



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

2004-2005

Mr. Roman Jaquez, Chairperson, Board of Trustees



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.lowellccs.org

Dear LCCPS Community,

Our Charter School passed its first five years cycle re-certification inspection.

Congratulations to all! Because of this, the school year 2004-2005 is of significant importance for our community. It seems that our good MCAS results for the year 2003-2004 served us well for the DOE Board of Trustees to decide in our favor and to grant us the charter renewal. I believe that it is due to their recognition of the hard work and tenacity of everyone, including the children, involved in our wonderful school!

Two major events happened at the end of this school year: The Board of Trustees voted to change the school management structure; and the Director, Sue Jamback, resigned.

The School's Board of Trustees decided not to renew its contract with the school management company, Imagine Schools (former Chancellor-Beacon) when it was due to be renewed in June. Instead, the Board made the decision to handle all operations and administrative needs in-house. On June 27th, the Board of Education approved our request to change the organization structure. The new structure features a CEO who will report to the Board, and two academic principals, a COO and a part-time CFO who will report to the CEO. I want to thank Imagine Schools and Sue Jamback for all the work done that culminated with our renewal.

To guide and oversee the change process, the Board created an ad hoc Transition Committee, which included: four Board members, four teachers and one parent. This committee has accomplished the following goals:

- Make sure the school had all resources needed for its normal operation by July 1st
- Hire interim school principals and have them in place by the above date.

Resources were in place by targeted date. Among other accomplishments:

- A Finance Department was created and personnel hired.
- HR consultants were hired
- Grant Writers for entitlement grants were contracted
- Payroll and insurance /benefits continuity were assured.

Taking a little longer time:

- It took the Board approximately two weeks beyond the targeted date to secure and have in place the upper school principal (grades 4 - 8). Ms. Elizabeth Torosian was hired for that position.
- Mr. Mathew Gallup was hired as principal for grades K – 3, and
- Mr. Rida Eng was appointed as the LCCPS Chief Executive Officer.

These positions are on an interim basis. This is the third time Mr. Eng assumes this position. The Board is engaged in the search for a CEO. She/he will have the final decision on the school management issues. We would like to have that person in place at or no later than November 30, 2005.

Hopefully, these changes will provide a more suitable teaching, learning and working environment for all LCCPS students and staff members. By having Academic Principals with limited administrative responsibilities, we expect the school to increase its focus on instruction for better student performance.

With this new school year, the school is adding one more grade and one hundred more students as we have been doing in previous years. We will be a K – 8 school this year. With 750 students, we are the third largest school in Lowell. Next year, we'll be the second largest. We are not a small school anymore, hence the reasons for the structural changes that we are implementing. We expect the CEO to help the Board in submitting an amendment to the Board of Education for our High School certification. Good curriculum implementation, MCAS results and solid school operation are our only venue to get that High School status. Let's do it!

I want to take the opportunity to thank our dedicated and tireless staff, committed teachers, all the Members of the Board of Trustees, school volunteers, parents, and students who day in and day out work very hard to make this school a prime educational center. I would like to also thank the superintendent of Lowell Public Schools, Karla Baehr and her staff for their help in transportation, special education and food service matters, the City's Fire Department and Building Inspection Office for their help with our continuous building renovation process.

Con gratitud y aprecio,

Roman B. Jaquez/ Chairman

Official Complaints Received during the 2004-2005 school year.

The Board received only one official complaint from the parents of a child. They were looking to change their child's classroom. The matter was resolved satisfactorily.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
MISSION STATEMENT	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7 – 8
EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY	9
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE	10 – 25
<i>Academic Success and Accountability</i>	10
<i>Organizational Viability</i>	22
<u>SCHOOL PROFILE</u>	
OUR STUDENTS	25 – 26
<i>Student Demographics</i>	25
<i>Application, Waiting List and Turnover Data</i>	25
<i>School Report Card</i>	26
GOVERNANCE	27 – 29
<i>Board of Trustees</i>	27
<i>Board Committees and Members</i>	28
<i>Major Board Policies</i>	29
DISSEMINATION	30 – 31
<i>Faithfulness to the charter</i>	30
OUR STAFF	31 – 32
<i>Staff Profile, Staff Turnover and Summary of Teacher Qualifications</i>	31
FINANCE	33 – 38
<i>Approved School Budget</i>	33
<i>Financial Statement</i>	36
<i>Balance Sheet</i>	37

INTRODUCTION

The Lowell Community Charter Public School (LCCPS) is presently a K-7 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. It was intended that LCCPS would eventually become a K-12 school by the year 2010 enrolling approximately 1,300 students; however, the present charter only permits expansion through grade 8. LCCPS will add grade 8 during the upcoming 2005-2006 school year. LCCPS intends to apply to the DOE to amend the charter to add grades 9 – 12. As of October 1, 2004, the number of students enrolled at LCCPS was 645. The enrollment cap for the 2004-2005 school year was 651.

This past school year, middle school students (grades 5 – 7) had their own area within the building separate from elementary students. This separation was able to occur because of renovations that were completed to provide additional classroom space. For the upcoming school year, eighth grade instruction will be added, as well as three additional teachers to serve in three new fifth-grade classrooms.

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 fifth year of preparing children of Lowell to succeed as students and citizens. In five years, LCCPS has celebrated numerous successes while facing many challenges. Our greatest success during the 2004-2005 school year was the DOE's decision to renew the school's charter for a second five-year term. Other successes include responding to demand by continuing to increase enrollment, the completion of our first annual summer school enrichment program, and laying the foundation for academic success for low-income immigrant children. The challenges have ranged from those inherent in creating a new charter school from the ground up, and others that appear to be more unique to LCCPS in particular. At the close of the school's fifth year, LCCPS continues to emerge as a model for urban public school performance and reform.

Like many American urban public schools, at LCCPS, we are educating primarily first- and second-generation immigrant children. We are providing rich academic instruction in English to English-as-a-second-language learners. The percentage of these students at LCCPS is much greater than in nearly every public school in the Commonwealth, which creates specific challenges that the school is dedicated to overcoming. We expect our students to master the English language and all other appropriate and required academic content. At the same time, we provide them with daily World Language instruction that will allow them to develop the literacy and communication skills in their first language to perform as literate, bilingual citizens.

