

Summary of SWOT Analysis Feedback

(Note: Although every effort was made to interpret the feedback, some responses were not legible)

Strengths:

- ELP now counts across the board
- Multiple measures
- Science assessment included
- School climate
- Consistency with star rating makes it easier for stakeholders to understand
- Thoughts of AAC or basic principles already laid out
- Acceptance of focusing on growth, also equity
- Development of a robust system/direction in support of Nevada's system
- Focus on growth as an indicator
- Huge variety of participants
- Already trying to address climate/culture as result of prior advisory group work
- Parents, teachers, schools and state want the best for NV students
- We can start over and create something that works for all NV students
- Clear
- Multiple measures of success
- ACT – progress
- The process of our system
- Multiple measures or accountability from all school districts and charter schools
- The Star System is easy to understand
- There is a clear set of policies and practices that will be used to measure how Nevada's schools are performing and a clear expectation of the progress that schools must make with ALL groups of students. Required indicators will be weighted appropriately and used to rate schools on academic achievement, graduation rates, English-language proficiency, and school climate. Accountability measures will encompass the realities of Nevada's required future workforce.
- Strategies for improvement are in place for schools needing assistance as prescribed
- Additional support for professional development is realized
- Equity is the basis of all decision making- 95% of all students are assessed
- Stake holder input/process well rounded picture of each institution
- Transparency of school performance to all stakeholders (SS, TD, parents etc.)
- Growth (V. Cot)

Weaknesses:

- Lack of a strong research base on in a system truly identified school quality accurately
- 5th year grad rate
- SPED students dropouts
- ESSA is the 50% attendance
- Job skills not included for students interested in career
- Work credits not applied to CCR indicators

- AAC had different set of mandates, not ESSA
- Time
- ACT not broad enough for all students
- Too easy to just use old system with small tweaks
- Many priorities among many stakeholders
- Money can drive decisions not always best
- Damage morale
- Not properly funded
- Attainable?
- Gaps in skills across grade levels
- How will we measure whether a student has equal access to a well-rounded education? How will it be defined in Nevada?
- The term “non-academic” is nebulous and could lead to misunderstandings among Nevada’s districts. Some districts may not realize that music and arts, for example, have been listed as two of the seventeen subjects defined within the well-rounded education provision within the ESSA. Districts need to realize that federal resources are available to expend these types of programs thus benefitting additional students.
- Once accountability measures are set, is it fixed- that is, no opportunity for refinement?
- How will time frames be established for schools to report achievement?
- Everybody will not be happy no matter what
- Timeliness of data

Opportunities:

- Can we continue to teach and improve the system as new info/research indicates that we should?
- Will we use an appropriate N-size (10 or fewer) to ensure the most student groups are identified?
- Having a system that can accurately identify schools that should be identified for comprehensive or targeted support
- Credit sufficiency needs to account for students enrolled for the year. Currently, schools held accountable for students entering at any point in time
- ESSA is reset
- Broaden participation mandated by ESSA, than original AAC group
- Great opportunity to identify the accountability work to align ESSA
- Voice can be heard
- Changed emphasis of ESSA from federal to state level
- Can improve school achievement
- Reshape system into something functional now
- Fresh start to communicate with schools and communities
- Graduation rate adjustments
- Communicate what accountability is
- New aggressive yet achievable goals can be set that truly reflect the values and needs of ALL of Nevada’s students.

- Indicators can be expanded to add to the “picture” of school performance based upon equity in providing students with a well-rounded education including a number of subjects. This would provide schools with the opportunity to expand those programs to engage more students.
- Needs assessments can be performed to help establish goals to meet the newly established targets with federal dollars being used to narrow the gaps.
- Start fresh; communicate plan to all involved get more buy in
- Adjust grad rates- more equitable- give credit for 5th year grad rate
- Make more actionable for teachers
- ACT work keys
- Align performance standards to NVACS so system is aligned across schools, staff, community

Threats:

- Groups or individuals that may find errors or inadequacy in the system
- Not identifying some sub groups, thus potentially leaving them behind
- Schools continue
- 67% grad rate difficult for at-risk populations, mostly credit deficient students and schools are “dumping” credit deficient students. The new accountability system needs to accommodate or provide a framework to prevent punitive system for students serving at risk
- Fragments/siloed thinking, accountability should be connected and it’s essential connected to other subgroups
- Maintaining engagement will be a challenge
- Culture of embracing Nevada’s failures
- Continual change environment making establishing a system difficult
- Time and money short
- Strings attached
- Can damage motivation
- Inequitable
- Not everyone will be pleased. Can’t make everyone happy
- Definitions must be clearly stated. For example, what courses will be considered part of a well-rounded education and how can ALL Nevada’s students truly be provided with EQUAL ACCESS? Where will this be articulated? How can Nevada ensure that well-rounded subjects are not left up to individual building principals to “interpret” what this means? Some may skirt the intention of this provision. For example, Nevada could miss out on funding allocations which may be provided (via Title IV) for the development of programs in music and the arts thus enhancing this opportunity to become engaged in these types of experiences which lead to a higher quality school climate.
- What appropriate interventions will be provided for our lowest performing schools? How will financial resources limit what can really be accomplished and even impact other initiatives?
- The people not happy= squeaky wheel
- Norming with magnet type schools- not equitable selective process to get in
- Confusing or unclear to parents