



**Office of Charter Schools**

**2012-2013 CHARTER RENEWAL APPLICATION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive Summary .....	1
II. Looking Back: The Record and Analysis of Performance.....	3
III. Looking Forward: Plans for the Next Charter Term .....	4

## RENEWAL NARRATIVE

### I. Executive Summary

#### A. Enrollment and Demographic Overview

1. Provide the enrollment and demographic information for the current school year.

<b>CURRENT YEAR ENROLLMENT &amp; DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION</b>	
Total Enrollment	920 (Dec. 2012)
# of Students on Waiting List	397 (Mar. 2012)
<b>Gender</b>	
# Male	410
# Female	510
<b>Ethnicity/Race</b>	
# White	573
# Black	229
# Hispanic	56
# Asian	9
# Native American	2
# Other (Multi-racial)	70
<b>Special Populations</b>	
# Students with IEPs	170
# English Language Learners	4
# Homeless Students	0
# Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	602

2. Provide enrollment information for length of charter contract (ADM count).

<b>TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>				
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
235	316	424	870	920

3. Provide the number and percentage of students eligible for special education by eligibility category for the length of the charter contract.

<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENT POPULATION BY CATEGORY</b>												
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Year 6	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	0	0	4	1.3%	4	.9%	8	.9%	9	1%		
Blind or Low Vision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Cognitive Disability	2	.9%	3	.9%	2	.5%	3	.3%	5	.5%		
Deaf or Hard of Hearing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Deaf-Blind	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENT POPULATION BY CATEGORY												
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Year 6	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Development Delay (early childhood)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Emotional Disability	4	2%	9	3%	10	2%	3	.3%	6	.7%		
Language or Speech Impairment	4	2%	3	1%	7	1.7%	24	2.8%	41	4.5%		
Multiple Disabilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1%	1	.1%		
Orthopedic Impairment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.1%	1	.1%		
Specific Learning Disability	13	6%	27	9%	46	10.8%	71	8.2%	84	9.1%		
Traumatic Brain Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

4. Provide the number and percentage of ELL students for length of charter contract.

ELL STUDENT POPULATION CHART											
Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Year 6	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0	0	7	2.2%	11	2.6%	15	1.7%	26	2.8%		

5. Provide the number and percentage of Homeless students for length of charter contract.

HOMELESS STUDENT POPULATION											
Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Year 6	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**B. Academic Performance Overview**

Anderson Preparatory Academy (2008)								
	AYP	PL 221	NWEA % meeting reading growth target	NWEA % meeting LA growth target	NWEA % meeting math growth target	ISTEP % Passing Math	ISTEP % Passing ELA	ISTEP % Passing Math & ELA
SY 2008-09	n/a	n/a	58.3%	47.8%	58.9%	67.00%	55.00%	50.00%
SY 2009-10 6-8	No	Commendable	46.3%	49.8%	47.6%	62.15%	68.69%	53.27%
9-10			71.2%	61.1%	64.3%			
SY 2010-11	No	D (Watch)	52.9%	58.7%	54.7%	62.61%	66.67%	52.32%
9-10			55.1%	42.6%	51.5%			
SY 2011-12 ADDED TESTING FOR GRADES 2-5	n/a	D	44.4%	52.7%	47.4%	70.54%	69.31%	58.17%

## **II. Looking Back: The Record and Analysis of Performance**

### **C. Written Overview**

#### *Mission:*

The mission of the Anderson Preparatory Academy is to provide a safe, disciplined, structured, and creative environment preparing students to strive toward a goal of academic excellence while nurturing diverse individual interests, fostering the desire for learning and developing those cherished principles and values of leadership, character, patriotism, and respect for self, family, community, and country.

APA opened its first school year in August of 2008 serving 240 students in grades 6-8. The school's environment was built around a "military academy" format that focused on structure and discipline. Coupled with these aspects was a firm position on maintaining the philosophy that every child has the right to a "safe" public school environment. The fulfillment of this mission is evidenced in our school growth. The academic curriculum focused upon a college preparatory liberal arts and sciences format.

In less than five years parents in the local demographic area of Anderson, Indiana and surrounding communities have supported and increased the APA enrollment to over 900 students as the school has expanded to grades K-12. Structure, discipline, school safety, and a strong academic education are major factors for parent confidence in APA.

APA has met its mission by providing a creative environment while seeking academic excellence and nurturing individual interests. APA utilizes a diverse curriculum delivery methodology allowing students to be creative in their academic goals. Through DOE state core standards, blending an approved on-line digital approach to the academic curriculum and school wide technology for each student, APA students have the ability to accelerate their academic progress. Academy cadets have the opportunity to excel with over 20 college course credits from institutions of higher learning such as Ball State University, Purdue University and Indiana University. APA has a strong program for students needing remedial credit recovery through the utilization of technology to meet their curriculum needs.