Lowell Community Charter Public School is able to report on the success of its academic programs. Consistently, students who have been educated at LCCPS since kindergarten have scored higher on internal and state-wide assessment tests as compared with students who have more recently been enrolled at LCCPS. Significant progress was made between the 2003 and 2004 MCAS testing results, which enabled the school to achieve its Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determination, and to demonstrate that students are learning at our school. 2005 MCAS testing results have not all been received as of the writing of this report; however, the 2005 third grade reading results were comparable to 2004, with 33% scoring Proficient as compared with 36% in 2004, but the school had established a goal of 50% proficiency that it will work to achieve in the coming school year. The majority of students at LCCPS have increased their reading proficiency since entering the school. As compared with 2004, significant increases were noted in the percentage of students reading at or above grade level for grades 2, 6, and 7 as determined by Success For All reading assessments; this testing did note declines in the other grades that will be addressed in the coming year.

During the 2004-2005 school year, LCCPS added two full-time English Language Learners (ELL) teachers to its staff specifically to work with students for whom English is a second language. ELL teachers were successful in working with classroom teachers to provide more effective instruction to assist these students in developing literacy and communication skills.

LCCPS continues to implement the Reading First Initiative. This federally funded program has provided the school with on-going high quality professional development and hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of teaching and reading materials. This program allowed the school to identify and utilize student achievement data to target instruction in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. As we enter the school's second term with renewed focus on the five elements of reading instruction, we eagerly anticipate a more rapid increase in student achievement.

Organizational viability continues as one of the school's most unique strengths. The school has smoothly handled continuous yearly growth (LCCPS has added a grade every year). Additionally, by the end of August 2005, the school will have completed the renovation of attached building "Mill 5", which will double the area of the school and allow for continued growth. LCCPS continues to steadily grow in its financial solvency and stability and has had no negative findings on its independent audits.

Those at Lowell Community Charter Public School look to its sixth year, and the first after the charter renewal, with eager anticipation. As the school grows, so does the strength of its programs. The needs of the students who reside in the city of Lowell will remain the same: they need and deserve excellent and committed teachers, strong academic programs, wrap-around social services, and the highest of expectations for their productivity and success.

EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

Lowell Community Charter Public School is a school where all children are expected to succeed. It is the intent of the school that none of the students at our inner city school will drop out of school and all will go on to higher education after graduation from LCCPS, thus, the school's highest priority is the promotion of academic achievement for all students. For this academic success to occur, the school has focused on literacy first. Our primary task is to teach limited English speakers to read and write in English. Every student receives a minimum of 135 minutes of reading and writing instruction each day.

Although LCCPS has a longer school day than all Lowell district schools, our students are expected to complete homework each night. In 2004-2005, all students in grades were 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 daily instruction in Khmer or Spanish. Other "specials" include art and physical education. Finally, LCCPS instituted a three-week academic enrichment program during the summer of 2004.

One hallmark of the school is the relationship between teacher and student and teacher and parent. Typically, four times each year, every classroom teacher sits down with parents and their child to review three major documents: the quarterly report card (which includes student current reading level), the student's portfolio, (samples of student work) and the Quarterly Learning Contract. The QLC is a contract that is created by the teacher, parent, and student that sets academic or social/emotional goals for the student that will be worked on, evaluated, and reset each quarter. Over 90% of our parents attend each of these quarterly conferences due to the commitment of the parents and that of the staff who make every effort to make themselves available to meet at the convenience of the parents. Staff members hold conferences at any time (day or night), and conduct them at the student's home if transportation is an issue for the family.

LCCPS acknowledges the needs of its families. In addition to a safe and productive school, our families appreciate other supports. We provide free before- and after-school care for over 150 students each day. Working parents may drop off their children at 6:30 AM. At 7:30 AM, we serve breakfast to most of the students at the school. At the end of the day, students whose parents are still at work are enrolled in our free after-school program until 6:00 PM. In 2004-2005, all staff members serving in the After-School Program were qualified teachers who provided nurturing and student-centered after-school care and instruction.

Teachers at Lowell Community Charter Public School utilize a variety of teaching methods, and cooperative learning dominates every classroom. Students work in teams of 3-5, and also work independently depending on the task. Teams are encouraged to discuss the work and "think together". Teachers award team points to acknowledge success and to motivate students to share ideas and skills. The school also provides individual and small-group tutoring to students who are working below-grade level.

Lowell Community Charter Public School Annual Report

Summary of Performance

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

1. Academic Success and Accountability

Lowell Community Charter Public School has established the following academic goals in its revised Accountability Plan, approved June 2003:

❖ ***Academic Goal 1***

Students who have been at the school since kindergarten, or for three consecutive years, will demonstrate progressive improvement of reading skills on the MCAS, TerraNova, Success for All quarterly assessments, and Reading First assessments.

Measurement

Progress will be measured against current and previous annual results for each student.

Affirmative Evidence

1) **MCAS:** The MCAS has been administered to all students in the 3rd grade at LCCPS for 5 consecutive years. This exam consists of 40 multiple-choice questions and several short, open response questions. The majority of the questions are based on reading passages that include fiction, non-fiction, legends, poetry, and plays. The data presented below in Table 1 are based on the scores and proficiency levels of 96 students as received from the Massachusetts Department of Education.

The school recorded significant gains on the third grade MCAS reading test in 2004 as compared to the 2003 results. For 2005, LCCPS established an internal goal of 50% of students scoring at the Proficient level, a 14% increase over last year. The school also had hoped for a 6% drop at the Needs Improvement level and a 9% drop at the Warning level. With such significant gains in 2004, these were high expectations. Table 1 below indicates the Grade 3 MCAS results from Spring 2001 to 2005 on a percentage basis; the Spring 2005 scores are based on the receipt of 86 student scores.

Table 1: 3rd Grade MCAS scores for Reading from Spring 2001 to Spring 2005

	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>	<i>Warning</i>
<i>Spring 2005</i>	33 %	43 %	24 %
<i>Spring 2004</i>	36 %	51 %	14 %
<i>Spring 2003</i>	7 %	56 %	37 %
<i>Spring 2002</i>	17 %	47 %	37 %
<i>Spring 2001</i>	23 %	48 %	29 %

Spring 2005 scores indicate that progress is similar to a little lower than Spring 2004. Students scoring at the Proficient level have remained relatively the same. The number of students scoring at the Needs Improvement level decreased; however, these students moved into the Warning level.

