A. EDUCATION PLAN

A.3.1. PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION – MASTERY AND PROMOTION

A.3.1.1. Mastery and Promotion before 2013 - 2014 School Year.

At Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA), letter grades or their equivalents will be assigned for each course as following:

A: 90-100%, B: 80-89%, C: 70-79%, D: 60-69%, and F: 59% and below. Full mastery of a topic will be achieved with a B grade or higher (or 80% score or higher).

Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) will promote students to the next grade level if they achieve mastery in every class with a B or a higher grade or with a total grade average of B. Students who consistently score below B (or below 80%) in reading and/or math, or are determined to be at-risk of academic failure through benchmark, formative and summative assessments, will receive remedial instruction in these topics in the school RTI-Early Intervention Reading & Math Program, the centerpiece of the school Performance Management Plan (PMP).

Benchmark, formative and summative assessments are components of the school Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring System that continuously assesses and monitors student academic progress, and drives Common Core State Standards-based high quality instruction. The Comprehensive Assessment and Monitoring System is the core element of Strategy III in the Performance Management Plan (PMP).

SPA students who drop below C in English and/or math, and fail to improve back to at least 70% after remedial instruction, will repeat the class. Students who fail math, reading and writing, science and social studies core classes by consistently staying below grade C in each one of these classes after participating in remediation will repeat the entire grade.

In general, Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) will not promote students for social reasons.

However, factors such as -- student's report grades, scores on state exams, outcomes of formative and summative assessments, and other indicators of academic achievement as the academic team feels appropriate -- will also be considered in the decision to retain students.

Since Core Knowledge and Singapore Math allow repetitive teaching of the same information in various formats; this makes it possible to promote a student to the next level even if s/he has earned less than B (or 80%) but no lower than 70%. For a student to be considered for this alternative promotion, s/he will be required to attend remediation through the RTI-Early Intervention Reading & Math Program or through other programs; satisfactorily complete all homework, and demonstrate an effort to improve.

Retention of ELL students will be considered on a case-by-case basis and challenges associated with the language deficiency will be weighed in the decision to retain these students.

A.3.1.2. Mastery and Promotion from 2013 – 2014 School Year.

In 2010, Arizona lawmakers, through ARS 15-701 and House Bill 2732, provided guidance for third grader retention effective from the 2013 school year.

Seneca Preparatory Academy (SPA) will implement the new legislation that requires that a student not be promoted from third grade if his/her score on the reading portion of the AIMS test, or successor test, falls far below the 3rd grade level. Students enrolled in grade three before the 2013 school year are exempt from the new promotion requirements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR A.3.1

- ARS 15-701. http://www.azleg.gov/ars/15/00701.htm.
- House Bill 2732. http://sepacs.org/2010/07/fact-sheet-for-hb-2732-third-grade-retention/.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR A.3.0

- ADE, 2010a. About CCSS. 2010. Retrieved on 5-31-10. http://www.ade.state.az.us.
- Polya, G. (1996). How to Solve It. Summary of George Polya, "How to Solve It". 2nd edition, Princeton University Press, 1957. Retrieved on April 10, 2011 from: http://www.math.utah.edu/~alfeld/math/polya.html.
- ADE, 2010b. Arizona Department of Education website. Retrieved June 2010. https://www.azed.gov/AZRTI/webRTI_CurriculumInstruction_012009.pdf.
- ADE 2010c. Arizona Department of Education website. Retrieved on 9-5-10. http://www.ade.az.gov/azrti/AZ3TieredlevelsStudentSupport.pdf#tier3
- ARS 15-704. http://www.ade.state.az.us/azreads/15-704.pdf.
- Core Knowledge Foundation, 2010. http://www.coreknowledge.org/the-k-8-sequence.
- Downey, C. et al, 2009. (Downey, C., Steffy, B., Poston, W., English F). *50 Ways to Close the Achievement Gap. Third Edition.* Corwin Press. A SAGE Company.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement, 2004. *Successful Charter Schools.* Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education. Available at htpp://www.ed.gov/admins/comm./choice/charter/index.html.
- US Dept of Education. 2007. US Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement, K-8 Charter IDEA 2004, Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities, Office of Special Education. http://www.ade.state.az.us/ess/resources/lawsRegs/06-6656IDEA04Regulations.pdf.
- IDEA 2004, Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities, Office of Special Education. http://www.ade.state.az.us/ess/resources/lawsRegs/06-6656IDEA04Regulations.pdf.
- SDE, 2010. *Singapore Math for US.* Staff Development for Educators (SDE). Retrieved on July 5, 2010 from http://www.sde.com/singapore-math/faq.asp.

- Grossen, B., 1995. Overview: The Story Behind Project Follow Through. Effective School Practices. Vol 15, n0.1, 1995-6. June 2010 from http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~adiep/ft/grossen.htm.
- Lindsay, J., 2009. Direct Instruction and Wesley Elementary School, Houston, TX. June 2010 from http://www.jefflindsay.com/EducData.shtml.
- Johnson, E., Mellard, D., Fuchs, D., McKnight, M. 2006. Responsiveness to Intervention (RTI): How to Do It. National Research Center on Learning Disabilities. From May 2010. www.nrcld.org.
- Project ACHIEVE. (2010). Extracted May 23, 2010 from http://www.projectachieve.info/professionalservices/responsetointerventionimplementation.html
- Tomlinson, 1999 http://www.ericdigests.org/2001-2/elementary.html.
- Gillies, R. M. (2007). Cooperative Learning: Integrating Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks. Sage.
- Rebecca Gau. *Program Accountability and Performance Management.* Presentation at Arizona Charter Schools Association Training. Phoenix, Arizona 2-13-10.
- Tomlinson, C. A. 2001. *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. (2nd Ed.) Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Friend M. and Bursuck, W. 2009. *Including Students With Special Needs: A Practical Guide for Classroom Teachers*, 5th edition. Pearsons.
- DPI, 2011. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. http://dpi.wi.gov/home.html.
- Project Follow Through. www.projectpro.com/ICR/Research/DI/Summary.htm. January 14, 2010.
- Wiggins G., McTighe J. 2005. *Understanding by Design.* 2nd edition. ASCD, Alexandria Virginia. USA.
- Finn, J. and Achilles, C. 1999. Tennessee's Class Size Study: Findings, Implications, Misconceptions. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. June 20, 1999. 21: 97-109.
- Molnar, A. et al. Evaluating the SAGE Program: A Pilot Program in Targeted Pupil-Teacher Reduction in Wisconsin. Evaluation and Policy Analysis. June 20, 1999. 21: 179-192.
- Wedman, J. and Waigandt, A. 2004. *Core Knowledge Curriculum and School Performance: A National Study.* Retrieved April 2010. http://www.coreknowledge.org/mimik/mimik_uploads/documents/31/CK_National_Study_2004.pdf.

- Core Knowledge. 2011. See website at http://www.coreknowledge.org/