APA, by charter design, is a rigorous college preparatory curriculum. During the 2011-12 school year 14 APA Academy cadets in grades 10-12 were enrolled in college course programs utilizing Purdue University, Ball State University, Indiana University, Indiana University at Fort Wayne, and Ivy Tech. The 2012-13 academic year reflects a similar statistic.

Eight APA cadets qualified for graduation at the conclusion of the 2011-12 school year with two being early high school qualified graduates. All are in post secondary programs. In the spring of 2013 APA will have nine early high school graduates in its graduating class of over 50.

APA develops leadership, character, patriotism, and develops a respect for family, community and nation. APA has 100% of its cadets in grades 6-12 enrolled in either the USAF-CAP or USAF-JROTC programs. APA requires 100% of its cadets in grades 6-12 to participate in 24 hours of community service per year. This participation is monitored for each cadet through technology and is integrated into the school's curriculum.

**Looking Back: The Record and Analysis of Performance**

*Educational Performance*

- A. **Provide any educational performance-related evidence, supplemental data, or contextual information that may not be captured in OCS’s current academic data. Submissions may include updates related to previous school findings.**

**APA improved the passing percentages for both language arts and math from 52.3% to 58.2%, an 11% gain in achievement.** Under the previous system, we would have received a B or an A for proficiency improvement.

At issue is that we received a D rating from the IDOE A-F system for grades 3-8. Receiving a D is a significant challenge to overcome no matter what the form of measurement. **ATTACHMENT A** illustrates the problem solving methodology suggested by Ball State University. It is included in the ongoing professional development plan developed in the summer of 2012 and continuing weekly and monthly throughout the school year.

K-8 District to district:	#TEST LARTS	#TEST MATH	BOTH M AND LARTS ISTEP+		
	L. Arts	Math	Both		
ACS DISTRICT SCORES	1805	66.0%	1933	70.5%	58.1%
APA District Scores	280	69.3%	285	70.5%	58.2%

A comparison in proficiency between the Anderson Community Schools and APA shows overall that as a district APA outscored ACS in language arts and matched ACS in math overall. APA outscored the district. Even though APA is not content with exceeding the performance of the local school district, the performance of the APA grades 6-8 had a significant advantage over Anderson Highland grades 6-8. The difference in ELA passing percentage was 9.6 which is **16% higher** for APA than Highland. In math, targeted for strong APA improvement measures, the difference 6.1 – **8.4% higher** than Highland. That comparison is:

	ELA Pass N	ELA Percent Pass	Math Pass N	Math Percent Pass	Pass Both Math and ELA Percent
Anderson Highland Middle School Grades 6-8	519	59.7%	532	60.9%	51.0%
<b>APA Grades 6-8 PreAcademy</b>	280	<b>69.3%</b>	285	70.5%	<b>58.2%</b>

In the A-F rating, the following information shows that our elementary school (calculated in house) exceeded all but one of the ACS elementary schools significantly. The highest scoring ACS elementary had an equal rating if our elementary had been calculated separately by the state. (3-5<sup>th</sup> Grade). Our middle school had lower math scores than we desired and that is the priority area in the curriculum our strategic planning addresses, yet our middle school scored a .5/4 where Anderson Highland scored a 0.

**APA: Elementary School (See Attachment B for A-F in-house report card.)  
3.25 Grade: B**

Anderson Community School Corp	5033	Valley Grove Elementary Sch	Madison	3.50	B	
Anderson Community School Corp	5097	North Side Intermediate School	Madison	2.00	C	
Anderson Community School Corp	5098	East Side Intermediate School	Madison	2.50	C	
Anderson Community School Corp	5102	Eastside Elementary School	Madison	2.50	C	
Anderson Community School Corp	5142	Anderson Elementary School	Madison	2.50	C	
Anderson Community School Corp	5146	Ersrine Elementary School	Madison	2.25	C	
Anderson Community School Corp	4945	Anderson High School	Madison	1.90	D	
Anderson Community School Corp	4977	Tenth Street Elementary Sch	Madison	1.00	D	
<b>Anderson Community School Corp</b>	<b>5076</b>	<b>Highland Middle School</b>	<b>Madison</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2012 F</b>	<b>Last year: F</b>

**B. Using the school’s accountability and assessment data, illustrate the improvement in academic performance of students over the term of the charter school’s existence. Consider the following questions in your analysis.**

1. What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? Do the state data, the achievement data and the individual student data align to support your conclusions?