Table 2: Comparison of Current 3rd Grade Cohort (40 students) Versus Non-Cohort (46 students) 2005 Reading MCAS

	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>	<i>Warning</i>
Cohort	40% (16 students)	33% (13 students)	27% (11 students)
Non-Cohort	26% (12 students)	52% (24 students)	22% (10 students)

Table 2 shows a comparison in MCAS scores between the cohort group (students who have been enrolled at LCCPS since grade K) and the non-cohort group (students who began enrollment at LCCPS after grade K). At LCCPS, the non-cohort group is slightly larger than the cohort group. Students in the cohort group outperformed the non-cohort group with more students scoring at the Proficient level. Since these numbers are based on such a small population, it is important to look at the number of students as well, especially at the Warning level where the numbers of students are relatively the same.

Significant gains were also made on the fourth grade English/Language Arts MCAS test from the Spring 2004 administration as noted in last year’s report. There was a 2% gain at the Advanced level, a 28% gain at the Proficient level, a 13% gain in Needs Improvement and a 43% drop at the Warning level. The increase in both the Proficient and Needs Improvement levels resulted from the significant decrease at the Warning level. The scores for the current 4th grade from the Spring 2005 administration were not available at the time this report was written.

2) TerraNova: LCCPS made the decision to stop using the TerraNova test in the early spring of 2005. This decision was made for four reasons: 1] Too many hours of instruction were lost due to administering required assessments [MCAS, MEPA, Reading First (DIBELS and GRADE)]; 2] The MCAS will be testing all grades 3 through 8 on Reading or English/Language Arts and Mathematics starting in the 2005-2006 school year; 3] The TerraNova was not being used to target instruction, unlike the MCAS, MEPA and DIBELS; and 4] The TerraNova was not compatible with our testing database, making it difficult to utilize the data effectively to target instruction. In order to measure progress in mathematics, LCCPS will be switching to the G-MADE (Group Mathematics Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation). This test is prepared by the same publishing company, AGS Publishing, as GRADE, and is compatible with Testwiz.

As a result, there are no Spring 2005 TerraNova scores for reading or math. The scores on the Fall 2004 test are not a good indicator as the fall test measures what a student is supposed to have mastered at the end of that grade level. Because the Spring 2005 TerraNova was not administered, the Fall 2004 scores could not be compared to Spring 2005 scores to determine if progress was made. Also, it is important to note that the TerraNova goals were deleted from the new Accountability Plan that is in the process of being revised for the beginning of the 2005-2006 school year, the first year of the school’s second 5-year cycle of its charter.

3) Success For All Reading Assessments: 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 6. The Kindergarten program is an all-day SFA program called Kindercorner that encompasses reading, writing, math, discovery and social skills. Students in grades 1 through 6 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. Students in grade 7 have been removed from the Success For All model and partake in a teacher-created model based on a variety of print media.

Approximately every 9 weeks, all students in grades 1 through 7 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 7 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 has 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 3: Percentage of Students Reading At or Above Grade Level Based on SFA Reading Assessments from Spring 2004 to Spring 2005

Grade	Spring '04	November '04	January '05	April '05	June '05
1	78	67	65	64	64
2	43	56	55	72	71
3	83	89	86	83	74
4	83	90	86	88	65
5	80	78	82	80	57
6	56	77	59	62	71
7	21	32	32	55	61

In terms of whole grade reading progress throughout the year, the SFA reading assessment data (shown above in Table 3) show that the greatest increases were in grades 2 and 7. Data

for other grades did not change as much. Scores dropped in grades 3, 4, and 5 between April and May.

In order to look at progress over time and how the programs and instruction at LCCPS affect it, it is necessary to compare scores between cohort and non-cohort groups. As the school ages and expands, there are more cohort data available for comparison. The annual report for the 2003-2004 school year report looked at cohort groups that started in 2000 (current 4th grade) and 2001 (current 3rd grade). This year the cohort for the class that started with LCCPS in 2002 (current 2nd grade) will be added.

Table 4: Comparison of Students in Grades 2 through 4 (Cohort Groups versus Non-Cohort Groups) Reading Below, At, or Above Grade Level Based on Spring 2005 Internal Reading Assessments

	<i>Number of Students</i>	<i>BELOW Grade Level</i>	<i>AT Grade Level</i>	<i>ABOVE Grade Level</i>	<i>Total AT or ABOVE Grade Level</i>
Grade 2 Cohort	49	18%	16%	65%	81%
Grade 2 Non-Cohort	50	40%	24%	36%	60%
Grade 3 Cohort	40	27.5%	25%	47.5%	72.5%
Grade 3 Non-Cohort	49	31%	31%	38%	69%
Grade 4 Cohort	52	31%	31%	38%	69%
Grade 4 Non-Cohort	44	41%	23%	36%	59%

Table 4 indicates that students who have been at LCCPS consistently are reading at a higher level than their peers who have more recently enrolled at LCCPS. The greatest differences can be seen in the second and fourth grades. Twenty-one percent more students in second grade are reading at or above their peers. At the end of second grade, 22% more students from the non-cohort group are reading below grade level. Looking more closely at this percentage, it is important to note that 14 of these students are new to LCCPS this year, starting at the beginning or some point mid-year. The fourth grade cohort also continues to outperform the non-cohort group with 10% more students reading at or above grade level and 10% less reading below grade level.

4) Reading First Assessments: 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 and third 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).

The following tables outline progress on GRADE and DIBELS. The first section (4.1) of tables will summarize whole group progress by grade. The second section (4.2) of tables will look at cohort groups versus non-cohort groups in the second and third grades.

4.1 GRADE and DIBELS WHOLE GROUP PERFORMANCE in GRADES K, 1, 2 and 3

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 declines between benchmark dates as some students may have reached the benchmark in one administration, but not in the next one.

KINDERGARTEN

Table 5: GRADE Subtest - Listening Comprehension

	<i>Fall (9/30/04)</i>	<i>Spring (5/31/05)</i>
Weak	41 %	22 %
Average	39 %	44 %
Strength	20 %	34 %

Table 6: DIBELS Subtest - Initial Sound Fluency

	Fall	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	27 %	18 %	N/A
Some Risk (Supplemental)	36 %	59 %	N/A
Low Risk (Core)	38 %	23 %	N/A

Table 7: DIBELS Subtest - Letter Naming Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	43 %	23 %	34 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	26 %	22 %	52 %
Low Risk (Core)	24 %	28 %	48 %

Table 8: DIBELS Subtest - Phonemic Segmentation Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	N/A	18 %	7 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	N/A	24 %	17 %
Low Risk (Core)	N/A	58 %	76 %

Table 9: DIBELS Subtest - Nonsense Word Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	N/A	8 %	13 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	N/A	13 %	12 %
Low Risk (Core)	N/A	79 %	76 %

The GRADE data in Table 5 indicate that students listening comprehension scores are developing toward strength. Seventy-eight percent of students exhibit the ability to hear and comprehend sounds, a good indicator of reading ability. Most of the data concerning DIBELS (shown in Tables 6 through 9) shows positive increases in the Low Risk (Core) category by the spring outcome. A kindergarten student's ability to segment phonemes fluently and to blend sounds together to form words, nonsense or not, is essential in gauging that student's readiness to read. By the spring, 76% of kindergarten students scored at the Low Risk (Core) level on both of these subtests (Tables 8 and 9). Only a small percentage of students scored at the At Risk (Intervention) level on both of these tests. These are the students who will continue to be monitored closely to determine if they need to participate in an intervention curriculum in the first grade.

