	25.6%	37.2%
5=79 students	31.2%	45.6%	24%	38%
6=68 students	32.3%	42.6%	26.5%	33.8%
7=76 students	30%	52.6%	18%	32%
8=40 students	25%	55%	20%	40%

2. Organizational Viability

❖ Viability Goal 1

The school will be fiscally solvent and sound.

Measure 1:

Annual expenses will not exceed total income. [Please note that the LCCPS Accountability Plan incorrectly stated this as: *Annual expenses will not exceed net income.*]

Affirmative Evidence

Please see finance section at the end of this report that verifies this measure.

Measure 2:

The school's annual independent audit will report no major findings.

Affirmative Evidence

There were no major findings included in this year's auditor's report.

Measure 3:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

The Board of Trustees has reconstituted the Friends of LCCPS organization as a vehicle for fundraising and launching programs for the upcoming 2007-2008 academic year.

❖ *Viability Goal 2*

Families will be satisfied with the education they receive at LCCPS.

Measure 1:

The school will be fully enrolled each year, based on target enrollment figures (enrollment will increase annually to 900 in 2008).

Affirmative Evidence

Opening target enrollment figures and end-of-year enrollment figures will indicate full enrollment each year. Enrollment at LCCPS has been stable and near capacity since it opened in fall 2000. The school opened in the fall of 2000 as a K-3 elementary school and has added one grade per year through 2005-2006; the school included grades K-8 for the third consecutive year in 2007-2008. While the school desires all students return to LCCPS each consecutive school year, the transient nature of the Lowell population has meant the school has experienced turnover each year. As families in Lowell often leave the city for employment opportunities or for housing in other parts of the country, LCCPS has enrolled new students in each grade each year. Enrollment at Lowell Community Charter Public School is especially affected by the high numbers of families living in poverty who are forced to move to find less expensive housing.

Historically, the school has been very successful at attracting approximately 115 new students annually: demand for the LCCPS kindergarten program is very high. As of June, 2008, LCCPS has over 100 students on the waiting list for kindergarten.

Table 40: LCCPS Enrollment History (2000-2001 through 2007-2008)

School Year	Grades	Enrollment per Charter	Enrollment October 1	Enrollment December 1	Enrollment March 1	Enrollment June 1
2000 - 2001	K - 3	312	NA	NA	NA	NA
2001 - 2002	K - 4	392	360	354	354	357
2002 - 2003	K - 5	472	472	472	472	460
2003 - 2004	K - 6	552	549	550	535	523
2004 - 2005	K - 7	632	645	648	639	626
2005 - 2006	K - 8	754	742	N/A	739	740
2006 - 2007	K - 8	900	865	865	844	819
2007-2008	K-8	900	925	917	896	879

Table 34 illustrates the enrollment history and trends at LCCPS from its inaugural 2000-2001 school year through the 2007-2008 school year. Please note that enrollment figures during the 2007-2008 school year (October 1, December 1, and March 1) were higher than the final enrollment at the end of the year (June 23, 2008), 872, as these values included students who attended LCCPS for only a portion of the year. The table also indicates that the school enrollment has typically been between 95% and 103% of its enrollment capacity.

N.B. In subsequent Annual Reports, we will only report enrollment figures for October 1, March 1 and end of year as this ties in with the SIMS report

Measure 2:

The average score for each item on annual parent satisfaction survey will be 3.0 or higher (1-4 scale).

Affirmative Evidence

A 28 question survey (translated into Spanish and Khmer) was sent to LCCPS families and 156 completed surveys were collected. The questions asked for parents to rate various areas of the school from programming to instructional practice. The range of responses is noted by percentage from “Strongly Disagree” to “Disagree” to “Agree” to “Strongly Agree”. Parents were also able to add comments.

1. I am satisfied with the school’s academic performance.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 3%	Agree 44%	Strongly Agree 52%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

2. I am likely to recommend this school to others.

Strongly Disagree 3%	Disagree 4%	Agree 35%	Strongly Agree 58%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

3. The school is fulfilling the mission outlined in the charter.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 6%	Agree 43%	Strongly Agree 50%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

4. I am satisfied with the quality of instruction that our children receive at our school.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 9%	Agree 43%	Strongly Agree 47%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

5. I am satisfied with the school’s efforts to manage student behavior.

Strongly Disagree 7%	Disagree 12%	Agree 43%	Strongly Agree 38%
-------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

6. The school has provided a safe atmosphere for my child/children.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 9%	Agree 40%	Strongly Agree 50%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

6. Homework helps my child do better in class.

Strongly Disagree 3%	Disagree 3%	Agree 53%	Strongly Agree 41%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

7. I am satisfied with the performance of the teachers who offer instruction in the core content areas. (Reading, Math, Social Studies, Science)

Strongly Disagree 2%	Disagree 1%	Agree 45%	Strongly Agree 52%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

8. I am satisfied with the school's efforts to communicate with families.

Strongly Disagree 5%	Disagree 7%	Agree 43%	Strongly Agree 45%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

