A. EDUCATION PLAN

A.5. NARRATIVE FOR MATH PMP

Overall Objective of the Math Performance Management Plan

To develop and successfully implement the math arm of the RTI-Early Intervention Reading & Math Program 18 to 24 months after school opens.

A.5.a. Basis for Setting Baseline Figures for Math PMP

MATH AIMS PROFICIENCY BASELINES					
Year	**Baselines**	**3rd Grade**	**4th Grade**	**5th Grade**	**6th Grade**
		Math	**Math**	**Math**	**Math**
2011	**Year 0 Initial Baseline**	**57%**	**59%**	**54%**	**30%**
2012		58%	60%	55%	31%
2013	**Year 1 Baseline (green)**	**59%**	**61%**	56%	32%
2014	**Substitute Year 1 Baseline (gray)**	**60%**	**62%**	**57%**	33%
2015		TBD	TBD	**58%**	**34%**
2016		TBD	TBD	TBD	**35%**
2017		TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

Table 1. Performance Management Plan Math AIMS Baseline Proficiency

- The "Orange Band = Year 0 Initial Baseline" represents the average percentage of students who scored proficient in the math AIMS test in 2010 and 2011 in the 16 elementary and 6 middle schools located in the target area. These average values are calculated in Table 2 located at the end of this narrative.
- The "Green Band = Year 1 Baseline" represents the percentage of SPA students who are projected to pass the math AIMS test in Year-1 of a specific grade if SPA opens in 2013.
- The "Gray Band = Substitute Year 1 Baseline" represents the percentage of SPA students who are projected to pass the math AIMS test in substitute Year-1 of a specific grade if SPA opens in 2014 instead of 2013.

MATH AIMS PROFICIENCY STATUS

Summary of Data

SPA Student Math AIMS Proficiency if School Opens in 2013:

- Year 2013. Math Proficiency: 59% for 3rd graders; 61% for 4th graders.
- Year 2014. Math Proficiency: 57% for 5th graders.
- Year 2015. Math Proficiency: 34% for 6th graders.

Discussion of Data

- The baseline values for 2011 listed in Table 1 under the name "Initial Baseline" represent the 2-year average percentage of grade 3 to 6 students who passed the math AIMS test in 2010 and 2011in 16 elementary and 6 middle schools that serve the target area. The disaggregated AIMS test data from these 22 primary schools used to calculate the 2011 "Initial Baseline" are compiled in Table 2 located at the end of this narrative. Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) used 2-year averages instead of the traditional 3-year ones because the math AIMS test was substantially changed in 2010; and these changes invalidate all previous math AIMS test results that could have been used in this analysis.

- Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) uses the 2011 average values (Y0 Initial Baseline data) to determine the baseline percentage of SPA students who will pass the math AIMS test in 2013 when School opens its doors. As shown in Table 1, the average percentages of students who passed the math AIMS test in 2011 in the target area are: 57% third graders, 59% fourth graders, 54% fifth graders and 30 % sixth graders. Assuming that these Initial Baseline percentages increase by 1% per year, SPA has estimated that 59% third graders and 61% fourth graders will pass the math AIMS test in 2013 during Year 1. It is worth mentioning that the School will open with students from kindergarten to fourth grade.

- In 2014 (Year 2), Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) will open its first 5th grade classes. As shown in Table 1, SPA is predicting that 57% of the 5th graders will pass the math AIMS test in Year 2. In 2015 in Year 3, SPA will open its first 6th grade classes and Table 1 predicts that 34% of these students will pass the math AIMS test in that year.

- Briefly, in Table 1, the "green band" represents the Year 1 baseline percentage of SPA students who are projected to pass the math AIMS test when school first opens its doors or when a specific grade first becomes available at SPA.

- It is possible that SPA might not be able to start school in 2013; instead, school will start in 2014. In that situation, Substitute Year 1 Baseline (in gray) will be used to predict the percentages of students who will score proficient in the math AIMS test during that opening cycle.

