

Sam Drury
210 East Sterne Boulevard
Centennial, Colorado 80122-1026

August 22, 2009

Board of Education
Littleton Public Schools
5776 South Crocker Street
Littleton, Colorado 80120

Dear Board Members:

At the August 13, 2009 LPS Board of Education meeting during the "Citizens' Requests to Speak to the Board" I spoke about LPS student academic achievement progress with a focus upon CSAP results for LPS schools during the past three years. That time frame began with the launching of the current LPS strategic plan and coincides with the duration of the 2006-2009 school improvement plans (SIPs).

At the September 14, 2006 workshop the LPS Board of Education had received and discussed an "Improving Student Achievement" presentation, which included this District Achievement Goal (DAG): "90% of all students will be on or above grade level in reading, math, writing, and science by 2011. The achievement gap in student performance will be cut in half by 2009." **The 3% overall gain in LPS CSAP proficiency during the past three years** (2006 through 2009 %P+A were 70%, 71%, 71%, and 73%, respectively) **was quite small** compared to expectations of the District Achievement Goal and stated targets in the 2006-2009 school improvement plans. The CSAP portion of the five-year overall achievement gap goal was 20% (90% - 70%); therefore, the three-year "cut in half" goal was 10% gap reduction by 2009.

My August 13 handout to you on "LPS CSAP Schools" included a one-page tabulation of LPS CSAP district and schools proficiency (percent proficient plus advanced) and changes that provides three-year comparisons of **2009** and **2006** performance for each subject area (reading, writing, math, and science) and the total for each school and the district. Only two schools had total gains of at least 10% during the past three years! Seven schools (including the two above 10%) had total gains of at least 5%; one school had total losses of at least 5%; all other schools had smaller changes. The institutional inertia maintains the status quo and continues to prevent significant increase in student academic achievement. **Those results are not encouraging.**

The attachment to this letter modifies that tabulation by asterisks to indicate subject category results (in **bold**) that include the school-selected Student Learning Cornerstone Goal for each original 2006-2009 School Improvement Plan. My preliminary analysis of gains in those school-selected SIP subjects also shows disappointing results.

For example, the total LPS gain in school-selected SIP subjects was about 3.9% (from 60.7% in 2006 to 64.6% in 2009), assuming equal weight for each school's results. If both charter schools are omitted from that data, then the total LPS gain in school-selected SIP subjects was about 2.6% (from 59.2% in 2006 to 61.8% in 2009). Also without charter schools, elementary schools gain was about 2.0% (from 60.8% in 2006 to 62.8% in 2009), middle schools gain was about 4.9% (from 46.9% in 2006 to 51.8% in 2009), and high schools gain was about 2.6% (from 67.3% in 2006 to 69.9% in 2009).

Fourteen of the 22 individual not-charter schools had less than 5% proficiency change (gain or loss from 2006 to 2009) in school-selected SIP subjects. Only three schools had a large gain (at least 10%): Ames ES (16.3% Writing), Goddard MS (15.7% Math), and Highland ES (11.0% Writing).

For three years I have stated to you that effects of the Board-approved strategic plan (core beliefs and focus areas) upon the buildings-implemented school improvement plans (using the districtwide SIP template) are uncertain. A lot depends upon the levels of understanding of, agreement with, and commitment to the SIPs in each of the buildings. I also have stated that the CSAP results were not encouraging. My September 13, 2007 and August 8, 2008 letters to you also included the following still-valid paragraph:

I believe that improvements are needed with regard to these “understanding of, agreement with, and commitment to” (UAC) concerns:

- Board and superintendent public commitment to DAG results.
- Central administration management of SIP preparation and evaluation.
- Building principals and teachers UAC to DAG, SIPs, and PLCs.
 - Very few schools even mention the DAG on their school websites.
 - Very few schools have posted the SIPs on their school websites.
 - Most schools have been using some PLC concepts for years with little or no effect.
- Use of inaccurate statements and avoidance of “bad news” disclosures.
- Prompt transparency of DAG detailed results for credible public accountability.