9. I am satisfied with the performance of the teachers who offer instruction in the enrichment areas.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 6%	Agree 50%	Strongly Agree 43%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

10. My questions are responded to in a timely and friendly manner.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 7%	Agree 49%	Strongly Agree 43%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

11. I am satisfied with the overall performance of the school.

Strongly Disagree 2%	Disagree 8%	Agree 50%	Strongly Agree 40%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

12. I would like for my son/daughter to receive more instructional time in reading and mathematics.

Strongly Disagree 3%	Disagree 5%	Agree 41%	Strongly Agree 59%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

13. People who work in the school office are friendly and welcoming.

Strongly Disagree 3%	Disagree 8%	Agree 50%	Strongly Agree 39%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

14. I am satisfied with the performance of the principal.

Strongly Disagree 5%	Disagree 8%	Agree 45%	Strongly Agree 42%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

15. I support the uniform policy.

Strongly Disagree 3%	Disagree 7%	Agree 22%	Strongly Agree 68%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

16. I am pleased with the food service program.

Strongly Disagree 8%	Disagree 10%	Agree 42%	Strongly Agree 40%
-------------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------

17. I am likely to recommend this school to others.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 7%	Agree 41%	Strongly Agree 51%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

18. The school building and grounds are well maintained.

Strongly Disagree 7%	Disagree 3%	Agree 41%	Strongly Agree 49%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

19. Staff at the school care about my child's progress.

Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree 6%	Agree 41%	Strongly Agree 52%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

20. My child's teacher knows my child and focuses on him/her as an individual.

Strongly Disagree 0%	Disagree 5%	Agree 37%	Strongly Agree 58%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

21. I am satisfied with my child's exposure to technology.

Strongly Disagree 0%	Disagree 7%	Agree 41%	Strongly Agree 52%
-------------------------	----------------	--------------	-----------------------

22. The school is proactive with communicating important issues regarding my child.

Strongly Disagree 0%	Disagree	Disagree	6%	Agree	37%	Strongly Agree	57%
23. My child's teacher communicates with me regularly about my child's progress.							
Strongly Disagree 0%	Disagree	Disagree	2%	Agree	40%	Strongly Agree	58%
24. I feel comfortable talking with my child's teacher about something with which I disagree.							
Strongly Disagree 1%	Disagree	Disagree	3%	Agree	37%	Strongly Agree	59%
25. The principal is accessible to parents.							
Strongly Disagree 11%	Disagree	Disagree	11%	Agree	43%	Strongly Agree	35%
26. The school has communicated ways for me to get involved in my child's education.							
Strongly Disagree 5%	Disagree	Disagree	5%	Agree	43%	Strongly Agree	47%
27. The school newsletter is a good source for obtaining school information.							
Strongly Disagree 3%	Disagree	Disagree	3%	Agree	37%	Strongly Agree	57%

Clearly, in each of the above areas, the results show that we have met this goal, as the percentages are greater in the areas of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree".

Measure 3:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

At the end of the 2007-2008 school year, LCCPS had an enrollment of 872 students. Of these, 116 (or 12.5%) have decided not to return to LCCPS for the 2008-2009 school year. Thirty-five students and their families have moved away. Therefore, LCCPS has easily exceeded its goal of 90% reenrollment with a reenrollment rate of 9%. Such a high reenrollment rate is testimony to the high degree of satisfaction of parents with the education their children are receiving at LCCPS. LCCPS hopes to continue this very encouraging trend. In fact, LCCPS presently has the longest waiting list in the history of the school.

Measure 4:

The school will not lose more than five percent of its student body during the year. This calculation will not include students moving out of the Lowell area.

Affirmative Evidence

LCCPS lost a total of 78 students during the 2007-2008 school year, 35 of who were students who moved out of the Lowell area. Of the remaining 43 students,

11 withdrawals were due to parental dissatisfaction, 12 were due to additional needed student services not provided at LCCPS, and the remaining 14 withdrawals were due to transportation or custody transfer issues. Since this number of students leaving (78) reflects 8.4% of the student population and therefore exceeds the 5% cap as stated in measure 4 above.

❖ **Viability Goal 3**

The Board of Trustees will be a strong governing organization of LCCPS.

Measure 1:

The Board of Trustees' membership numbers will meet its by-law requirements.

Affirmative Evidence

The LCCPS Board of Trustees at any given moment during the 2008-2008 school year operated with a membership in accordance with its by-law requirement (see Governance section).

Measure 2:

The Board of Trustees will provide adequate facility space for the school, including overseeing expansion plans, leases, and other necessary items.

Affirmative Evidence

LCCPS operated at full capacity as per student enrollment policy of 900 students. During the 2006-2007 school year, we completed the major renovation needed to sustain a viable operation. During the 2007-2008 school year, renovations were minimum. Nevertheless, the Board continues to oversee the building lease and other facility issues and has provided school administration with the resources and staffing that allowed for the addition of extra classrooms, offices and recreation areas.

Measure 3:

The Board of Trustees will complete an annual evaluation of the internal management services.