GRADE 1

Table 10: GRADE - Total Test

	Fall (9/30/04)	Spring (5/31/05)
Weak	60 %	17 %
Average	38 %	57 %
Strength	2 %	26 %

Table 11: DIBELS Subtest - Phonemic Segmentation Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	12 %	5 %	0 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	19 %	4 %	4 %
Low Risk (Core)	69 %	91 %	96 %

Table 12: DIBELS Subtest - Nonsense Word Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	13 %	15 %	1 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	19 %	25 %	27 %
Low Risk (Core)	68 %	60 %	72 %

Table 13: DIBELS Subtest - Oral Reading Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	N/A	18 %	7 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	N/A	24 %	17 %
Low Risk (Core)	N/A	58 %	76 %

Table 10 represents only the Total Test scores from GRADE. In the fall, students are given two subtests, Phonological Awareness and Early Literacy Skills. These two scores are then combined to get a Total Test score. In the spring, students are given two different subtests, Vocabulary and Comprehension. These two subtests scores are also combined to get a Total Test score. As a result, Total Test scores are the only comparison from fall to spring.

Significant progress can be seen in first grade reading development. In the fall, 40% of students were exhibiting average to strong indicators of reading ability. By spring, this percentage increased to 83%, more than double the number from the fall.

In terms of DIBELS scores, first grade students showed remarkable progress and great promise to be on target for becoming good readers in the coming years (see Tables 11 through 13). Ninety-six percent of students fell in to the Low Risk level in phoneme segmentation and three-quarters of the class are at the Low Risk level for Nonsense Word Fluency and Oral Reading Fluency. It is promising to see that such small percentages fell into the At Risk level on all three subtests, with no students falling into the At Risk level on the Phoneme Segmentation subtest.

GRADE 2

Table 14: GRADE Subtest - Vocabulary

	<i>Fall (9/30/04)</i>	<i>Spring (5/31/05)</i>
Weak	27 %	17 %
Average	59 %	53 %
Strength	14 %	30 %

Table 15: GRADE Subtest - Comprehension

	<i>Fall (9/30/04)</i>	<i>Spring (5/31/05)</i>
Weak	58 %	22 %
Average	35 %	52 %
Strength	7 %	26 %

Table 16: GRADE: Total Test

	<i>Fall (9/30/04)</i>	<i>Spring (5/31/05)</i>
Weak	42 %	20 %
Average	51 %	56 %
Strength	7 %	23 %

Table 17: DIBELS Subtest - Oral Reading Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	21 %	28 %	39 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	26 %	16 %	15 %
Low Risk (Core)	53 %	56 %	46 %

Tables I4 through I6 indicate that reading progress is evident across both subtests and with the Total Test score. The Vocabulary subtest indicates that students in the Weak level decreased by 10% and students in the Strength category doubled. The Comprehension subtest indicates dramatic progress regarding this skill, with 36% of students testing out of the Weak level, and the number of students in the Strength category nearly tripling.

The DIBELS data (shown in Table I7) do not reflect the same progress as the GRADE data. The percentage of students falling into the Low Risk level decreased from the fall and the winter and the percentage of students falling into the At Risk level increased. As stated earlier, the benchmark increases with each administration. This GRADE data indicate that these students do have the skills necessary to read at grade level; however, nearly half of this grade does not yet exhibit fluency. This is a skill that will have to be continually emphasized throughout their instruction in third grade in order to have them reading at or above grade level prior to administration of the third grade MCAS test.

Table 18: GRADE Subtest - Vocabulary

	<i>Fall (9/30/04)</i>	<i>Spring (5/31/05)</i>
Weak	49 %	29 %
Average	44 %	56 %
Strength	7 %	16 %

Table 19: GRADE Subtest - Comprehension

	<i>Fall (9/30/04)</i>	<i>Spring (5/31/05)</i>
Weak	56 %	33 %
Average	40 %	48 %
Strength	3 %	19 %

Table 20: GRADE - Total Test

	<i>Fall (9/30/04)</i>	<i>Spring (5/31/05)</i>
Weak	58 %	36 %
Average	37 %	44 %
Strength	4 %	20 %

Table 21: DIBELS Subtest - Oral Reading Fluency

	Fall Screening	Winter Benchmark	Spring Outcome
At Risk (Intervention)	34 %	46 %	37 %
Some Risk (Supplemental)	34 %	22 %	34 %
Low Risk (Core)	31 %	32 %	29 %

Tables 18-20 indicate that third grade progress is similar to that of second grade on GRADE. Slightly more progress can be noted in the area of Comprehension than in Vocabulary. Vocabulary decreased 20% at the Weak level and increased 9% at the Strength level. Comprehension scores decreased 23% in the Weak level and increased 16% at the Strength level, which was very encouraging progress. As a whole, 64% of third grade students scored in the Average to Strength range on the Total test, a 23% increase from the fall administration.

DIBELS data, shown in Table 21, remained relatively unchanged in third grade. As noted earlier, the benchmark increases with each administration; however, the number of students exhibiting oral reading fluency did not grow much from fall to spring.

4.2 GRADE and DIBELS COHORT GROUP PERFORMANCE in GRADES 2 and 3

As stated earlier, GRADE and DIBELS are only administered to students in grades K through 3 as part of the Reading First grant. As a result, the cohort comparison is looking at students in grades 2 and 3 only, as these grades have had more time in our program than

students in grades K and 1. Tables 22 through 25 compare progress between cohort and non-cohort groups based on the Spring 2005 administration of GRADE.

