

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 15, 2016

TO: Members of the State Board of Education

FROM: Brett Barley, Executive Director of the Nevada Achievement School District (NV ASD)

RE: School Recommendations for Nevada ASD 2017 Conversion Eligibility

This MEMO outlines the approach that the Nevada Achievement School District used to inform its recommendation of nine (9) schools to be considered by the Nevada State Board of Education for eligibility to convert to an Achievement School for the 2017-18 school year. This number is equal to 26% of the total list of the 34 eligible schools. Upon receipt of this MEMO and the accompanying recommendations, the Nevada State Board of Education will consider the proposal and on December 15th, return to the Nevada Achievement School District a list to compose no less than 50% of the schools recommended to be considered for 2017 conversion to an Achievement School.

To formulate its recommendations, the Nevada Achievement School District tiered all schools identified as eligible through the State’s *Rising Star School* list based on five (5) factors: Proficiency, Growth, Equity, Star Ratings and Other Indicators. In addition, the NV ASD considered Community Input and explored a set of considerations to provide additional context.

The recommendations followed the pattern below:

- Schools that chose to participate in the NV ASD process.
- Schools that were prioritized were identified as Tier 1 *and* in the bottom 5th percentile in Math or Reading in 2016 *and* did not demonstrate positive progress in prior years.
- While using current interventions as a strong consideration, schools receiving intervention but also meeting the above criteria were identified. Those schools are identified gray shading.
- Schools that met the criteria, however, had a consideration that would prevent them from being a successful partnership in 2017, will be offered the opportunity to enter into an MOU that will align to the NV ASD exit criteria, those schools are identified with an “*”.

OPT-IN SCHOOL:

Sponsor	School Name	Rationale
Clark	Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy	The Board of Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy has elected to opt-in to the Nevada Achievement School District community engagement process to consider a partnership with a qualified operator.

NV ASD RECOMMENDED SCHOOLS:

District	School Name	Tier	Rationale
Clark	Brinley MS	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math 2016; bottom 10th percentile for two consecutive years in Reading • Survey by zip code shows that 47% families in that geographic area see need for major improvements in academic supports and curriculum
Clark	Cambeiro ES	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including proficiency and growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Reading in 2016; bottom 10th percentile in both subjects since 2011-12 SY • Survey by zip code shows that 58% of families in that geographic area believe schools need major improvements in student safety
Clark	Craig ES	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Math and 6th percentile in Reading in 2016 • Bottom 10th percentile in both content areas over the past 5 testing years
Clark	Jerome Mack MS	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including proficiency and growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Math in 2016 • Bottom 10th percentile across subgroups in Reading and Math, with inconsistent prior performance
Clark	Von Tobel MS	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math in 2016; bottom 10th percentile 3/5 testing years for at least one subject
Clark	Orr MS	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Math; bottom 10th percentile in both subjects 2/5 testing years • Consistent trend downward since 2011-12 SY • Survey by zip code shows that 65% of families in that geographic area believe see need for major improvements in parent communication
Clark	Bailey MS	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including proficiency & growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Reading; bottom 10th percentile for the past 5 testing years in Reading and in the bottom 10th percentile in Math for the past two testing years • Survey by zip code shows that 52% of families in that geographic area believe that schools need major improvements in community engagement • <i>Currently has local intervention in place since 2014, but shows need for dramatic improvement</i>
Clark	Fitzgerald ES	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including proficiency & growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Reading; bottom 5th percentile in Reading and bottom 10th in Math for the last 5 testing years • Below 35% growth for the last two consecutive years • <i>Currently has local intervention in place, but shows need for dramatic improvement</i>
Clark	Kelly ES	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority in multiple factors including proficiency & growth • Bottom 5th percentile in Reading; bottom 1st percentile for two consecutive testing years • Equity indicator of subgroup for IEP is in the 1st percentile for both subjects • Survey by zip code shows that 45% of families in that geographic area believe schools need major improvements or complete overhaul • <i>Currently has local intervention in place, but shows need for dramatic improvement</i>