Affirmative Evidence

The Board is directing the responsibilities for management across the school into the hands of the CEO. The Board implemented an evaluation instrument to assess the CEO's performance. The Board, as per this instrument, performed an evaluation of the school CEO in March 2008. The CEO resigned before results from evaluation were presented to him.

❖ **Viability Goal 4**

LCCPS will provide its students with a competent and consistent teaching staff.

Measure 1:

All teachers and teacher assistants will meet the requirements of NCLB.

Affirmative Evidence

Sixty-five (83%) of the teaching staff at LCCPS during 2006-2007 met or exceeded the requirements of *No Child Left Behind* (i.e., were highly qualified). Six out of 8 (75%) of the teaching assistants met the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*. LCCPS is working with remaining staff to complete the licensing process. (See Staff Profile, pg 65-66.)

Measure 2:

Voluntary teacher turnover will be under 20% annually. This percentage will not include teachers who are not offered new contracts.

Affirmative Evidence

The total number of teachers at LCCPS during the 2007-2008 school year was 78. Of these, only 1 was not offered a new contract for 2008-2009. As of July 31, 2008, 3 of the 78 teachers who completed the 2007-2008 school year voluntarily decided not to return to LCCPS for the 2008-2009 school year, a voluntary teacher turnover rate of 4%, meeting our accountability goal.

Measure 3:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

This measure will be evaluated at the end of the 2009-2010 school year; however, as of June 30, 2008, 46% of teachers who were employed at LCCPS at the beginning of this charter will begin the 2008-2009 school year at LCCPS.

Measure 4:

The administration will provide appropriate oversight and support of new and returning 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.

Affirmative Evidence

During the 2007-08 school year, LCCPS continued to have one lead teacher per grade level along with a lead teacher for World Languages, Physical Education and English Language Learners. They provided instructional and behavioral management support to the teachers at their grade level or within their department. Lead teachers participated in a mentor-training program and mentored new teachers as well as those new to LCCPS. Mentors and mentees kept a log of meetings and journal entries.

Issues were discussed during lead teacher meetings, which were held once a month. Upon request, mentors were provided with substitute coverage so that mentors could observe their colleagues teaching various lessons within their classrooms for their own improvement. A principal formally observed each teacher on 1-3 occasions during the year with more occasions for teachers new to the school. Lead teachers also served as liaisons for their teammates.

Teachers had common planning time throughout the school year that allowed them to collaborate and plan various themed units and lessons within their grade levels which was beneficial for the teachers involved as well as for their students. All teachers began the year by creating goals with one being personal and the other two being academic. Before formal observations, there was a pre-observation meeting where the teacher and principal reviewed the lesson objectives and procedures along with pinpointing an area for which the teachers wanted specific feedback. Following each observation, the teacher and principal met again in order to discuss the written observation rubric and what the teacher learned from the experience. Finally, all teachers were given the opportunity to complete the summative reflection form including their achievements, looking at their goals, their gains and their areas of improvement as professional educators during the school year.

SCHOOL PROFILE

1. Student Demographics

For the third consecutive year, Lowell Community Charter Public School served students in grades K-8 during the 2007-2008 school year. A demographic breakdown of the student population as of the end of the 2007-2008 school year is presented below in Table 35. LCCPS added grade 8 during the 2005-2006 school year, which is the highest grade permitted under the current charter. The final enrollment number as of June, 2008 was 872 students.

Table 41: Student Demographics (2007 – 2008, end-of-year)

	Number	Percentage
White	118	13.5%
Black or African American	90	10.3%
Asian	275	31.5%
Hispanic or Latino	352	40.3%
Native American or Alaska Native	1	.1%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	0.3%
White and Black; White and Asian; or White, Black, and Asian	19	2.2%
Limited English Proficient	274	31.4%
Free/Reduced Lunch	696	79.7%
Special Education	88	10.1%
Female	457	52.3%
Male	415	47.5%

Total number of instructional days: 190
 Starting and ending dates (2006-2007): August 20, 2006 through June 23, 2008
 Hours of instruction: 8:00 AM – 3:20 PM

2. Student Application, Waiting List and Turnover Data

Lowell Community Charter Public School Enrollment Data 2008-2009			
Grade	Students	Not Returning	Waiting List
K	125	N/A	64
1	153	11	13
2	161	9	6
3	108	10	10
4	94	7	3
5	85	9	4
6	85	3	7
7	72	8	1
8	76	4	5
Total	959	61	113

Table 42: Student Turnover Data (2007 – 2008)

Total Number of students who left during the 2006-2007 school year	78/ 8.4%
Total Number of students who finished the school year and chose not to return for the 2007-2008 school year	116/12.5%

****Summary of withdrawals:**

- 35 Students moved away
- 11 Parents dissatisfied with program or longer day/year
- 12 Students needed special services not provided by LCCPS
- 14 Transportation, custody transfers, other issues

Number of students expelled = 0
 Number placed in in-school suspension = 32
 Number placed in out of school suspension = 43
 Student Attendance Rate = 94.14%

3. School Report Card

Report Card:

This report includes information on the school's performance on the 2007 Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) by content area, grade level, and for particular student populations. Comparison data from the state and from Spring 2006 are also provided. In addition, this report includes other information as required by the federal "No Child Left Behind" Act.