Table 22: Comparison of Cohort Group and Non-Cohort in 2nd and 3rd Grade on GRADE – Subtest: Vocabulary (Spring 2004)

I.	Number of Students	II. Strength	Average	Weak
Grade 2 Cohort	49	33 %	55 %	12 %
Grade 2 Non-Cohort	50	26 %	48 %	26 %
Grade 3 Cohort	40	17.5 %	60 %	22.5 %
Grade 3 Non-Cohort	49	14 %	53 %	33 %

Table 23: Comparison of Cohort Group and Non-Cohort in 2nd and 3rd Grade on GRADE – Subtest: Comprehension (Spring 2004)

III.	Number of Students	IV. Strength	Average	Weak
Grade 2 Cohort	49	33 %	49 %	18 %
Grade 2 Non-Cohort	50	20 %	50 %	30 %
Grade 3 Cohort	40	17.5 %	52.5 %	30 %
Grade 3 Non-Cohort	49	20 %	43 %	37 %

Table 24: Comparison of Cohort Group and Non-Cohort in 2nd and 3rd Grade on GRADE – Subtest: Total Test (Spring 2004)

V.	Number of Students	VI. Strength	Average	Weak
Grade 2 Cohort	49	33 %	53 %	14 %
Grade 2 Non-Cohort	50	18 %	54 %	28 %
Grade 3 Cohort	40	20 %	50 %	30 %
Grade 3 Non-Cohort	49	20 %	39 %	41 %

Table 25: Comparison of Cohort Group and Non-Cohort in 2nd and 3rd Grade on DIBELS – Subtest: Oral Reading Fluency (Spring 2004)

VII.	Number of Students	VIII. Low Risk (Core)	Some Risk (Supplemental)	At Risk (Intervention)
Grade 2 Cohort	49	49 %	18 %	33 %
Grade 2 Non-Cohort	50	42 %	14 %	44 %
Grade 3 Cohort	40	25 %	40 %	35 %
Grade 3 Non-Cohort	49	33 %	31 %	37 %

Overall, the data continue to indicate that students in the cohort group are testing at higher levels than their peers in the non-cohort group. If these measures are indeed good indicators of reading ability, students who have been at LCCPS consistently since kindergarten have gained more of the skills necessary to be good readers. The data are definitely more favorable in second grade; however, the cohort group in third grade is testing ahead of their peer non-cohort group. The Total Test scores in Table 24 indicate that almost twice as many second grade students scored at the Strength level. Students scoring at the Average level are relatively the same and half as many students are scoring at the Weak level as compared to their peers in the non-cohort.

The data are similar in the third grade; however, the differences lie in the Average and Weak levels as 20% of the students from both the cohort and the non-cohort scored at the Strength level. At the Average level, half of the cohort group scored at this level as compared to 39% in the non-cohort group. Lastly, there were 11% less students at the Weak level from the cohort. The DIBELS data in Table 25 indicate that the second grade cohort is performing at a higher level than the third grade cohort. Sixty-seven percent of students in second grade cohort are scoring at the Low Risk and Some Risk level compared to 56% percent in the second grade non-cohort.

❖ **Academic Goal 2**

Students who have been at the school since kindergarten, or for three consecutive years, will demonstrate progressive improvement in mathematics on the 1) MCAS, and 2) TerraNova.

Measurement

Progress will be measured against current and previous annual results for each student.

Affirmative Evidence

1) **MCAS:** Currently students in grades 4 and 6 are tested in mathematics with the MCAS test. There are more longitudinal data at the fourth grade level than at the sixth grade level as LCCPS has only had sixth grade classes for two years. The current sixth grade did take the MCAS; however, the scores were not available at the time this report was written. As a result, the only math scores available for sixth grade are from the spring 2004 administration. The spring 2005

scores for fourth grade are also not available for this report; however, there are three years of math data for this grade.

Table 26: MCAS Mathematics Scores for 6th Grade from the Spring 2004 administration (Baseline Data)

% Advanced	% Proficient	% Needs Improvement	% Warning
5	28	37	30

LCCPS set improvement goals for all classes taking the MCAS in the spring of 2005. From this baseline data for sixth grade, the school projected the following growth: 15% would score at the Advanced level, 40% would score at the Proficient level, 25% would score at the Needs Improvement level and 20% at the Warning level.

Table 27: MCAS Mathematics Scores for 4th Grade From Spring 2002 to Spring 2004

	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Needs Improvement	% Warning
2002	0	3	39	58
2003	0	0	37	63
2004	2	5	54	42

As Table 27 indicates, fourth grade MCAS mathematics scores have risen between 2002 and 2004. The improvement goals for fourth grade math were projected as follows: 10% would score at the Advanced level, 25% would score at the Proficient level, 38% would score at the Needs Improvement level and 27% at the Warning level.

It is also important to note that LCCPS did not look at cohort groups taking the Math MCAS due to the fact that both populations are too small to draw any significant or valid conclusions. The total population taking the spring 2004 MCAS in 4th grade was 40 students, with a cohort group of only 15 students. The total population of students taking the spring 2004 MCAS in 7th grade was 43 with a cohort group of only 12 students.

LCCPS also went through its second round of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations last spring. Table 28 below provides that results of those determinations.

Table 28: Adequate Yearly Progress Determinations in English/Language Arts and Mathematics for 2003 & 2004

		2003	2004
English/ Language Arts	Aggregate	NO	YES
	All Sub-Groups	NO	YES
Mathematics	Aggregate	NO	YES
	All Sub-Groups	NO	YES

Table 28 provides clear evidence that the progress made in 2004 was substantial enough to move school from not meeting the benchmarks for adequate yearly progress (AYP) in 2003 to meeting them

across the board in 2004. The school achieved AYP not only as a whole in the aggregate, but in each of its sub-groups as well. Should the school meet its projected MCAS goals for the spring 2005 administration, the school will easily achieve AYP in all areas again.

2) TerraNova: As stated in the first section of the Performance Profile, TerraNova is no longer being administered at LCCPS. As a result, there are no additional data, even from the fall administration, that would enlighten progress in the area of math. Starting in the fall of 2005, all students in grades K through 8 will take the Group Mathematics Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (G-MADE). This test will also be administered in the spring of 2006 so the school can track progress. The G-MADE is also designed to measure where students are at, not where they are supposed to be. This will allow the school to use this tool to target students and instruction.

2. Organizational Viability

❖ Viability Goal 1

The school will be fully enrolled each year.

Measurement

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; the school included grades K-7 during the 2004-2005 academic year. 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 experience turnover each year. As families in Lowell often leave the town 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 effected by the high numbers of families living in poverty who are forced to move for less expensive housing.

Historically, the school has been very successful at attracting 115 new students annually: demand for the LCCPS kindergarten program is very high. The waiting list for the kindergarten program was 41 for the 2004-2005 school year, making demand nearly 1.4:1.