Our data indicates a weakness in growth data for the middle school grades especially in math grades 7 and 8 for ISTEP+ in Spring 2012 testing. However, the proficiency grew in 2012 from 52.3% (2011) to 58.2% in passing both segments. The passing rate for math was 70% for all grades (3-8) but passing percentage for math in 7<sup>th</sup> grade was 56.3% and in 8<sup>th</sup> grade 62.5%.

Growth in grades 6-8 considered for PL221 status in 2012 was low and resulted in deduction of points from the A-F rating scale. The low growth overall for 6-8 language arts was 43.1% (under the target of 39.8%) and for math 6-8 was 56.9% (under the target of 42.4%.)

**IREAD 3:** Our first year of operations for the elementary school resulted in testing students that were new to our system. Many had struggles with reading that we inherited. The state requires 90% passing. Our goal for next year will be 80%.

IREAD 3: % passing	Spring	Summer Retest
	31/46	67.3 % 2/10
Total Passing Percentage after remediation and retesting:	71.7 %	

The plan for ensuring that elementary students can read by 3<sup>rd</sup> grade is included with DOE required reading plan - **Attachment E**.

2. What areas of strength are apparent?

**LEGACY STUDENTS:** Our legacy students have demonstrated a high degree of achievement compared to the local school district and students that have not been part of APA their entire middle and high school careers. The information on the chart below reflects the performance for current 10-12 grade students that have been with us since the inception of the school.

**LEGACY STUDENTS GRADES 10-12**

On Course to Graduate	Taken Honors Classes, Co-credit college, or AP Courses	ECA Algebra 1	ECA English 10
99%	31%	60%	86%

The retakes for ECA Algebra 1 taken in December of 2012 have not yet been recorded. Algebra 1 ECA has improved each year. The first ECA given in 2009 had less than 20% pass. In 2010-11, 34% passed. Overall in 2012, over 50% passed school wide.



## LEGACY STUDENTS GRADE 12

The seniors included as legacy students have the following performance levels.

On Course to Graduate	Taken Honors Classes, Co-credit college, or AP Courses	ECA Algebra 1	ECA English 10
99%	38%	73%	96%

### **ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROMISE FOR THE FUTURE:**

When we separate the elementary school from the middle school, the elementary would have received a 3.00 in language arts and 3.50 in math for a combined grade of 3.25. Our elementary school showed significant growth and proficiency especially considering that it was in its first year. Math proficiency for grades 3-5 was 75.1%. Even more impressive were the results for selected grade levels. In grade 5 (now 6<sup>th</sup> grade for 2012-13) math proficiency was 82.7%. Low growth was 31% overall compared to 56.9% as noted for math 6-8<sup>th</sup> grades.

The elementary school was successful in its first year because students used the Rotation Learning System allowing for individualized instructional level teaching. Students were held to mastery expectations and had to follow the sequence of learning skills that put skills into context. We determined that we would expand the model of Rotation Learning individualized instruction to the middle school. This has been implemented. In addition, a new instructional focused administrator was hired replacing the previous person. The teachers responsible for the low scores have been replaced. Training in the Rotation Learning system has been extensively embedded into the year professional development process.

3. What factors have contributed to these results, and how have these factors contributed to student performance results?
  - a) Do the areas of weakness affect many or few students? Is it a particular subgroup of students? Is there a trend in one content area or across all content areas?

Our AYP groups of free and reduced students, black students, and special education students are making lower progress than our paid lunch white students. The new elementary school scored in all groups significantly higher than the middle school. The middle school math and language arts performance caused the D rating. Our curriculum needed realigned to the reality of our student body abilities and background in middle school math.

- b) Have ALL students' performance been analyzed? What progress monitoring tools do you have in place that provided this information?

**ATTACHMENT B** has an A-F analysis for each grade and significant sub groups. Each student has been analyzed and steps are in place for this school year to establish additional specific and targeted monitoring. We have past and present scores for ISTEP+ and NWEA available to every teacher through two sources. All of our teachers have been given access to Learning Connection through the DOE and our student management system has data for the last two years available. Our plan is to have each homeroom teacher (advisor), K-12, be responsible for monitoring and

guiding support for each of his or her small group of children. Students are identified in language arts and math with their distance from cut scores. Teachers are being trained to use Learning Connection to drill down to sub tests.