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Lowell Community Charter Public School is to prepare children for success as students, citizens, and workers by providing a supportive, challenging, multicultural learning environment that integrates the strengths of Lowell's diverse communities and cultures.

Enrollment (2007-2008, end of year)			
	School	District	State
Race/Ethnicity			
White	13.7 %	13.7 %	70.8 %
African-American	10.2 %	10.2%	8.1 %
Hispanic	41.2 %	41.2 %	13.9 %
Asian	30.0 %	30.0 %	4..9 %
Native American	0.2%	0.2 %	0.3 %
Gender			
Male	48.3%	48.3 %	51.4 %
Female	51.7 %	51.7 %	48.6 %
Selected Population Enrollment			
Limited English Proficiency	32.0 %	32.0%	5.8 %
Low-income	70.9 %	70.9 %	29.5%
Special Education	9.8%	9.8%	16.9 %
TOTAL COUNT	922	922	962,766

Grades Offered: K, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05,06, 07,08

Percent of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers:
78.8%

Additional Teacher Information:

The percent of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers includes both K-8 teachers and world language teachers.

There are a total of 64 full-time teachers: 78.1 % of them are highly qualified, 34% have Master's Degrees.

GOVERNANCE

1. Board of Trustees

LCCPS is characterized by strong organizational capacity. LCCPS was proposed by leaders of the Southeast Asian and Latino communities in an effort to address the unique needs of the city of Lowell, and in particular the needs of these immigrant groups who comprised a significant portion of Lowell's population. Up until the school opened in 2000, there was no school in Lowell dedicated to meeting the needs of the Southeast Asian and Latino students who were struggling and needed the special attention that the charter school provides.

At the time of the initial charter application, the founders hoped to create a school where students would "learn together to live together", thus addressing gang violence that plagues Lowell. In 2000, school completion rates for Lowell students was unacceptably low; the dropout problem rendered too many young people – especially low income and minority students – woefully unprepared for the demands of productive employment and citizenship.

The founding board envisioned filling the needs of these students and their families by creating a model public school with features often resisted in traditional public school settings that include:

- An extended school day: free quality before and after school care
- An emphasis on technology
- Specific emphasis on immigrant culture and history
- Emphasis on Khmer and Spanish languages
- Instruction on character and ethics
- An emphasis on family and community engagement throughout the school

The founders designed a structure for the school that would be large enough to serve as many students as possible and simultaneously feel small. The charter describes a larger school that is divided up into smaller units, thus creating a sense of intimacy and connection.

A maximum of fifteen and a minimum of five members of the Board of Trustees govern the school. The Board of Trustees is responsible for policy governance, overall management and oversight of the school. Members of the board are carefully selected to represent most of the ethnic groups in Lowell and a wide array of political and organizational expertise and experience.

2. Board Committees and Members

Officials	Governance Expertise	Occupation	Term of Appointment
Chairman <i>Mr. Thel Sar</i> *All Subcommittees	Expertise in local family issues, Liaison to Cambodian community	Probation Officer Lowell District Court	2 nd term End November 15, 2009
Vice Chairman <i>Dr. Allen Scheier</i> * Academic Committee * Personnel Committee * Recruitment Committee	Veteran public school teacher and advocate, Education Policy & Governance	High School Teacher, Mathematics	2 nd term End May 25, 2010
Treasurer Mr. Richard Chávez * Facility Committee * Finance Committee	Expertise in financial management	Vice President Enterprise Bank & Trust	1 st term End June 23, 2009
Secretary <i>Ms. Susan Johnston</i> * Academic Committee * Parent Involvement Committee * Personnel Committee	Expertise in special education	Retired public school Speech and Language Pathologist.	2 nd term End February 25, 2009
Members	Governance Expertise	Occupation	Term of Appointment
Mr. Roman Jaquez * Facility Committee * Finance Committee * Personnel Committee * Recruitment Committee	Extensive experience in business management and community service volunteer	Electrical Engineer and Business Owner	1 st term End January 15, 2010
<i>Dr. Roger Boggs</i> * Academic Committee * Facility Committee * Finance Committee * Personnel Committee	Expertise in personnel educational hiring, middle school and high school	Research Professor	1 st term End January 19, 2009
<i>Mr. Marcos Devers</i>	Veteran high school teacher and previous Lawrence City Council President	Massachusetts Registered Professional Engineer (Civil Engineer)	1 st term End June 16, 2011
<i>Mr. Vesna Nuon</i>	Veteran Community activist serving on many organizational Boards	Psychologist	1 st term End June 16, 2011
<i>Mr. Michael Vann, emeritus</i> * Facility Committee * Recruitment Committee	Liaison to Cambodian youth and families	Juvenile Probation Officer	2 nd term End January 19, 2008
<i>Mr. Giovanni Rodriguez</i>	Expertise in building design and traffic solutions	Transportation Engineer	1 st term End November 21, 2009
Julius Antigua	Administrative Assistant to the Board of Trustees	Graduate student in regional, economic and social development	

The Board of Trustees meets at regularly scheduled monthly meetings that take place on the third Tuesday of every month. Sub-committee meetings are scheduled as needed. A public posting is made 48 hours prior to each meeting and all meetings are subject to the Open Meeting law.