SCHOOLS CONSIDERED FOR A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU):

District	School Name	Tier	Rationale
Clark	West Preparatory Academy MS*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including proficiency and growth. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math for 2016; Bottom 10th percentile since 2010-11 in both subjects. Survey by zip code shows that 45% of families in that geographic area believe schools need major improvements or complete overhaul School excluded from recommendation due to unique configuration.
Elko	Owyhee ES*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including proficiency and growth. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math in 2016; bottom 10th percentile since 2010-11 in both subjects. School excluded due to Operator Supply.
Elko	Owyhee HS*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including proficiency and growth. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math in 2016; Bottom 10th percentile since 2011-12. School excluded due to Operator Supply.
Elko	West Wendover ES*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including proficiency and growth. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math in 2016; Bottom 10th percentile since 2010-11. School excluded due to Operator Supply.
Elko	West Wendover Junior HS*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including growth. Bottom 5th percentile in Math in 2016; inconsistent proficiency results in the past five years. School excluded due to Operator Supply.
Mineral	Hawthorne Junior High School*		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including proficiency and growth. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math in 2016; inconsistent proficiency results in the past five years. School excluded due to Operator Supply.
Mineral	Schurz ES*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including proficiency. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading & Math in 2016; Bottom 10th percentile for all years where students were tested. School excluded due to Operator Supply.
Washoe	Desert Heights ES*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including growth. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading in 2016; Bottom 10th percentile in Reading for the past two tested years. School excluded due to Operator Supply.
Washoe	Natchez ES*	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High priority in multiple factors including proficiency. Bottom 5th percentile in Reading in 2016; inconsistent results over the past five years. School excluded due to Operator Supply.

Schools that were excluded from 2017 conversion eligibility recommendations for an identified consideration may still be considered for recommendation in future years if they do not enter into an MOU or through the MOU fail to meet the agreed upon targets.

A specific call for Operators and Transformation Teams to address limitations with supply of operators to serve all kids across the State, will be prioritized for the 2018 NV ASD process.

Below are details on each of the factors that informed the recommendation.

APPROACH TO RECOMMENDATIONS:

Framing Questions	Does the school’s performance both currently and previously demonstrate it could benefit from a whole-school intervention?
Tier Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: If a school is high priority for several indicators, including Proficiency and/or Growth then the school is Tier 1. • Tier 2: If a school is high priority for some indicators, including either Proficiency or Growth then the school is Tier 2. • Tier 3: If a school is high priority for few or no indicators, and medium or low priority for Proficiency and Growth then the school is Tier 3.

PROFICIENCY:

The percentage of students who are able demonstrate grade level knowledge and skills on a nationally-normed assessment.

Framing Questions	How is the School doing now? How did the school do in previous years?
Tier Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: If the school is in the bottom 10th percentile now AND has either consistently been in the bottom 10th percentile OR trended downwards, then the school is Tier 1 for Proficiency. • Tier 2: If the school is in the bottom 10th percentile now AND has previously been mixed OR is not in the bottom 10th percentile but is trending down, then it is a Tier 2 for Proficiency. • Tier 3: If the school is no longer in the bottom 10th percentile AND is stable or trending up, then it is a Tier 3 for Proficiency.

GROWTH (Elementary & Middle Schools):

Using the Average Growth Percentile (AGP), the percentage of students who are on track to be proficient in three (3) years.