SPA Projected Math Proficiency vs. Board's Level Adequate Academic Performance

- Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) projected percentages of students who will pass the math AIMS test in 2013 (59% and 61% 3rd and 4th graders respectively) are identical to or surpass the 59% state average recommended by the Board to demonstrate sufficient progress toward the Board's Level of Adequate Academic Performance (LAAP) in math in 2010.
- This suggests that SPA projected 2013 math AIMS proficiency figures will be close to the 2013 Board's LAAP in math. Therefore, SPA projected math AIMS proficiency figures for 2013 are adequate and in line with ADE expectations.

STUDENT GROWTH STATUS IN MATH

Summary of Data

SPA 2013 Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for Math or for Reading ≥ 41%

- In Table 3 located at the end of this section, SPA used growth data from 16 target area elementary schools to estimate the 2011 median math and reading SGP for the target area. These estimates are:
    - Math SGP: 47% with 10% standard deviation.
    - Reading SGP: 47% with 7% standard deviation.
    - Average standard deviation for math and reading : 8.5 = (10 + 7)/2
    - To calculate the lower level of the math and reading Board's LAAP values, SPA uses the following statement from the Board:

      "A school that serves any students between grades three and eight must meet or exceed the state average percent proficient in reading and in math on the state assessment and have a student growth percentile of **no less than minus one standard deviation from the state median growth percentile in reading and in math"**.
    - Consequently, in 2011, the lower level of the reading and math median SGP = 47% - 8.5% = 38.5% rounded to 39% SGP.
    - SPA assumes that the median SGP will increase by 1% per year from 2011 until Year 1 when the School starts running or when a specific grade first become available at the school. Therefore, in 2013 the reading and math median SGP will be no less than 41% (39% + 2%). In 2014, it will be no less than 42%.

A.5.b. Present a Process, Articulated for each Strategy, for Gathering and Analyzing Data on the Effectiveness of the Action Steps

As shown in the Math PMP Template and in this narrative, Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) uses a scientific-based data-driven methodology and thought process to justify the use of each strategy, tool or process used in the reading and math PMP. For instance, in Section A.5.a of this

narrative, SPA compiled and analyzed AIMS data from 16 target area elementary and 6 middle schools to estimate the baseline percentage of its students that will pass the math AIMS test in Year 1. This scientific, analytical thought process is used at all levels in this application.

A.5.c. Provide a Process for Updating and Implementing Improvements to the Action Steps based upon the Data Analysis

Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) will develop a School Instruction Handbook that will provide detailed information on the curriculum, instructional methods, and assessments that SPA teaching staffs will be required to use to provide a high-quality scientific and standard -based RTI math and reading program. While improvements to school activities and processes will be fully documented by school staffs, updating the School Instruction Handbook will be done twice a year (in November and during the summer) by the Instructional Leadership Team.

The Instructional Leadership Team will spearhead the implementation of the School RTI-Early Intervention Reading & Math Program and the overall effort of closing the achievement at Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA). This team will be made of the following personnel:

- Executive Director;
- Assistant Director , Curriculum & Instruction;
- Special Education Teacher;
- Singapore Math Coordinator;
- SRA Reading Mastery/Core Knowledge Coordinator;
- Grade K-3 Teacher Representative;
- Grade 4-6 Teacher Representative.

A.5.d. Present a Viable Plan for Managing Student Academic Performance Process in Math that Includes a Predicted Baseline

Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) believes that the information presented in the Math PMP Template and in this Math PMP Narrative provides a viable plan for managing the student academic performance process that will lead to their success in math.

This success is predicated upon the scientific development of the following math predictable baselines for proficiency that will reflect the skills and knowledge levels of target area students:

- Year 0 (2011) Initial baseline of target-area students who passed the math AIMS test:

- Grade 3: 57%
- Grade 4: 59%
- Grade 5: 54%
- Grade 6: 30%

- Year 1 (2013) Baseline percent of SPA students who are projected to score proficient in the math AIMS test:
  - Grade 3: 59%
  - Grade 4: 61%
- Year 2 (2014) Baseline percent of SPA students who will score proficient in the math AIMS test:
  - Grade 5: 57%
- Year 3 (2015) Baseline percent of SPA students who will pass the math AIMS test:
  - Grade 6: 35%

In addition, SPA success in math is predicated upon the scientific development of a math predictable baseline for student growth. The median SGP in 2013 will be at least 41% for both math and English.