3. Major Board Policy Decisions 2007-2008

The following are the amendments and policy changes implemented during this 2007-2008 school year:

- Board voted to approve implementation of the Scott Foresman Reading program for grade 1-6.
- Board voted to hire Cain, Bourret, Jarry and Vaillancourt P.C. as the independent auditing firm for the fiscal year 2007-08.
- Board voted to approve the salary increases for teaching staff up to 2.38% for the 2008-09 school year.
- Board voted to sign into a line of credit with Enterprise Bank and Trust Company in the amount of \$400,000.
- Board approved to maximize student enrollment at 900 students for the 2008-09 school year.
- Board approved the change to the organizational chart from two academic principals to one academic principal and two assistant principals. The Academic Principal will report to the CEO.

Official Complaints Received During the 2007-2008 School Year:

- 1) The Board received a letter as per school grievance policy from a member of the teaching staff. The issue was the contesting of employment termination based on performance evaluation results. The Board Personnel Committee through due process made a final decision to complete addressing of this grievance at a meeting in compliance with Massachusetts Open Meeting Law. Upon advise from the committee that a hearing with the full Board would be the next step, the complainant decided not to pursue this issue further.
- 2) The Board received a letter as per school grievance policy from a member of the teaching staff. The issue was the contesting of a written warning issued based on work behavior. The Board Personnel Committee made a decision that brought to completion this grievance claim. It was done at a meeting in compliance with Massachusetts Open Meeting Law.
- 3) The Board received a letter as per school grievance policy from a member of the management staff. The issue was the contesting of work suspension based on work behavior. The Board Personnel Committee instructed employee in writing

on how to proceed as per grievance policy. This person opted to leave the school and not to proceed with the complaint.

- 4) The Board received a letter as per school grievance policy from a member of the management staff. The issue was the contesting of a written warning issued based on work behavior. The Board, through due process and acting upon the recommendation of the personnel committee, made a final decision to complete the address of this grievance claim at a Board meeting in compliance with Massachusetts Open Meeting law.
- 5) The Board received a letter as per school grievance policy from a member of the management staff. The issue was the contesting of a written warning issued based on work behavior. The Board Personnel Committee instructed employee in writing on how to proceed as per grievance policy. This person opted to resign and not to proceed with the complaint.
- 6) The Board received a letter as per school grievance policy from a member of the management staff. The issue was the contesting of work suspension based on work behavior. The Board Personnel Committee instructed employee in writing on how to proceed as per grievance policy. This case is still open.
- 7) The Board received a letter from Massachusetts Charter School Office (Mass CSO) requesting a response of wrongdoing allegations made against the Board of LCCPS to multiple state agencies. The Board hired a third party to investigate all allegations. The Board, through due process and in compliance with Massachusetts Open Meeting Law, voted to provide to Mass CSO the unedited report with findings from the third party. The school has not heard from any state agency regarding these allegations. Mass CSO responded with satisfaction for the school response at the present time.
- 8) The Board received a letter from two school parents requesting documents, clarification and explanation of Board bylaws, Board decision on Parents and Educators Together (PET) and Board's plans on hiring school CEO and how parents will participate in the process. Through communication dated April 28, 2008 the Board answered their concerns.

DISSEMINATION

❖ ***Faithfulness to the Charter Goal 1***

LCCPS will place an academic emphasis on the culture, language, and history of the Southeast Asian and Latino peoples.

Measure 1:

All students in grades K-8 will take either a Khmer or Spanish class daily.

Affirmative Evidence

During the 2007-2008, all LCCPS students participated in either a Khmer or Spanish class daily. Instruction begins in kindergarten; students in kindergarten through grade 3 receive 30 minutes of instruction daily, and students in grades 4-8 receive 45 minutes of instruction each day.

Measure 2:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

LCCPS met this goal by providing Khmer and Spanish language classes and several special events as noted later in this section.

Measure 3:

Parents will agree that LCCPS offers their student significant opportunities to learn about the Southeast Asian and Latino cultures.

Affirmative Evidence

LCCPS continues to highlight the Southeast Asian and Latino cultures with several special celebrations throughout the year (see Measure 4), including Cambodian New Year, Spanish Heritage Month, and African-American Month. Additionally, LCCPS' continuing enrollment growth and waiting list speak to the satisfaction of parents with the unique cultural education opportunities at LCCPS. This is also noted on the parent satisfaction survey as there is satisfaction with the mission of the school and the quality of instruction provided in areas of enrichment.

Measure 4:

The school will provide at least three activities done during the year that placed a specific emphasis on these two groups of people.