An entire team has the primary purpose of communicating to the homeroom teacher targeted needs for ISTEP+ achievement improvement and NWEA analysis student by student. That team also is in charge of administering formative mini-tests (“Jet Tests”) to grade level groups of students using the Odyssey program assessment capability and then communicating to teachers the needs of each student in terms of standards performance indicators tested. This analysis and reporting team is uniquely qualified to assist teachers to provide targeted reinforcement and re-teaching plans in real time. The Jet Tests actually prescribe learning paths that give instruction using our Odyssey curriculum software that can then be measured and the skills re-tested to determine mastery. Our model includes grouping students for teacher-direct instruction using the resources on the DOE website to do off-computer lessons and assessments.

**Professional development for teachers and evaluators / coaches:** Coaches and evaluators have been trained starting in the summer of 2012 and meet weekly to share strategies and compare performance as shapers of the achievement efforts. Professional development has been developed for the data team beginning in 2008 as the Chief Academic Officer and assistant developed the methodology for the Rotation Learning System, first in the special education program and then expanding to the elementary school in school year 2011-12. A checklist that has been developed for training the data team and evaluation teams along with teacher coaches has served as the framework for professional development and is addressed throughout the year during weekly meetings and school wide at monthly professional development for the K-12 staff. The checklist with professional development framework is **Attachment D**.

All students’ grade level and groups’ performance has been analyzed and data has been submitted through CSapphire as well as is included in **Attachment B** to this renewal application. The progress monitoring tools utilized include the unique assessment system used with Compass Odyssey curriculum throughout the K-12 program. In addition, primary grades utilize Lindamood Bell screening assessments and locally developed benchmark testing for reading levels. The A-Z Reading software provides additional reading assessment.

Benchmark testing is conducted for each standard throughout the year prior to testing in the spring. That has been established for the 2012-13 school year. The testing is already being utilized to address needs as they become evident. 8<sup>th</sup> period for grades 6-8 is used exclusively for math and language arts remediation for students that demonstrate lack of proficiency on ISTEP+, ongoing Compass quizzes and tests, and the custom made benchmark testing.

**C. Organizational Performance**

**III. Looking Forward: Plans for the Next Charter Term**

**A. Academic Data and Educational Strategies**

1. The school will continue the improvements as described previously including digital tracking of ongoing student achievement and use of testing. The RISE Evaluation system customized for and by APA will track teacher performance and allow for the professional development coaching needed to improve classroom performance based on student outcomes. The APA RISE Evaluation system is detailed in **Attachment B, pp. 26-36**. The next steps are to accelerate the programs that have been put into place.

**Curriculum: Rotation Differentiated Model**

**General Principles**

Overview for the Vision of the Rotation Learning Classroom

- Small group instruction replaces large group lecture.
- Education must be personalized through projects that result in learning the standards.
- Differentiated instruction is required for all students.
- Students move at their own pace with 80% mastery required for each skill in sequence.
- Progress is reported in grade equivalence and in middle and high school, GPA.
- Hands on experiential learning is expected for off computer teacher directed lessons.
- Portfolio assessment ensures that students have the skills for life.
- All learning should be compatible with brain research.
- The following features of Optimal Learning Environments should be incorporated:
  - Student choice
  - Student centered
  - Whole-part-whole approach
  - Active student participation
  - Focus on ideas before mechanics
  - Authentic purposes for learning
  - Immersion in language and print
  - Teacher and peer demonstrations
  - Approximation
  - Immediate response (During planning and presentation stages)
  - Classrooms as learning communities (Students share in the development and presentation of projects.)
  - High expectations

(Vaughn, Bos p. 54)

**References**

Vaughn, S. and Bos, C. (2009) *Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behavior Problems* 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey Pearson Prentice Hall

## **Overview of System**

- Direct Instruction: Teacher facilitates
- Project-based learning: Standards based and personalized
- Computer based: Assessment and formal classroom progress
- Final advancement procedures: Written formal evaluation with prescription

## ***CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT***

Room layout for best practices

- Computer center for individualized learning
- Teacher small group instruction center
- Independent study for project based learning and hands on learning activities

Discipline plan and procedures

- Use school-wide discipline plan.

Student motivation

- Work to link student interests to independent projects and mini-projects
- Work on life skills that are part of student transition plans including the Senior Portfolio skills

## ***PROJECT BASED LEARNING***

Format

- Use PBL format to construct with individual students or with small groups that will do similar projects
- Teacher directed projects are to be used to assist students in learning how to prepare and design projects independently

Management

- Use the standards checklist to record progress on Indiana standards
- Develop project library in electronic portfolio

Assessment

- Use NWEA to measure general growth.
- Use ISTEP+ scores to confirm mastery and needs for improvement for each student
- Use ISTEP+ scores to target small group instruction for shared needs

Develop use of Compass Odyssey for formative assessment on an ongoing basis

## ***DIRECT INSTRUCTION: Teacher facilitator***

Sources for lessons and Assessments

- Odyssey Software
  - Lessons can be given straight from the Odyssey curriculum using the small group center and LCD projector.
  - Lessons can be focused on group needs with follow up done by the individuals during the computer based rotation based on Indiana Standards using the Internet.