A.5.f. Identify Action Steps Required to Achieve Each of the Four Prescribed Strategies in Each Plan

Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) believes that this goal has been achieved in the Math PMP Template.

A.5.g. Identify the Timeline, Responsible Party, Evidence of Meeting Action Steps, and Budget for Accomplishing Each Action Step

Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) believes that this set of activities have been achieved in the Math PMP Template.

A.5.h. Provide a Progression of Action Steps from Start to Finish for Each Strategy that are Sequential, Timely, and Use Data to Contribute to the School's Ability to Meet the Identified Annual Report

Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) believes that this series of activities have been met in the Math PMP Template

A.5.i. Create Action Steps within Each Strategy that Complement and Support the other Strategies to the Extent Appropriate

It is SPA belief that goal A.5.i has been met in the Math PMP Template.

A.5.j. Include Concrete Artifacts that Provide Evidence of the Implementation of each Action Step

The goal in Section A.5.j has been met in the Math PMP Template.

A.5.k. Provide Adequate Resources (e.g. time, money, personnel, etc.) to Implement the Action Steps that Support the Strategies.

Goal met in the Math PMP Template.

A.5.l. Budget Needs Identified in the Performance Management Plan are Accounted for in the Budgets and Discussed in the Assumptions.

SPA believes that this goal has been met as shown in the Math PMP Template.

A.5.m. Ensure Consistency with the Application's Education Plan

Section A.5 of this application is consistent with the Education Plan.

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO PASSED THE AIMS TEST IN THE TARGET AREA ELEMENTARY & MIDDLE SCHOOLS

		THIRD GRADE			FOURTH GRADE			FIFTH GRADE			SIXTH GRADE		
School Name	**Year**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**
CE Rose	2011	67	--	63	79	--	80	79	58	73	--	--	--
CE Rose	2010	71	--	66	72	--	59	84	81	77	--	--	--
CE Rose	2009	68	88	--	64	93	--	80	93	--	--	--	--
CE Rose	2008	--	81	--	--	70	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CE Rose	2007	--	80	--	--	78	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Van Buskirk	2011	49	--	44	56	--	50	79	57	78	--	--	--
Van Buskirk	2010	45	--	38	62	--	58	82	73	73	--	--	--
Van Buskirk	2009	63	77	--	72	88	--	68	90	--	--	--	--
Van Buskirk	2008	--	65	--	--	50	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Van Buskirk	2007	--	84	--	--	78	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cavett	2011	52	--	35	68	--	39	63	49	31	--	--	--
Cavett	2010	56	--	41	55	--	53	57	68	40	--	--	--
Cavett	2009	49	--	--	60	83	--	70	81	--	--	--	--
Cavett	2008	--	76	--	--	64	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cavett	2007	--	82	--	--	68	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Holladay Mag.	2011	68	--	69	78	--	61	69	46	47	--	--	--
Holladay Mag.	2010	68	--	53	76	--	47	60	68	41	--	--	--
Holladay Mag.	2009	71	76	--	75	94	--	66	69	--	--	--	--
Holladay Mag.	2008	--	71	--	--	67	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Holladay Mag.	2007	--	86	--	--	88	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hollinger	2011	58	--	55	86	92	72	81	49	49	--	--	--
Hollinger	2010	69	--	61	65	76	61	65	74	45	--	--	--
Hollinger	2009	63	90	--	78	77	--	69	86	--	--	--	--
Hollinger	2008	--	80	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hollinger	2007	--	86	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mission View	2011	47	--	47	65	--	51	75	47	66	--	--	--