Affirmative Evidence

LCCPS is wonderfully diverse, and its demographics are quite unique in Lowell and across the Commonwealth. The emphasis on the culture, language, and history of the Cambodian and Latino peoples is a natural part of LCCPS. The traditions, culture, and language of these two groups of people are “taught” as part of the daily curriculum at LCCPS. In addition to regular classroom instruction in language arts, reading, math, social studies, and science, students in all grades have one class daily in either Khmer or Spanish. Within these classes, students are exposed to the culture, language, and respective political and social histories of Cambodia and Spanish-speaking countries.

Latino Activities

During this past academic year, we again embarked on enriching our students with activities promoting the Latino culture and heritage. As it is so important to familiarize Hispanic students with the contributions of their heritage as well as introducing all students to this rich background, LCCPS formally sponsored cultural activities for the third year. During the month of October, we presented to our students exhibitions of artists from the world of art, music, theater and dance.

Asian Activities

In addition to the activities highlighting the Latino heritage as described above, staff and students participated in a special celebration of the Cambodian New Year on April 13 as well as celebrating Cambodia month in April. This holiday is the most popular and the joyous celebration in Cambodia. This year, our team tried very hard to make our New Year the Best of the Best for our school for our students, parents, and the community. Our Khmer staff members and local community leaders organized the following activities:

1. Cambodia Flag rising in front of the Lowell City Hall. The Lowell mayor then issued a proclamation to the Cambodia community.
2. All Lowell schools dedicated time to educating students of different ethnicities about Cambodian culture and history.
3. For the Cambodian New Year celebration at LCCPS, we invited an opera musician from Cambodia to perform with the Angkor Dance Troupe, and had presentations of Cambodian classical, folk, and popular dance.
4. LCCPS continued the tradition of the Khmer culture fashion show.
5. LCCPS continued the Khmer music class, having obtained musical instruments from the Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association and Morgan Cultural Center.
6. LCCPS hired a music master, who resides in Lowell, to help plan the celebration.

7. LCCPS has applied for a grant in order to further the development of the Cambodian music and dance program.



African Heritage Celebration

On May 30th, LCCPS presented their first African celebration with a special assembly consisting of a live performance and video. Students were able to view traditional arts and crafts and a fashion show featuring the native dress of various African nations representative of our student/family population. Another segment of the presentation featured traditional drum music and dance along with a professional storyteller.

It is our sincere hope to continue the tradition of celebrating African heritage along with the Hispanic and Cambodian celebrations that enrich our school culture.

❖ Faithfulness to Charter Goal 2

LCCPS will disseminate its best practices relative to English Language Learners, urban, and economically disadvantaged students and communities.

Measure 1:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

Although a partnership was not established for ELL, the Reading First director did attend meetings with members of the Reading department for Lowell Public Schools as they have been using the Scott Foresman reading program for the past few years.

This summer, 4 of our teachers (2 from the ELL department) attended a workshop sponsored by the ELL office of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. One of the facets of this workshop is to disseminate best practice and success of our teaching model as it relates to the continually improving outcomes of our students for MELA-O and MEPA testing.

Measure 2:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

Members of the administrative staff and select teachers participated in a series of visits to area charter schools. This programming was organized through the MA Charter School Office with the purpose of observing best practices. Upon return to LCCPS, administrators and teachers met to discuss their findings and to go forward and select practices that could be adopted and adapted to our school community. An action plan is to be developed which members of our school team will then present at a future date. Under the direction of Ms. Denise Molina, sixth grade students developed an action plan for obtaining student lockers. The strategy for this problem solving and leadership activity allowed these students the opportunity to present their idea and process at a special gathering in Boston.

Measure 3:

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.

Affirmative Evidence

LCCPS has established a partnership with several Greater Lowell area community groups and businesses. Examples of community involvement at LCCPS include:

- For the second year, the Boy Scouts of America have sponsored a troop for boys. This has afforded them the opportunity to participate in activities involving other troops in the Greater Lowell area.
- Fund raising activities have allowed middle school students the opportunity to provide monies and items to those less fortunate, particularly at the holidays.
- Members of the chorus have performed at various community functions throughout the city and particularly for members of the senior citizenry of Lowell.
- A partnership with a local Cambodian dance troupe will move forward next year, which will afford more opportunities for student performances.

OUR STAFF

1. Staff Profile

LCCPS continues to recognize its teaching and other support staff as the ones primarily responsible for the school's success, and values their retention greatly. As Table indicates, at the end of 2007-2008, 7 out of 78 classroom teachers (10%) are not returning to LCCPS for the fall of 2008-2009. As Table indicates, 8 out of 36 (22%) other staff (all, non-teaching full-time staff) that finished the year are not returning to LCCPS for the fall of 2007-2008. Four teachers left and were replaced during the 2007-2008 school year. At the end of the school year, five members of the Senior Management team resigned their positions as we start the next school year with changes in the organizational structure of the school.