Affirmative Evidence

Table 29: LCCPS Enrollment History (2000 – 2005)

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

Table 29 illustrates the enrollment history and trends at LCCPS from the 2000-2001 school year through the 2004-2005 school year. The table indicates that the school enrollment has been between 95% and 103% of its enrollment capacity in accordance with the charter. LCCPS added a third social worker in the 2003-2004 school year to address the daily attendance issues of some students; this social worker created an incentive program which recognized homeroom classes for days of 100% attendance.

❖ **Viability Goal 2**

The average daily attendance rate will meet or exceed similar local schools.

Measurement

The school will compare its attendance to three Lowell public schools: the Pyne, the Varnum, and the Murkland.

Affirmative Evidence

Table 30: Comparison of Attendance Percentages Lowell Public Schools

School	Year 4 (2003 – 2004)	Year 5 (2004 – 2005)
LCCPS	93.4	93.6
LPS: Pyne	94.6	Not available
LPS: Varnum	94.9	Not available
LPS: Murkland	94.5	Not available

Though the 2004-2005 attendance data were not available for Lowell Public Schools at the time of this report preparation, Table 30 indicates that attendance at LCCPS in 2003-2004 was slightly lower than the Pyne, Varnum, and Murkland schools. Attendance at LCCPS increased slightly during 2004-2005, and LCCPS will continue to work toward greater attendance next year.

❖ **Viability Goal 3**

The school will be fiscally sound as reported in the school’s annual audits.

Measurement

Expenses will not exceed net income.

Affirmative Evidence

Lowell Community Charter Public School is financially solvent and stable. This is evidenced by its audited surplus balance on June 30, 2004 being \$1,378,174, as compared to an audited surplus balance on June 30, 2003 of 796,938. Since carrying an audited deficit of (\$108,594) at June 30, 2000, LCCPS has had annual surpluses. Each year a balanced budget is presented for board’s approval and for the last four (4) fiscal years the school has wisely expended its revenues to acquire more space, educate more students, employ more staff and create a surplus. Also, each year there is 3% of total revenue set aside for future plans to build/buy a building, which will

further the school's stability. The school has a strong cash flow with an available line of credit, which is currently unused. The audited cash balance has increased from \$6,500 on June 30, 2001 to \$1,476,751 on June 30, 2004 (from cash and cash equivalents). There have been no negative findings noted during these independent audits. The accounting practices solidly in place include weekly reporting to the finance committee chair: weekly balance sheet reporting, monthly reporting on expenditures vs. cash flow, the creation of annual budgets and 5 year extended forecasts.

❖ **Viability Goal 4**

The annual parent satisfaction survey will indicate strong support and satisfaction.

Measurement

3.0 or higher

Affirmative Evidence

The Parent Satisfaction Survey, administered annually, is one of the measures that illustrates that the school is fulfilling its viability and mission. At the time of preparation of this annual report, the results of this survey were not yet available. Survey topics include satisfaction with academic program, mission of the school, performance of staff, communication and overall atmosphere of the school.

❖ **Viability Goal 5**

The re-enrollment rate will be high.

Measurement

90% of the students will remain at the school from year to year.

Affirmative Evidence

Table 31: Percentage of Students Re-enrolling Each Year

Year 3 (2002-2003)	Year 4 (2003-2004)	Year 5 (2004-2005)
97.4	93.0	96.5

Table 31 shows that the student re-enrollment rate at LCCPS has significantly exceeded 90% for the past three years.

❖ **Viability Goal 6**

Professional staff will be competent, content experts, and highly skilled.

Measurement

Staff will meet or exceed NCLB requirements.

Affirmative Evidence

All instructional staff at LCCPS meet or exceed the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*.

SCHOOL PROFILE

OUR STUDENTS

1. Student Demographics

In 2004-2005 Lowell Community Charter Public School served students in grades K-7. A demographic breakdown of the student population as of the end of the 2004-2005 school year is presented below in Table 32. LCCPS will add grade 8 in 2005-2006, which is the highest grade permitted under the current charter.

Table 32: Student Demographics (2004 – 2005, end-of-year)

	Number	Percentage
Native American	1	0.2%
African American	53	8.5%
Asian	194	31.0%
Hispanic	265	42.3%
Caucasian	113	18.1%
Limited Eng Proficient	189	30.2%
Free/Reduced Lunch	520	83.0%
Special Education	61	9.7%
Female	327	52.2%
Male	299	47.8%

Total number of instructional days: 190
Starting and ending dates (2004-2005): August 25, 2004 through June 28, 2005
Hours of instruction: 8:00 AM – 3:30 PM

2. Application, Waiting List and Turnover Data

The total number of Kindergarten applications received for the 2004-2005 school year was 156; therefore, the number of applications compared to number of openings was $156/115 = 136\%$ (or demand was nearly 1.4 to 1). Table 33 below summarizes student turnover data during 2004-2005.

Table 33: Student Turnover Data (2004 – 2005)

Total Number of students who left during the 2004-2005 school year	38**
Total Number of students who finished the school year and chose not to return for the 2005-2006 school year	24

****Summary of withdrawals:**

- 15 Students moved away
- 5 Parents did not like longer day, year
- 6 Student needed or parents wanted smaller classes and/or more services
- 4 Parent dissatisfied with program, efforts to manage behavior, social concerns
- 8 Transportation, custody transfers, other

Number of students expelled = 0
 Number placed in in-school suspension = 11
 Number placed in out of school suspension = 8
 Attendance Rate = 93.6%

3. School Report Card

Report Card:

This report includes information on the school's performance on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) by content area, grade level, and for particular student populations. Comparison data from the district, the state, and from 2001 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 (2004-2005)			
	School	District	State
Race/Ethnicity			
White	18.1 %	43%	74.2%
African-American	8.5 %	6%	8.9%
Hispanic	42.3 %	21%	11.8%
Asian	31.0 %	29.3%	4.8%
Native American	0.2 %	0.2%	0.3%
Gender			
Male	47.8 %	51.8%	51.4%
Female	52.2 %	48.2%	48.6%
Selected Population Enrollment			
Limited English Proficiency	30.2 %	23.1%	5.1%
Low-income	83.1 %	65.1%	27.7%
Special Education	9.7%	13.2%	15.9%
Migrant	0.2 %	41.2%	14%
TOTAL COUNT	626	14,603	975,911

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

Percent of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers: 100%

Additional Teacher Information:

The percent of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers includes both K-7 classroom teachers and world language teachers.