Mission View	2010	50	--	52	54	--	42	70	80	57	--	--	--
Mission View	2009	75	82	--	66	84	--	64	67	--	--	--	--
Mission View	2008	--	56	--	--	69	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mission View	2007	--	78	--	--	76	--	--	v	--	--	--	--
Ochoa	2011	61	--	64	58	--	23	55	24	30	--	--	--
Ochoa	2010	52	--	36	50	--	41	57	71	31	--	--	--
Ochoa	2009	57	72	--	74	95	--	39	71	--	--	--	--
Ochoa	2008	--	58	63	--	56	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ochoa	2007	--	64	46	--	62	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pueblo Gardens	2011	71	--	71	88	100	81	66	50	55	--	--	--
Pueblo Gardens	2010	81	--	80	76	88	69	76	71	62	--	--	--
Pueblo Gardens	2009	71	95	--	94	78	--	69	86	--	--	--	--
Pueblo Gardens	2008	--	85	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pueblo Gardens	2007	--	80	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AZ Acad of Lead	2011	--	--	--	--	--	--	65	29	35	--	--	--
AZ Acad of Lead	2010	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	69	13	--	--	--
AZ Acad of Lead	2009	--	--	--	--	--	--	41	--	--	--	--	--
AZ Acad of Lead	2008	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AZ Acad of Lead	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elvira	2011	65	--	66	69	82	62	82	60	75	--	--	--
Elvira	2010	68	--	56	77	65	69	67	75	66	--	--	--
Elvira	2009	64	80	--	63	84	--	60	73	--	--	--	--
Elvira	2008	--	77	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elvira	2007	--	81	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gallegos Basic	2011	81	--	73	80	--	83	89	64	80	--	--	--
Gallegos Basic	2010	79	--	81	88	--	88	86	84	75	--	--	--
Gallegos Basic	2009	84	90	--	91	99	--	82	93	--	--	--	--
Gallegos Basic	2008	--	96	--	--	96	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gallegos Basic	2007	--	96	--	--	95	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Liberty	2011	64	--	48	74	--	72	76	51	65	--	--	--
Liberty	2010	81	--	76	79	--	81	76	81	71	--	--	--

Liberty	2009	70	86	--	73	90	--	75	82	--	--	--	--
Liberty	2008	--	86	--	--	79	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Liberty	2007	--	81	--	--	80	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Los Ninos	2011	61	--	60	61	--	61	63	60	49	--	--	--
Los Ninos	2010	67	--	68	54	--	54	67	61	50	--	--	--
Los Ninos	2009	67	77	--	68	83	--	61	63	--	--	--	--
Los Ninos	2008	--	77	--	--	67	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Los Ninos	2007	--	81	--	--	86	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mission Manor	2011	55	--	51	64	--	49	76	49	62	--	--	--
Mission Manor	2010	58	--	47	59	--	53	62	79	56	--	--	--
Mission Manor	2009	51	78	--	57	86	--	56	70	--	--	--	--
Mission Manor	2008	--	85	--	--	77	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mission Manor	2007	--	81	--	--	73	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Riviera	2011	60	--	47	52	--	60	70	38	58	--	--	--
Riviera	2010	48	--	49	52	--	40	56	68	33	--	--	--
Riviera	2009	49	69	--	49	83	--	59	79	--	--	--	--
Riviera	2008	--	67	--	--	70	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Riviera	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Santa Clara	2011	66	--	60	62	--	55	68	35	51	--	--	--
Santa Clara	2010	59	--	55	50	--	47	49	44	40	--	--	--
Santa Clara	2009	57	79	--	46	59	--	54	82	--	--		
Santa Clara	2008	--	49	--	--	60	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Santa Clara	2007	--	80	--	--	80	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Southside MS	2011	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	60	33	21
Southside MS	2010	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63	54	21
Southside MS	2009	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	51	71	--
Southside MS	2008	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Southside MS	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wakefield MS	2011	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	67	33	34
Wakefield MS	2010	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	54	61	27

Wakefield MS	2009	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	45	83	
Wakefield MS	2008	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Wakefield MS	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Appolo MS	2011	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	66	35	29
Appolo MS	2010	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	66	71	36
Appolo MS	2009	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	45	86	
Appolo MS	2008	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Appolo MS	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chaparral MS	2011	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	66	27	34
Chaparral MS	2010	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	69	74	43
Chaparral MS	2009	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	55	77	
Chaparral MS	2008	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--			
Chaparral MS	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--			
Sierra MS	2011	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	67	32	31
Sierra MS	2010	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	71	74	29
Sierra MS	2009	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	47	79	
Sierra MS	2008	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--			
Sierra MS	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--			
Utterbach MS	2011	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	68	34	32
Utterbach MS	2010	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63	62	28
Utterbach MS	2009	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	51	81	
Utterbach MS	2008	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Utterbach MS	2007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AVERAGE		**63**	**79**	**57**	**68**	**79**	**59**	**67**	**66**	**54**	**60**	**59**	**30**
STD DEV		**9.9**	**9.7**	**12.1**	**12.0**	**11.9**	**14.7**	**11.1**	**16.4**	**16.6**	**8.367**	**19.99**	**5.67**
MEDIAN		**64**	**80**	**55**	**66**	**80**	**58**	**67**	**69**	**55**	**63**	**67**	**30**
MED STD DV		**12**											
School Name	**Year**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Math**
		THIRD GRADE			**FOURTH GRADE**			**FIFTH GRADE**			**SIXTH GRADE**		