Table 43: Classroom Teachers: Percentage Who Left After Each Year's End

2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
25%	19%	9%	17%	10%

Table 44: Other Staff: Percentage Who Left After Each Year's End

2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
10%	24%	11%	13%	22%

Requirements of No Child Left Behind

Charter School Teacher Qualifications: a teacher in a charter school must have a Bachelors Degree and must either possess MA teacher certification or have taken and passed the applicable MA Teacher Tests. Charter school teachers have 1 year from date of hire to pass the teacher test (s) to remain at the school and be considered as Highly Qualified. Teacher Assistants must have completed two years of college or hold an Associates Degree. Table 45 summarizes teacher qualifications during 2007-2008.

Table 45: Summary of Teacher Qualifications (2007 – 2008)

Position	Number of Staff Members	Percentage
Full Time Teachers	78	
Full Time Administration	8	
Full Time Teaching Assistants	8	
Number of Teaching Staff Designated as Highly Qualified	65	83 %
Number of Administrative Staff Designated as Highly Qualified	6 * 1 N/A	86%
Number of Teaching Assistants Designated as Highly Qualified	6	75 %
Average Years Teaching Experience	6.2	
Average Years at LCCPS	3.0	

For those staff members who have not received the designation for “Highly Qualified”, the Human Resource Department and the Curriculum Coordinator have been working with these staff members in order to coordinate a plan so that 100% of the teachers and teaching assistants are designated “highly qualified” according to the standards as set forth in “No Child Left Behind”. This year, we have partnered with the Title 1 Dissemination Project and the Hampshire Educational Collaborative who both a qualified providers of professional course work for teachers and teaching assistants.

As many teachers are preparing for re-certification in 2009, we have contacted the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education so that a representative from the bureau of certification can come to LCCPS and assist teachers with the necessary procedure for updating their licensure. This past year, the Curriculum Director has provided trainings during designated professional development times (per the school calendar) and after school hours so that teachers are afforded the opportunities to earn the necessary Professional Development Points (PDP’s) required for re-certification.

FINANCES

1. Approved School Budget (Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2009)

LCCPS Approved Budget – Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2008		Approved Budget FY 2008
REVENUE		
Tuition Rate	\$	11,072
Number of Students		840
Tuition - State Funds		
FEDERAL & STATE AWARDS		
TITLE I (Fund Code 305)	\$	583,000
TITLE II - A (Teacher Quality Fund Code 140)		48,322
TITLE II D (Enhanced Educ. Tech. Code 160)		3,995
TITLE III (ELL Fund Code 180)		39,217
TITLE IV Safe and Drug Free (Code 331)		8,073
TITLE V (Innovative Programs, Code 302)		2,699
Federal Special Education, code 240		170,324
SPED Program Improvement, Code 274		7,200
Reading First (Fund Code 728-A)		130,950
Singapore Math G/T Grant		0
Javits G/T Grant (Fund Code 580)		30,000
Service Learning Grant		1,500
Charter School Dissemination Grant		2,500
Peabody Grant		45,000
Total Grant Revenues:		
OTHER REVENUE		
Private Donation	\$	20,000
Medicare & Circuit Breaker Reimbursement		140,000
Interest Income		12,000
Food Services Reimbursement		350,000
eRate Telecommunications Reimbursement		35,000
Other Income (Legal Fee Fund Raising)		60,000
Before & After School Program (contribution)		57,000
Sub-Total Other Revenue		674,000
Total Revenues:		\$ 11,047,260
EXPENSES		
SALARIES		
ADMINISTRATIVE		\$ 668,656
FACILITIES		367,107
SPECIAL ED		428,274

LCCPS Approved Budget – Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2008 (continued)		Approved Budget FY 2008
STUDENT SERVICE STAFF	\$	465,928
INSTRUCTIONAL		3,942,671
After School:		168,750
Sub Total Salaries:	\$	6,041,386
PAYROLL TAXES	\$	206,011
WORKER'S COMP. INSURANCE		25,978
HEALTH INSURANCE		571,000
OTHER BENEFITS		60,414
Total Personnel Costs:	\$	6,904,789
FACILITY & PROGRAMS EXPENSES		
Rent (assume 25c increase per sqf)	\$	631,250
CAM Charge		142,000
Building Repairs		80,000
Cleaning Supplies		45,000
Security		10,000
Telecommunication		20,000
Waste Removal		15,000
Insurance		18,000
Utilities		135,000
Miscellaneous		5,000
Depreciation-Leasehold		145,000
Depreciation-Furniture		24,000
Depreciation-Computer		45,000
Food Services		350,000
Total Facilities:	\$	1,665,250
SPECIAL EDUCATION		
Specialists & Services	\$	130,000
Copier Supplies		0
Copier Lease		0
legal Fee for SPED		5,000
Postage and Freight		0
Staff Development		4,000
Supplies		6,000
Workbooks Consumable		3,600
SPED Equipment		1,600
Miscellaneous		1,000
Total Special Education:		151,200
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS		
Textbooks	\$	60,000
Textbooks Reading First		0
Workbooks Consumable		45,000
Classroom Supplies (@\$76/pp 2008)		65,000
Supplies and Books for Library		7,200