***COMPUTER- BASED: Individualized based on instructional grade level***

Compass Odyssey Software – K-6 (Aligns with NWEA)  
Standards generated prescriptive lessons

Used as tools:

Word processing

Spreadsheets

Graphic presentations: Power Point and beyond

Additional Notes on Rotation Learning Environment:

Strategies used in Rotation classrooms include the following with thoughts and observations included:

1. Use of the stages of learning: Our textbook details the stages of learning as entry, acquisition, proficiency, maintenance, generalization, and application. This is another example of the stages of learning expressed in different formats depending on the author. Piaget expresses the same stages but in dramatically different terms. Frank DeSensi, a school “reconstructor” from Kentucky in a program given to charter and private schools through the CELL group in Indianapolis, had four stages. Acquisition, Articulation, Application, and creative Application across different circumstances. DeSensi spoke of being intentional about learning and did learning observations with inventories detailing how much work was in each stage in a classroom. He found that most classrooms were almost totally focused on acquisition of skills instead of application. The BASE classroom will focus on critical thinking and problem solving using acquired skills.
2. Our school is based on a model that is very strict about the use of operant learning theory. We are a military school and there are clear consequences for behaviors, both positive and negative. In our classrooms we use computers for our curriculum delivery as well as textbooks. Our students are allowed to use learning as a reward. They can access problem solving or simulation games that practice the skills they have acquired. Through mini projects, they can apply the skills but only after they prove acquisition.
3. The second model of cognitive strategy instruction includes more of the steps to use. We use modeling, self-regulation, verbalization, and reflective thinking in our teaching and learning. Our school model stresses problem solving and critical thinking so our students engage in oral presentations and feedback within a small group setting or one on one. They are encouraged to keep track of their quiz and test scores in the computer based curriculum that we use. Often you will hear them say, “Hey, I moved my score in main idea from a 50% to an 80%.” They print out their own scores, evaluate them, then turn them in. (The computer maintains continuous progress monitoring that staff, students, and parents can see.)

Group exposure to state standard(s)  
Activity aligned with same state standard(s)  
Individual learning path aligned with the student's appropriate learning level

*Results for students:*

Past gaps in the learning path are identified and accounted for. Students receive remediation on lacking skills, while providing an opportunity to progress academically.

For our curriculum, we are using a complete digital solution that is led by our licensed classroom teachers. We are writing our own unit plans based on the Indiana Academic Standards for the present and prior grade level. We are using hands-on materials and addressing problem solving skills daily. We have been using Learning Connection and the DOE website to help address standards. Also utilize is our digital curriculum, Compass Odyssey, to reinforce and reteach standards that students have not mastered.

*Results for students:*

Students will show improvement in all standards, such as number sense, computation, algebra and functions, geometry, measurement, data and analysis, probability, and problem solving skills

***Instruction/Interventions:***

Customized education  
Advanced technology usage  
Direct instruction tutoring  
Peer Tutoring: High school students gain community service hours for tutoring.  
Title 1 instruction

*Results for students:*

Highly engaged educational interactions  
Bridging educational content/standards gaps  
Ownership in education  
Mastery of standards

***Formative Assessments/Progress monitoring—Data-driven decision making:***

Instantaneous data based on student performance via technology driven assessments  
Data tracking via Compass Learning System  
Completely customizable assessments based on student needs and performance

*Results for students:*

Accurate results and identification of needs and strengths  
Custom education path built on data gained from assessment  
Clearly defined goals to promote motivation and accomplishment

We are using NWEA and ISTEP testing to identify students with weaknesses in math. We will evaluate progress weekly using Jet tests. Upper level students will come to the classroom and help peer tutor.

*Results for students:*

Students will recognize their weaknesses and participate in addressing them.

1. What are the strategies the school will employ to achieve the “Meets Standards” designation?

The following steps are prescribed for improving the performance of low performing sub groups of free/reduced students, black students, and special education.

## LANGUAGE ARTS

### Lindamood Bell reading therapy program:

A neuro-psychological program for the restricting of students’ sound letter association. Designed to reform neuron networks in non-readers that do not have a phonemic ability to connect.

Lindamood Bell materials have been acquired and training conducted during the summer of 2012 and ongoing support is provided by our Lindamood Bell specialist.

Staff training and development will be continued and expanded in the elementary primary grades. Comprehension skills are being addressed for emerging readers through the LIPS and Seeing Stars Lindamood Bell programs.