There are 36 classroom teachers: 83.3% of them are highly qualified, 17 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 ten-member Board of Trustees governs the school. The Board of Trustees is responsible for policy governance and overall management and oversight of the school. Members of the board are carefully selected to represent the two major ethnic groups in Lowell and a wide array of political and organizational expertise and experience.

2. Board Committee and Members

Officials	Governance Expertise	Occupation	Term of Appointment
Chairman <i>Mr. Roman Jaquez</i> * Finance Subcommittee * Facility Subcommittee	Extensive experience in business management and community service volunteer	Electrical Engineer and Business Owner	2 nd Term to end January 19, 2006
Vice Chairman <i>Mr. Thel Sar</i> * Personnel Subcommittee	Expert on local family issues, Liaison to Cambodian community	Probation Officer Lowell District Court	1 st Term to end November 15, 2006
Treasurer Dennis Demuth * Finance Subcommittee	Financial and investment management expert	2 nd Vice President Smith-Barney Investment and Financial Planning Officer	1 st Term to end August 24, 2007
Secretary <i>Ms. Susan Johnston*</i> Personnel Subcommittee	Public school expert	Retired public school Speech and Language Pathologists.	1 st term to end February 25, 2006
Consultant <i>Mr. Richard Chavez</i> (ex officio) * Finance Subcommittee * Facility Subcommittee	Financial management expert	Commercial Lending Officer	No expiration
Members	Governance Expertise	Occupation	Term of Appointment
<i>Mr. Michael Vann</i> Personnel Subcommittee Recruitment Subcommittee	Liaison to Cambodian youth and families.	Juvenile Probation Officer	2 nd term to end January 19, 2007
<i>Ms. Paulette Renault-Caragianes</i> * Finance Subcommittee	Expert on charter schools, management, governance	Lowell Community Health Center	1 st term to end December 9, 2006
<i>Ms. Vichney Keo-Sam</i> * Personnel Subcommittee	Expert on family services, Cambodian community	Casey Family Services, Social Worker	1 st term to end December 9, 2006
<i>Dr. Allen Scheier,</i> * Finance Subcommittee * Personnel Subcommittee*	Veteran public school teacher and advocate, Ed. Policy & Governance	High School Teacher, Mathematics	1 st term to end May 25, 2007

3. Major Board Policy Decisions 2004-2005

The following are the amendments and policy changes implemented during this 2004-2005 school year:

- Board voted to change/increase teachers salary scale
- Board voted to submit amendment for school management structure to the Department of Education
- Board voted to increase student enrollment to 750 students for the 2005-2006 school year
- Board voted to submit amendment for school enrollment policy
- Board voted to change Board Bylaws regarding to voting proceeding in approval of meeting minutes.
- Board voted to submit accountability plan for the 2005-2010 school period
- Board voted to submit resolution policy for bank checks signing
- Board voted to pay off debt with Imagine Schools
- Board voted to continue finance agreement with NCB
- Board voted to adopt a school summer program

DISSEMINATION

❖ *Faithfulness to the Charter Goal 1*

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

Measurement

Parents and students will participate in no fewer than six significant cultural events/seminars each year.

Affirmative Evidence

LCCPS is wonderfully diverse, and as noted in other sections of this Application for Renewal, the demographics at LCCPS 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, science and students in all grades have one class daily in either Khmer or Spanish. Within these classes, students are exposed to the language and respective political and social histories of Cambodia and Spanish speaking countries. Parents joined us during the 2004-2005 school year as the whole school acknowledged major cultural holidays such as the Cambodian New Year and Day of the Dead. In 2005, students studied and “replicated” Angkor Wat, created sculptural effigies of deceased family members for Day of the Dead, celebrated the Cambodian New Year with our Cambodian Dance Troupe, participated in Puerto Rican Festival and Khmer Water Festival, and were entertained by Inca Sun, a Latino musical group.

❖ *Faithfulness to Charter Goal 2*

LCCPS will disseminate best practices relative to ELL, urban, and economically-disadvantaged communities.

Measurement

LCCPS will collect and report feedback on the dissemination efforts.

Affirmative Evidence

Title I Dissemination Project: Lowell Community Charter Public School is a member of the Massachusetts Department of Education Title I Dissemination Project. Every year since 2002, LCCPS has been invited to disseminate its success at involving urban parents in the academic life of their child at school at the state’s Annual Title One Conference in Hyannis. At this conference, three LCCPS staff members gave a presentation titled “100% Parent Participation in School” to 40 teachers and school administrators in attendance. Three staff members have created a presentation on the effects of generational poverty, a school’s subtle barriers to parents, and how to get 100% parent participation.

In January 2005, two LCCPS staff members (a member from the language arts department and the ELL director) gave a presentation titled “From Angkor to America – Building the Khmer and

Language Programs at LCCPS” to a group of approximately 30 educators in San Francisco. The presentation covered the overall history of LCCPS, the community of LCCPS, language and identity building, how students their own culture and language, and linking language and learning with cultural awareness and pride.

OUR STAFF

1. Staff Profile

Key members of the leadership team at the school have been at the school for several years. The school’s Director, Sue Jamback joined the school at the beginning of the school’s second year. The school’s Assistant Headmaster, Rida Eng has been at the school since the school opened. There has been no turnover at the school at the administrative level in the past 4 years; however, Sue Jamback resigned as the LCCPS Director effective June 30, 2005. Additionally, the LCCPS Board of Trustees voted not to renew the contract of Imagine Schools (formerly known as Chancellor Beacon), the company that had managed the school since its opening. The LCCPS Board is currently interviewing candidates for the position of Chief Executive Officer (CEO). During this leadership transition, Rida Eng is serving as the school’s Interim CEO.

Table 34: Classroom Teachers: Percentage Who Left After Each Year’s End

2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
60%	33%	25%	19%

Table 35: Other Staff: Percentage Who Left After Each Year’s End

2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
37%	40%	10%	24%

As Table 34 indicates, at the end of 2004-2005, 7 out of 36 classroom teachers (19%) who finished the year chose not to return to LCCPS for the fall of 2005-2006. As Table 35 indicates, 7 out of 29 (24%) other staff (all staff except classroom teachers) who finished the year chose not to return to LCCPS for the fall of 2005-2006. Additionally, two classroom teachers left and were replaced during the 2004-2005 school year.

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 MA Teacher Tests. Charter school teachers have 1 year from date of hire to pass the teacher test 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 36 summarizes teacher qualifications during 2004-2005.