LCCPS Approved Budget – Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2008 (continued)		Approved Budget FY 2008
Supplies Reading Middle School		15,000
Supplies Copier		23,000
Supplies Title - I		0
Supply B/A School Program	\$	5,000
Copier Leases		27,000
Grant Writing		10,000
Consultant		10,000
SFA fee Reading First		0
Student Transportation		4,000
Media Equipment		5,000
Furniture & Equipment		5,000
Assessment		15,000
Student Activities		15,000
Field Trips (@\$30 pp/ 2008)		25,000
Physical Education		3,500
Athletic Programs		20,000
Technical Supplies (toner, printers, ...)		5,000
Computer Equip & Software		10,000
Staff Activities		5,000
Staff Development		18,000
Staff Dev. Reading First		0
Nurse Supplies		3,000
Other		5,000
Total Educational Programs:	\$	405,700
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES		
Audit	\$	15,000
Governance		14,000
Accounting Firm Fee		54,000
Legal		50,000
Consultant		35,000
Copier Lease		1,500
Copier Supplies		1,000
Insurance-Umbrella		26,000
Insurance for Directors		15,000
Office Equipment & Maintenance		1,000
Marketing		5,000
Postage & Freight		12,000
Payroll Processing		12,000
Tech Supplies		2,500
Printing		2,500
Office Supplies		5,000
Student Recruitment		5,000
Staff Recruitment		10,000
Staff Development		6,000

LCCPS Approved Budget – Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2008 (continued)		Approved Budget FY 2008
Travel Expenses		5,000
Principal & Interest - EB&T Loan 750K		200,000
Interest, Loan 250K		78,000
Bank Fee		3,000
Furniture		10,000
Computer Equip & Software		5,000
Miscellaneous		20,000
High School Planning		0
Total Administrative:	\$	593,500
TITLE I (Fund Code 305)	\$	583,000
TITLE II - A (Teacher Quality Fund Code 140)		48,322
TITLE II D (Enhanced Educ. Tech. Fund Code 160)		3,995
TITLE III (ELL Fund Code 180)		39,217
TITLE IV Safe and Drug Free Schools (Fund Code 331)		8,073
TITLE V (Innovative Programs Fund Code 302)		2,699
FEDERAL SPECIAL EDUCATION (Fund Code 240)		170,324
SPED Program Improvement (Fund Code 274)		7,200
READING FIRST (Fund Code 728-A)		130,950
Singapore Math G/T Grant		0
Javits G/T Grant (Fund Code 580)		30,000
Service Learning Grant		1,500
Charter School Dissemination Grant		2,500
OTHER Grants		0
Peabody		45,000
TOTAL GRANT Expense		1,072,780
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$	10,793,219
BUDGET SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	\$	254,041
2008 GOAL: 4 % SURPLUS		2.30%

2. Financial Statement

**LOWELL COMMUNITY CHARTER PUBLIC SCHOOL
FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND
EXPENDITURES
FOR THE YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2007
(UNAUDITED)**

INCOME:

Per Pupil Tuition	\$	9,144,375
State and Federal Grants		906,726
Other Income		265,222
Interest Earned		21,217
TOTAL INCOME	\$	<u>10,337,540</u>

EXPENSES:

Salaries	\$	6,146,845
Rent		745,750
Benefits and Payroll Taxes		821,515
Educational Materials		568,768
Consultants		483,846
Depreciation		233,458
Repairs and Maintenance		134,404
Cleaning		70,575
Utilities		136,280
Supplies		28,500
Insurance		17,467
Recruiting and Development		63,851
Interest Expense		28,244
Legal and Audit		179,277
Telephone		18,325
Other expenses		<u>180,763</u>
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$	<u>9,857,868</u>
 NET INCOME	 \$	 <u><u>479,672</u></u>

3. Balance Sheet

**LOWELL COMMUNITY CHARTER PUBLIC SCHOOL
BALANCE SHEET (UNAUDITED)
June 30, 2007**

ASSETS

Current Assets:

Cash	\$	1,979,653
Grants Receivables		241,772
Prepaid Expenses		57,610
Total Current Assets		<u><u>2,279,036</u></u>

Plant & Equipment:

Leasehold Improvements		2,244,394
Equipment and Furniture		970,236
Less Accumulated Depreciation		<u>(1,275,431)</u>
Total Plant & Equipment		<u><u>1,939,199</u></u>

Other Assets:

Security Deposits		<u>4,000</u>
-------------------	--	--------------

TOTAL ASSETS	\$	<u><u>4,222,235</u></u>
---------------------	-----------	--------------------------------

LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

Current Liabilities:

Accounts Payable	\$	355,333
Accrued Payroll		338,611
Accrued Expenses		58,866
Unearned Revenue		7,899
Total Current Liabilities		<u><u>760,709</u></u>

Note Payable		<u>736,337</u>
--------------	--	----------------

Total Liabilities		1,497,046
Total Net Assets		<u><u>2,725,189</u></u>

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS	\$	<u><u>4,222,235</u></u>
---	-----------	--------------------------------