SUPPORTS FOR STRATEGIES: Administration monitoring of results. Open dialogue regarding the program. Assessment data reporting to teachers/students/parents

### Customized Individual Learning Path: For individual needs

Computerized learning program(Compass)

Computer to access learning program

Staff to facilitate learning program

SUPPORTS: Tutoring services, daily and weekly reports on real time data to drive the instructional level of each student. Learning levels adjusted regularly in relation to data.

### Problem Solving Development for Math

Jet Tests will be administered and assessed weekly. Students will work on writing prompts, and they will be assessed using rubrics. This will be done weekly. We have developed an entire team that spends the vast majority of its time communicating to the homeroom teacher advisor’s needs for ISTEP improvement and NWEA analysis student by student.

### Title 1 Tutoring Service

#### Title 1 funding

Educators to facilitate tutoring: Elementary and Middle School

Computers provided at all levels for curricular tracking and programming.

Weekly monitoring of classroom data provided by technology usage

Data driven curriculum that is modified based on current student performance levels

### Real Math Supplemental Math Program (Elementary Level)

Funding for purchase of Real Math Program

Computers to distribute Real Math Program

Designated area to facilitate program

Administration monitoring of results. Open dialogue regarding the program.

Assessment data reporting to teachers/students/parents

Learning levels adjusted regularly in relation to data

### Regular ISTEP-Style Writing Prompts

Gathering Past ISTEP writing prompts from INDOE and disseminating to home room teachers to administer. Graders provided by high school program students

### Jet Tests

Tests will be given when a student completes a grade level for math and language arts. The Jet Tests will measure mastery of that grade level in the subject. Students must pass the Jet Test before being promoted to the next grade level equivalent. Students move at the pace of which they are capable and are not limited to age level expectations. Additionally, no students can move on until they prove mastery through the use of the Jet Tests. This applies to grades K-8 for the year 2012-13.

2. How will the school know if the improvement efforts are working in the short term (*e.g.*, 6 months) and in the long term (multiple years)?

The school will know if the improvements are working through multiple use of data sources. We will be able to measure all courses through the use of student progress monitors and the APA evaluation system with individual teacher grading for progress and growth. We will be able to determine effectiveness on the short term (6 month) through the use and analysis of our own benchmark testing system and classroom progress measured by grade equivalent growth. (GLE) In the long term, we will be able to see our growth continue in proficiency in math and language arts throughout all grades. Our ISTEP+ should continue to grow and we will be able to measure student growth, teacher related academic growth, and school trending as evidenced by increased performance on the A-F rating. We also will use the BSU Office of Charter Schools accountability measure including NWEA target growth measurement and targets established in general for academic growth through the accountability framework.



A chart of the school specific goals and strategies can be found in **Attachment C**.

- The following tables represent indicators from the Academic Performance Framework. The tables include data from school years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 (when available). As part of the school’s “looking forward” analysis, a school should fill out the tables below to demonstrate how it will get from its current performance level to Meets Standards by 2013-2014.

Are students making adequate growth based on the school’s median student growth percentile (SGP) in math and ELA? (K-8)? (Meets Standard: the median SGP is at least 50.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math
47	36	Not available	Not available	GOAL > 50	GOAL > 44	GOAL > 53	GOAL > 50

Are the lowest-performing students in the school making adequate growth based on the median student growth percentile (SGP) of the lowest quartile of students in math and ELA? (K-8)? (Meets Standard: the median SGP of the lowest 25% of students in the school is at least 50.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math
42	47	Not available	Not available	GOAL > 50	GOAL > 50	GOAL > 53	GOAL > 52

Are students achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? (K-8) (Meets Standard: At least 80% of students met proficiency in math and ELA.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
Percent Proficient - ELA	Percent Proficient - Math	Percent Proficient - ELA	Percent Proficient - Math	Percent Proficient - ELA	Percent Proficient - Math	Percent Proficient - ELA	Percent Proficient - Math
67	63	69.3	70.5	73% GOAL	74% GOAL	80% GOAL	80% GOAL

Are students achieving proficiency on ECAs in Algebra 1 and English 10? (HS) (Meets Standard: At least 80% of students met proficiency in math and ELA.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
English 10 ECA Pass %	Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	English 10 ECA Pass %	Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	English 10 ECA Pass %	Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	English 10 ECA Pass %	Algebra 1 ECA Pass %
73	33	71	56%	78% GOAL	59% GOAL	80% GOAL	80% GOAL