Framing Question	How were students growing in the two most recently available years of growth data (2013 & 2014)?		
Tier Rationale	The matrix below is a quick reference to apply subgroup thresholds for growth and the impact of a trend. Each Tier is also defined below.		
	Upward Trend	Mixed Trend	Downward Trend
Above 35% AGP	Tier 3	Tier 3	Tier 2
Below 35% AGP	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: If the school is most recently less than 35% in at least one subject AND trending down OR consistently has an AGP less than 35% in at least one subject, then the school is Tier 1. • Tier 2: If the school is at or below the 35% in AGP in at least one subject AND shows no trend or mixed trend, then the school is Tier 2. • Tier 3: If the school is most recently above 35% in both subjects in AND is has either a mixed or upward trend, then the school is Tier 2. 		

GROWTH (High Schools):

Using the Median Growth Percentile (MGP) to define the summary of student growth percentiles where the student growth percentile (SGP) is a measure of student achievement over time compared to a similar group of students.

Framing Question	How were students growing in the two most recently available years of growth data (2013 & 2014)?		
Tier Rationale	The matrix below is a quick reference to apply subgroup thresholds for growth and the impact of a trend. Each Tier is also defined below.		
	Upward Trend	Mixed Trend	Downward Trend
Above 35 MGP	Tier 3	Tier 3	Tier 2
Below 35 MGP	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1: If the school has most recently had an MGP of 35 in at least one subject AND is trending down OR consistently had an MGP of 35 or less than then the school is Tier 1. Tier 2: If the school is at or below the 35 MGP in at least one subject AND shows no trend or mixed trend, then the school is Tier 2. Tier 3: If the school has most recently had an MGP of 35 in both subjects AND is has either a mixed or upward trend, then the school is Tier 3. 		

EQUITY:

The percentage of students who are designated as a student with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or an English Language Learner (ELL) who are able demonstrate grade level knowledge and skills on a nationally-normed assessment. **Notes:** 1) Each subgroup will be tiered independently 2) Given only five (5) schools on the list have an FRL population below 50%, we are looking at subgroup data for IEP and ELL; FRL proficiency will be reported.

Framing Question	How is the school serving all kids?		
Tier Rationale	The matrix below is a quick reference to apply subgroup thresholds for equity and the impact of a trend. Each Tier is also defined below.		
	Upward Trend	Mixed Trend	Downward Trend
Above 10th Percentile	Tier 3	Tier 3	Tier 2
Below 10th Percentile	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1: If the school is in the bottom 10th percentile in at least one subject currently AND has either consistently been in the bottom 10th percentile OR trended downwards, then the school is Tier 1 for the subgroup. Tier 2: If the school is at or below the bottom 10th percentile in at least one subject AND shows no trend or mixed trend, then the school is Tier 2 for the subgroup. Tier 3: If the school has most recently been above the 10th percentile in both subjects AND is trending upward then the school is Tier 3 for the subgroup. 		

Note: For measures of Growth and Equity we identify a school as making progress if they can demonstrate similar progress across multiple content areas, as this is a requirement for systemic transformation. The use of a more stringent filter for these measures is because they are leading indicators towards making absolute gains.

STAR RATINGS:

The indicator for the most recently available school rating, an indication of a school’s comprehensive performance.

Note: A five (5) point change is used to indicate a trend.

Framing Question	How has the school been rated previously?
Tier Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: If the school is one star OR rated two stars or lower with a downward trend it is Tier 1 for rating. • Tier 2: If the school is two-star with no change or mixed results OR is a three star trending downward, it is a Tier 2 for rating. • Tier 3: If the school is two-star or above OR are trending upward, is Tier 3 for rating.

OTHER INDICATORS:

Those factors that impact a student’s experience and rate of success. **Note:** State averages for 2015-16 in Average Daily Attendance was 95%; incidents that led to suspension or expulsion was 3.76. Teacher vacancy data is based on current (2016-17) information provided at State Board Meeting on November 10, 2016; that current average per school is 3.3.