Table 36: Summary of Teacher Qualifications (2004 – 2005)

Position	Number of Staff Members	Percentage
Full time Classroom Teachers	36	
Full Time Teaching Assistants	5	
Number of Teaching Staff Designated as Highly Qualified	30	83.3%
Number of Teaching Assistants Designated as Highly Qualified	5	100%
Average Years Teaching Experience	5.2	
Average Years at LCCPS	2.1	

FINANCE

1. Approved School Budget

FISCAL
YEAR ENDING
June 30, 2006

REVENUE

TUITION - STATE FUNDS \$ 7,252,000

FEDERAL & STATE AWARDS

TITLE 1	397,700
READING GRANTS	106,000
TITLE III	44,700
SPECIAL EDUCATION	121,000
OTHER GRANTS	60,000
TOTAL GOV. GRANTS	729,400
PRIVATE GRANTS	-
INTEREST INCOME	10,000
OTHER INCOME	-
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 7,991,400

EXPENSES

SALARIES

INSTRUCTIONAL	\$ 3,859,000
SPECIAL EDUCATION	351,000
FACILITIES	62,000
ADMINISTRATIVE	396,000

TOTAL SALARIES	4,668,000
PAYROLL TAXES	170,000
WORKER'S COMP. INSURANCE	14,000
HEALTH INSURANCE	340,000
OTHER BENEFITS	60,000
BENEFITS	-
TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS	5,252,000

FACILITY EXPENSES

RENT	480,000
RENT - CAM CHARGE	150,000
BUIDING REPAIRS	295,000
CLEANING	120,000
SECURITY	5,000
TELECOMMUNICATION	28,600
WASTE REMOVAL	22,000
INSURANCE	17,000
UTILITIES	135,000
MISCELLANEOUS	12,000
LEASEHOLD DEPRECIATION	120,000
TOTAL FACILITIES	1,384,600

SPECIAL EDUCATION

SPECIALISTS	70,000
COPIER SUPPLIES	6,000
COPIER LEASE	2,000
LEGAL FEES FOR SPED	4,000
POSTAGE & FREIGHT	2,000
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	4,000
SUPPLIES	3,200
MISCELLANEOUS	12,000
TOTAL SPECIAL EDUCATION	103,200

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

TEXTBOOKS	118,000
TEXTBOOKS - READING 1ST	15,700
TEXTBOOKS - OTHER	27,000
CLASSROOM SUPPLIES	80,000
SUPPLIES - LIBRARY	7,200
SUPPLIES READING 1ST	32,500
SUPPLIES - TITLE 1	40,000
SUPPLIES - OTHER	6,000
SUPPLIES - COPIER	30,000
COPIER LEASES	3,000
CONSULTANTS - GRANTS	30,000
CONSULTANTS	51,200
SFA FEES READING 1ST	16,300
STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	10,500
FOOD SERVICES	5,000
MEDIA SUPPLIES	3,000
FURNITURE & EQUIPMENT	22,000
ASSESSMENTS	14,000
FIELD TRIPS	24,000
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	2,000
STAFF ACTIVITIES	2,000
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	20,000
STAFF DEV. READING 1 ST	2,000
SUPPLIES B/AFTER PROGRAM	10,000
NURSE SUPPLIES	1,200
OTHER EXPENSES	30,000
TOTAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	602,600

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

AUDIT	14,000
GOVERNANCE	14,000
MANAGEMENT FEE	-
LEGAL	10,000

BANK FEES	5,000
COPIER LEASE	1,300
COPIER SUPPLIES	15,000
INSURANCE - UMBRELLA	4,800
INSURANCE - DIRECTORS ETC	10,000
OFFICE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	2,400
MARKETING/DEVELOPMENT	6,400
POSTAGE AND FREIGHT	6,000
PRINTING & COPIER SUPPLIES	8,000
PAYROLL PROCESSING	6,000
TECH SUPPLIES	6,000
OFFICE SUPPLIES	21,000
STUDENT & STAFF RECRUITMENT	18,000
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	6,000
TRAVEL EXPENSES	3,600
MISCELLANEOUS	28,000
DEPRECIATION - FURNITURE & EQUIP	70,000
INTEREST & PRIN - NCB LOAN	-
INTEREST - NCB LOAN	66,000
INTEREST - OTHER	12,000
AMORTIZATION OF LOAN COSTS	8,000
RESERVE	-
INTEREST & PRIN. - CBA LOAN	-
FURNITURE ADDITIONS	20,000
COMPUTER DEPRECIATION	115,000
COMPUTER EQUIP. & SOFTWARE	30,000
FURNITURE USE AGREEMENT	-
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE	506,500
TOTAL EXPENSES	7,848,900
BUDGET SURPLUS	\$ 142,500

2. Financial Statement

FINANCIAL STATEMENT STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2005

(UNAUDITED)

RECEIPTS

PER PUPIL TUITION	\$	6,040,351
STATE AND FEDERAL GRANTS		681,639
OTHER GRANTS		47,068
OTHER INCOME		<u>61,242</u>
TOTAL REVENUE	\$	6,830,300

EXPENDITURES

SALARIES		3,105,442
BENEFITS & PAYROLL TAXES		399,186
OCCUPANCY COSTS		869,372
MANAGEMENT FEE		385,000
DEPRECIATION		222,002
INSURANCE		40,568
PROGRAM EXPENSES		512,315
INTEREST EXPENSE		64,945
GRANT EXPENSES		619,408
OTHER EXPENSES		<u>214,942</u>
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$	6,433,180
EXCESS OR REVENUE OVER EXPENDITURES	\$	397,120

3. Balance Sheet

BALANCE SHEET (UNAUDITED)

June 30, 2005

ASSETS

Current Assets

Cash	1,754,216
Receivables	223,845
Prepaid expenses	<u>61,944</u>
Total Current Assets	<u>2,040,005</u>

Plant & Equipment

Leasehold Improvements	1,287,393
Equipment and Furniture	750,902
Less Accumulated Depreciation	<u>(869,391)</u>
Total Plant & Equipment	<u>1,168,904</u>

Other Assets

Security deposits	4,000
Prepaid Loan Expenses	60,131
Total Other Assets	64,131

Total Assets 3,273,040

LIABILITIES

Current Liabilities

Accounts Payables	279,404
Payroll Payable	307,868
Unearned Revenue	92,192
Note Payable	783,146
Other Payables	<u>35,135</u>
Total Current Liabilities	<u>1,497,745</u>

Total Liabilities 1,497,745

Total Net Assets 1,775,295

Total Liabilities and Net Assets 3,273,040