Are students performing well on ISTEP+ in math and ELA in comparison to other schools in the district? (K-8) (Meets Standard: School's average % proficient on Reading and Math meets or exceeds the average performance of students in the home district by less than 15 percentage points.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
% Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient - Similar Schools-ELA	% Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient - Similar Schools-ELA	% Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient - Similar Schools-ELA	% Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient - Similar Schools-ELA
67%	60%	69.3%	66%				
Difference (in percentage points)	6	Difference (in percentage points)	3.3.5%	Difference (in percentage points)	0%	Difference (in percentage points)	
% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient - Similar Schools-Math	% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient - Similar Schools-Math	% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient - Similar Schools-Math	% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient - Similar Schools-Math
63%	60%	70.5%	70.5%				
Difference (in percentage points)	2	Difference (in percentage points)		Difference (in percentage points)		Difference (in percentage points)	

Are students performing well on ECAs in Algebra and English in comparison to other schools in the district? (HS) (Meets Standard: School's average % proficient on Reading and Math meets or exceeds the average performance of students in the home district by less than 15 percentage points.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
School English 10 ECA Pass %	District English 10 ECA Pass %	School English 10 ECA Pass %	District English 10 ECA Pass %	School English 10 ECA Pass %	District English 10 ECA Pass %	School English 10 ECA Pass %	District English 10 ECA Pass %
73%	63%	71%	N/Avail				
Difference (in percentage points)	10	Difference (in percentage points)	N/Avail	Difference (in percentage points)		Difference (in percentage points)	
School Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	District Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	School Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	District Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	School Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	District Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	School Algebra 1 ECA Pass %	District Algebra 1 ECA Pass %
33%	44%	56%	N/Avail				
Difference (in percentage points)	-11	Difference (in percentage points)	N/Avail	Difference (in percentage points)		Difference (in percentage points)	

Are low-SES students achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? K-8 (Meets Standard: School sub-group's average % proficient on Reading and Math meets or exceeds the statewide average performance of students by less than 15 percentage points.)

2010-11				2011-12				2012-13				2013-14				
65%	Percent of School*															
61%	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA															
64%	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA															
-3	Difference (in percentage points)															
57%	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math															
67%	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math															
-9	Difference (in percentage points)															
58%	Percent of School*															
64.8%	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA															
69%	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA															
-4.3	Difference (in percentage points)															
69.1%	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math															
71.6%	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math															
1.5	Difference (in percentage points)															

Are ELL students achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? K-8

2010-11				2011-12				2012-13				2013-14				
***	Percent of School*															
**	School ELL Proficiency Rate-ELA															
43%	State ELL Proficiency Rate**-ELA															
n/a	Difference (in percentage points)															
***	School ELL Proficiency Rate-Math															
53%	State ELL Proficiency Rate**-Math															
n/a	Difference (in percentage points)															
***	Percent of School*															
**	School ELL Proficiency Rate-ELA															
56.3%	State ELL Proficiency Rate**-ELA															
***	Difference (in percentage points)															
***	School ELL Proficiency Rate-Math															
64.7%	State ELL Proficiency Rate**-Math															
***	Difference (in percentage points)															

Are students with disabilities achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? K-8

2010-11						2011-12						2012-13						2013-14										
Percent of School*	School SPED Proficiency Rate-ELA	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School SPED Proficiency Rate-Math	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School SPED Proficiency Rate-ELA	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School SPED Proficiency Rate-Math	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School SPED Proficiency Rate-ELA	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School SPED Proficiency Rate-Math	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School SPED Proficiency Rate-ELA	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School SPED Proficiency Rate-Math	State SPED Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	
21%	32%	37%	-5	35%	48%	-13	15%	49.3%	48.5%	+8	54.7%	58.2%	-3.5%	18.5%														

Is the school meeting acceptable standards according to P.L. 221 categories? K-8 (Meets Standard: School received a “B” (Commendable Progress))

2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
D	D	C	B

Is the school meeting acceptable standards according to P.L. 221 categories? HS (Meets Standard: School received a “B” (Commendable Progress))

2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
C	Not rated by DOE	C (First rating)	B

<b>Overall Academic Rating 2010-2011 (K-8)</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>Overall Academic Rating 2010-2011 (HS)</b>	<b>D</b>

2011-12 IREAD				
Total Students	# Pass IREAD	% Pass IREAD	% ELL	% F/R Lunch
46	31	67.4%	0.0%	65.2%

**B. Educational Plans**

- Vision.** Provide a vision for what the school will look like in five years. Describe any changes to the school’s mission or substantial revisions to the educational program as described in the current charter that the school proposes to make for the next charter term. Discuss any associated challenges or risks.

There are no major changes or revisions to the educational vision for the school over the next five years. The Anderson Preparatory Academy will continue to offer a college preparatory curriculum of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The K-5 curriculum: Will be continued utilizing the Rotation Learning System as outlined and approved in our amendment for K-5.