Framing Questions	How many students are coming to school? How many incidents have led to a serious consequence (suspension or expulsion)? What is a student’s consistent classroom experience? How have students done in successfully completing credit requirements?			
Tier Rationale	<i>Average Daily Attendance (most recent year)</i>	<i>Incidents that led to Suspension or Expulsion</i>	<i>Number of vacancies in licensed positions.</i>	<i>Graduation Rate (High Schools Only)</i>
<i>Tier 1</i>	< 92%	≥ 9	> 6.6	Trending down or mixed trend
<i>Tier 2</i>	92-95%	5-8	3.3-6.6	Mixed and trending up
<i>Tier 3</i>	95%+	0-4	< 3.3	Trending up

COMMUNITY INFORMATION:

Based on information collected from a survey across multiple methodologies (online, paper, phone), information was collected on parent understanding and impressions of schools. This information was collected by zip code and therefore not directly linked to a specific campus. The information will be provided as context, including the following:

- % of families by zip code that note the degree of improvement that their school needs (None, Minor, Major, Overhaul)
- The school program element that the greatest % of parents identified as mattering most for their child’s education
- The school program element that the greatest % of parents identified as in need of the most improvement

CONSIDERATIONS:

The following items are considered in making recommendations for 2017 NV ASD conversion eligibility, in addition to the quantitative information that is shared:

Framing Questions	Is the school currently receiving a State or Local intervention?
	Has the school previously received a State of Local Intervention?
	Are there available qualified NV ASD Operators or Transformation Teams to allow for an opportunity for pairing?
	Are there any other extenuating circumstances that would prevent the school from being a successful match in this NV ASD cycle?
Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>If the school is currently receiving or has previously received an intervention, and is Tier 3, then the school may not be the best match for a 2017 NV ASD partnership.</i>• <i>If the school is currently receiving or has previously received an intervention and is Tier 1 or 2, then the school may be recommended for 2017 conversion eligibility.</i>• <i>If there is not a qualified NV ASD Operator or Transformation Team available to serve the students, then the school may not be considered for 2017 conversion eligibility but, if the school does not improve, it may be considered in future years.</i>• <i>If the school has or is facing an extenuating circumstance that could potentially impact the success of a NV ASD partnership, regardless of Tier, then the school may not be considered for 2017 conversion eligibility, but, if the school does not improve, it may be considered in future years.</i>

CC: Steve Canavero, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada Department of Education

Glossary of Terms:

American College Test (ACT): standardized college readiness assessment for high school achievement and college admissions.

Average Daily Attendance (ADA): This is the average percentage of student attendance for the school year.

Average Growth Percentile (AGP): describes the amount of growth needed to remain or become proficient on the State assessments in three years.

English Language Learner (ELL): students who have limited proficiency with the English language as measured by language assessment tools.

Formative Assessment: a range of formal and informal assessment procedures conducted by teachers during the learning process in order to modify teaching and learning activities to improve student achievement.

Graduation Rate: the rate at which 9th graders graduate by the end of the 12th grade.

Individualized Education Program (IEP): a written document that's developed for each public school child who is eligible for special education. It is a legal document that articulates a student's learning needs and aligned goals and plan to reach them.

Median Growth Percentile (MGP): a summary of Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) for a school or group. SGP is a measure of student achievement over time that compares the achievement of similar groups of students from one test administration to the next. In this way, SGP is a measure of relative student achievement.

Percentile: the percentage of value in its frequency distribution that are equal to or lower than it. For example, If you are 80th percentile in height that means you are taller than 80 out of 100 people your age and gender; or, if you are in the 2nd percentile on a Science test than you performed better than 2 out of 100 people who took the same test.

Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC): a common-core aligned, computer adaptive assessment administered once a year in grades three (3) through eight (8) used to measure student achievement and growth in English and Math. Also known as a "high stakes" assessment.

Subgroup: a group that share a similar characteristic and are also a part of a larger group.

Trend: two consecutive years of movement in either upward or downward.

Vacancy: the percent of licensed positions that are not filled with a permanent employee.

Additional terminology that is specific to Nevada's approach to assessing student performance can be found [here](#).