

## **A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS:**

Please find attached the lists, by LEA, of each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school in the State with the required data provided for each Tier I and Tier II school (Attachment A). Nevada chose not to exercise the option of expanding the schools identified in its lists of Tiers provided through the interim final requirements released in January 2010.

The following is the process that the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) used to develop its definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”:

### **First Criteria For Identification:**

The proficiency criterion was based upon the percent proficient, or the percent of the tested student body that scored in the proficient range in math and English/Language Arts (ELA) in 2008-09 on the State’s CRTs. For K-8 schools, this included students in grades 3-8. For high schools, this included students' best scores on High School Proficiency Examination results in their high school career through the spring of their 11th-grade year. Proficiency was determined for math and ELA for each school. Schools were assigned two ranks on the bases of math percent proficient and ELA percent proficient, respectively. For this criterion, the K-8 schools and high schools were ranked independently due to differences in student participation requirements and opportunities to test (i.e., high school retests).

### **Second Criteria For Identification:**

Growth was based upon whether schools had made progress on those assessments. Growth was determined as the change in a school’s percent proficient in math and ELA across the most recent four-year period for each school. For example, a school’s math and ELA changes in percent proficient from 2005-06 to 2006-07, from 2006-07 to 2007-08, and from 2007-08 to 2008-09 were computed. These changes were summed to determine each school's total growth over the four-year period. Schools were assigned two ranks on the bases of math growth and ELA growth, respectively. For this criterion, the K-8 schools and high schools were ranked independently due to differences in student participation requirements and opportunities to test (i.e., high school retests).

### **Combination of Criteria For Identification:**

A total of four ranks (i.e., math proficiency, ELA proficiency, math growth, ELA growth, respectively) were computed for each school. The ranks were summed to derive a total rank value for each school; each of the four ranks was weighted equally.

Including all schools (i.e., K-8 and High School) in the final ranking, the total rank values were used to identify the lowest five percent of schools.

### **Identification of Tiered Lists of Schools:**

Schools were then sorted for being Title I eligible and served, and for being identified as In Need of Improvement (INOI) at any level (school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring). The lowest five percent of the resulting list of 133 schools (or seven schools) were then identified as the basis of the Tier I list. To this Tier I list were added four Title I eligible and served high schools INOI with graduation rates of less than 60% over the past four years, resulting in a total of eleven Title I eligible and served schools identified as Tier I. The remaining 122 Title I eligible and served INOI schools comprise the Tier III list.

Remaining schools were then sorted for being Title I eligible and not served, for being identified as INOI, and for being secondary schools. (Under Nevada statute both middle and high schools are considered secondary schools.) There are 15 schools in Nevada that meet the criteria. Five schools then formed the basis of the Tier II list (five schools is greater than five percent of fifteen). To this Tier II list were added three Title I eligible and not served high schools INOI with graduation rates of less than 60% over the past four years, resulting in a total of eight Title I eligible and not served secondary schools identified as Tier II.