The Pre-Academy educational plan is continuing within the same mission as the original charter. We will infuse a blended approach to our methodology as this approach, based upon state data, was shown to increase student academic performance. Nothing would be changed or altered from our original curriculum or mission.

The Academy (9-12) will continue to complete the mission of a college preparatory curriculum of Liberal Arts and Sciences as defined in our original charter. APA has infused the utilization of technology and digital curriculums to assist our teaching staff with 21<sup>st</sup> century tools to complete this expectation.

2. **Educational Plan Modifications.** Describe any substantial modifications pertaining to the educational program that the school intends to request should it be renewed for an additional charter term.

In all grade levels, APA believes our methodology allows for individualized student instruction which allows students to accomplish the curriculum in accordance with ability levels and show improved student academic performance. Our approach over the next five years is to maintain our original educational vision and mission, and to continue to utilize “best practice” methodology to improve student success. There are no plans for substantial modifications to the educational program.

### C. **Financial Plans**

**5-year Financial Projections.** Complete a five-year projected budget for the next term at the campus and network level (if applicable). The budget detail should make clear the assumptions on which the school bases its key revenue and expenditure projections. The five year projected budget should include the Board of Directors review and attached minutes. If there is an intent to add to or change facilities, this should be included in the budgeted projection as well as new lease terms and/or building plans under Organizational Plans. Specific documents reviewed during the renewal process will include:

1. Current Board approved budget with minutes.

This documentation has been completed as of November 2012 and is currently in the hands of BSU.

2. Prior year Board approved budget with minutes.

This documentation has been sent to BSU as of November 2012

3. Current facility/school lease term and conditions.

This documentation has been sent to BSU as of November 2012

4. Applicable insurance policies and their renewal.

This documentation has been sent to BSU as of November 2012

Anderson Preparatory Academy is currently collaborating between its Finance Committee and Bookkeeping Plus to establish its 3 – 5 year strategic budget. The target for completion is January of 2013. A copy will be sent to BSU upon completion and reviewed by the Board of Directors.

There are no plans over the next five years to add or change current facilities.

**D. Organizational Plans**

The enrollment plan is dependent on the new flexibility provided by the amendment initiated by Ball State University in 2012 that allows flexibility with grade level distribution as long as the total enrollment figure is respected.

1. **Enrollment Plan.** Describe the enrollment plan for the next charter term (*e.g.*, grade level and projected student enrollment).

GRADE LEVELS	2013-14 enrollment	2014-15 enrollment	2015-16 enrollment	2016-17 enrollment	2017-18 enrollment
K	60	60	60	60	60
1	60	60	60	60	60
2	60	60	60	60	60
3	60	60	60	60	60
4	60	60	60	60	60
5	60	60	60	60	60
6	88	88	88	88	88
7	88	88	88	88	88
8	88	88	88	88	88
9	88	88	88	88	88
10	88	88	88	88	88
11	88	88	88	88	88
12	88	88	88	88	88
TOTAL	976	976	976	976	976

Anderson Preparatory Academy, depending upon school performance and client demand, may seek expansion of enrollment numbers through an amendment increasing the enrollment of grades K-5 from 60 to 88 matching the continuum for the current enrollment in grades 6-12 of 88 per grade. This would allow for an even flow of enrollment. Such an amendment submission would not occur unless the two factors mentioned were favorable to do so.

2. **Governance and Management.** Describe any anticipated changes to the governance and management of the school, including but not limited to board composition, committee structure, and/or amendments to by-laws.

As of the date of submission of this documentation there are no plans to alter or change the governance structure of the corporation, nor to change or amend the current Bylaws of the corporation.

3. **Transportation (if applicable).** Describe the plan for providing transportation to students to attend the school.

N/A

4. **Facility.** Describe the current status of the school's facility. Discuss any anticipated changes in facilities needs and/or location.

Currently, at the time of the submission of this documentation the current facility status is:

- 25<sup>th</sup> Street facility: Grades K-2, 36,000 sq. ft. school building on 10 acres w/ 17 classrooms, gymnasium, kitchen facility, offices, nurse's station; complete school facility
- 22<sup>nd</sup> Street facility: grades 3-5, 47,000 sq. ft., 7 acres, gymnasium, cafeteria, stage area, 19 classrooms, office area, nurse's area, complete school facility.
- 29<sup>th</sup> Street facility: 155,000 sq. ft., 22 acres, football stadium, 2 gymnasiums, cafeteria, multiple office areas, nurse's area, 50 classrooms, stage area,

There are no plans to change facility needs or locations.