Table 2. Percentage of Students Who Passed the AIMS Test in the Target Area Elementary & Middle Schools

TARGET AREA ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS																
								ETHNICITY			3RD GRADE AIMS (2011)			5TH GRADE AIMS (2011)		
SCHOOL NAME	A-F Total Score	A-F Grade	Read Median SGP	Math Median SGP	Std Count	% FRLP	% ELLs	% Hisp	% White	% Minority	% Read	% Write	% Math	% Read	% Write	% Math
AZ Acad Leadership	No data	No data	No data	No data	191	72	21	69	10	90	64	86	48	76	51	65
Borton Magnet S.	No data	No data	No data	No data	342	50	19	50	36	64	68	70	54	na	na	na
Cavet Elem S.	101	C	50	41	314	93	42	82	4	97	52	62	35	63	49	31
Children Reach. Sky	110	C	45	42	263	87	14	63	16	84	73	74	48	76	53	38
Children Success Acad	No data	No data	No data	No data	88	82	0	90	3	97	30	67	33	69	31	54
CE Rose Elem	142	A	56	70	538	83	34	96	2	98	67	88	63	79	58	73
Elvira Elem S.	131	B	54	65	652	83	34	89	4	91	65	80	66	82	60	75
Gallegos Basic Elem	132	B	48	49	597	55	26	86	6	94	81	90	73	89	64	80
Holladay S.	120	B	54	43	180	53	13	50	33	67	68	76	69	69	46	47
Hollinger Elem	119	C	50	40	497	92	44	91	2	98	58	90	55	81	49	49
Liberty Elem S.	112	C	46	39	805	80	13	93	1	99	64	86	48	76	51	65
Los Ninos Elem S.	100	C	39	38	668	80	56	84	8	92	60	66	69	60	44	54
Mission Manor Elem	109	C	46	46	595	81	39	93	3	98	55	78	51	76	49	62
Mission View Elem	106	C	51	52	349	92	38	92	1	99	47	82	47	75	47	66
Ocotillo Elem	147	A	No data	No data	515	84	37	87	6	94	45	76	55	44	58	54
Ochoa Elem	97	D	35	38	245	92	31	90	0	100	61	72	64	55	24	30
Pueblo Gardens	110	C	38	53	414	92	25	76	6	94	71	95	71	66	50	55
Rivera Elem	107	C	44	53	649	83	33	94	3	97	60	69	47	70	36	58
Santa Clara Elem	110	C	41	48	634	82	35	76	2	98	66	73	60	68	82	51
Van Buskirk Elem	113	C	57	62	398	90	34	91	3	97	49	77	44	79	57	78
TOTAL	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**8,934**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**
MEDIAN	**110**	**C**	**47**	**47**	**456**	**83**	**34**	**88**	**3**	**97**	**63**	**77**	**55**	**75**	**50**	**55**
STD DEVIATION	**14**	**--**	**7**	**10**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**
STATE AVERAGE	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**--**	**51**	**14**	**41**	**45**	**55**	**76**	**79**	**68**	**79**	**55**	**63**

Table 3. Target Area Elementary School Information.

Sources: Arizona Department of Education's website: http://www.ade.state.az.us/; Greatschools' website: www.greatschools.com; School Digger's website: http://www.schooldigger.com; and Arizona Charter Schools Association, https://azcharters.org/.

(1) For AIMS test, the values reported correspond to the percentage of students who score proficient in the AIMS test. (2) FRLP = Free/Reduced Lunch Program; ELLs = English Language Learners. SGP = student growth percentile. (3) Math AIMS results for 3rd graders are for 2009; no data available for 2010 and 2011.