Sincerely,



Sam Drury
 Phone: 303-795-1535
 E-mail: samdrury@ix.netcom.com

Attachment

cc: Scott Murphy

**Littleton Public Schools
Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP)
District and Schools Proficiency (%P+A) and Changes**

	Rank 2009	Rank 2006	Total		Reading		Writing		Math		Science						
			Chg	2009	2006	Chg	2009	2006	Chg	2009	2006	Chg	2009	2006			
Total LPS Grades 3-5 (10 tests)			1.7	75.6	73.9	0.7	81	80	3.0	70	67	0.7	81	80	4.0	59	55
Ames ES	10	14	13.5	74.5	61.0	7.7	81	73	16.3	67	51	10.0	79	69	33.0	63	30
Centennial ES	15	11	-7.4	58.3	65.7	-7.3	65	72	-2.3	59	61	-10.3	63	73	-14.0	25	39
East ES	14	15	-0.8	58.5	59.3	-1.0	58	59	-7.0	47	54	7.3	78	71	-6.0	34	40
Field ES	17	17	-1.0	55.0	56.0	-1.3	62	64	-7.3	44	51	1.0	63	62	13.0	42	29
Franklin ES	4	5	2.4	81.7	79.3	-0.3	86	86	7.3	74	67	2.0	90	88	-3.0	66	69
Highland ES	8	9	4.3	76.3	72.0	-0.7	83	84	11.0	70	59	5.0	85	80	-3.0	48	51
Hopkins ES	16	16	0.4	58.0	57.6	-0.7	67	68	4.7	53	48	-2.0	63	65	-2.0	31	33
Lenski ES	3	2	-2.8	87.6	90.4	-3.3	91	94	2.7	85	87	-2.0	91	93	-4.0	75	79
Littleton Academy CS	1	1	0.7	91.4	90.7	-3.3	93	96	2.7	89	86	-2.0	93	95	15.0	90	75
Littleton Preparatory CS	11	12	8.0	73.2	65.2	12.0	84	72	10.3	68	58	0.0	69	69	13.0	67	54
Moody ES	13	13	-2.0	60.8	62.8	8.3	75	67	-8.7	51	59	-4.3	64	68	-6.0	39	45
Peabody ES	7	4	-2.7	78.5	81.2	-7.3	81	88	0.3	73	73	-6.7	84	91	14.0	72	58
Runyon ES	5	6	3.9	81.4	77.5	0.3	87	87	8.3	78	70	1.0	85	84	10.0	62	52
Sandburg ES	6	7	6.7	80.2	73.5	4.3	83	79	8.0	75	67	6.7	87	80	10.0	68	58
Twain ES	9	7	2.6	76.1	73.5	2.3	84	82	-1.7	68	69	1.7	80	79	19.0	65	46
Whitman ES	12	10	-4.1	65.7	69.8	-1.0	73	74	-3.7	59	62	-6.0	75	81	-9.0	38	47
Wilder ES	2	3	0.8	90.9	90.1	-0.3	93	94	0.0	88	88	1.0	94	93	6.0	81	75
Total LPS Grades 6-8 (10 tests)			5.7	74.1	68.4	2.0	81	79	4.0	72	68	10.3	71	61	8.0	69	61
Euclid MS	5	5	7.2	70.5	63.3	4.3	79	74	2.7	67	64	13.7	68	54	10.0	64	54
Goddard MS	6	6	9.7	66.3	56.6	6.3	72	66	5.7	62	56	15.7	66	50	14.0	65	51
Littleton Academy CS	1	1	2.2	95.6	93.4	0.0	97	97	5.0	98	93	2.0	95	93	1.0	86	85
Littleton Preparatory CS	2	3	11.1	83.0	71.9	8.7	90	82	6.0	87	81	18.0	76	58	13.0	70	57
Newton MS	4	4	1.3	72.3	71.0	0.7	82	81	1.3	69	68	5.3	69	64	-9.0	63	72
Powell MS	3	2	1.3	79.2	77.9	-5.0	84	89	1.3	79	77	4.7	75	71	10.0	77	67
Total LPS Grades 9-10 (7 tests)			2.3	68.6	66.3	2.5	84	81	0.0	69	69	3.0	53	50	5.0	71	66
Arapahoe HS	1	1	1.0	73.4	72.4	0.0	88	88	-2.0	74	76	2.5	58	55	6.0	77	71
Heritage HS	2	2	5.0	73.0	68.0	3.0	88	85	3.0	73	70	8.0	58	50	7.0	75	68
Littleton HS	3	3	-0.1	56.3	56.4	2.5	72	70	-2.0	56	58	-1.0	41	42	0.0	57	57
Total LPS District (27 tests)			3.3	73.2	69.9	1.6	82	80	2.6	71	68	4.9	70	65	5.7	66	61
Total Littleton Academy CS (20 tests)			1.5	93.5	92.1	-1.7	95	96	3.8	93	90	0.0	94	94	8.0	88	80
Total Littleton Preparatory CS (20 tests)			9.6	78.1	68.6	10.3	87	77	8.2	78	70	9.0	72	63	13.0	69	56
Total State (27 tests)			1.4	58.0	56.6	0.6	68	68	1.3	55	54	1.6	54	53	3.3	48	45

Note: Asterisks indicate subject category results (in bold) that include school-selected Student Learning Cornerstone Goal for 2006-2009 School Improvement Plan.