

AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- I. Public Education Commission Meeting Date: January 13, 2017
- II. Item Title: Vote on Charter School Amendment –Monte Del Sol Charter School-Food Service Change
- III. Executive Summary and Proposed Motions:

Request and Rationale

Monte Del Sol Charter School requests to amend the food service terms of its contract. The school's contract currently states that the school:

will provide free and reduced lunch. Food services shall be provided in a manner that is in compliance with applicable laws regarding public school food programs.

The school is requesting to change the contract to state:

will provide the following food services:_____ food services shall be provided in a manner that is in compliance with applicable federal and state laws regarding public school food programs.

The school states the following rationale for its request:

Owing to budget pressures Monte del Sol Charter School is requesting an amendment to our contract that will allow us to cease serving Free and Reduced school lunches.

Through legislative action during the special session, we suffered a reduction in our SEG of \$43,000 and additional transportation cost reductions of over \$20,000 and reductions in instructional materials.

We had to enter a Reduction in Force to lay off three staff members in order to avoid being over budget by year end.

Monte del Sol began serving Free and Reduced lunches in 2010, 10 years after its founding. Each year the school has had to subsidize the cost of the program by almost \$40,000. This year we cannot afford to do so.

School History

Monte del Sol's Charter was initially granted for five years in December 1999 by Santa Fe Public Schools. The School opened in August 2000 with 121 students enrolled in seventh and eighth grades, and every year until 2005 then a new 7th grade of 60 students has entered the School.


By the 2004-2005 school year, the School had a full complement of 360 students in grades 7 through 12. The Class of 2005 was the first graduating class. Monte del Sol's Charter was renewed in 2004 and again in 2009 for a further five years by the Santa Fe School District.

The Public Education Commission renewed the school as a state authorized charter school for a 5 year term starting in 2015. The school is authorized to serve grades 7-12 and its enrollment cap is 360. According to the 2017 80 Day STARS report, the school had 350 students enrolled in December 2016.


School Performance

Monte Del Sol Charter School has received the following school grades:


In 2013-14 the school grade was a B. In 2014-2015 the school grade was a D. In 2015-16 the school grade was a D.



The tables below show a comparison of the school's state assessment proficiency data to the statewide data for the same grade levels and the Santa Fe Public Schools data for the same grade levels. This comparison for 2015 indicates that the school scored a lower proficiency in math than the statewide and Santa Fe Public Schools' proficiency rates. The school's reading proficiency rate was also lower than the statewide, but equivalent to Santa Fe Public Schools' proficiency rates, in math.



The 2016 state assessment performance data demonstrate a slight improvement in math from the prior year, but a slight decline in reading. The table below shows a comparison of the school's state assessment proficiency data to the statewide data for the same grade levels and the Santa Fe Public Schools data for the same grade levels. This comparison for 2016 indicates that the school scored a lower proficiency rate as compared to the statewide and Santa Fe Public Schools' proficiency rates in both math and reading.




School Enrollment and Demographics Data


The 80 day enrollment count at Monte Del Sol Charter School was 350 students for the 2016-2017 school year and 360 students for the 2015-2016 school year. This demonstrates a decrease in total enrollment by 10 students.

An evaluation of the students enrolled at the end of FY 2015 as compared to enrollment count at the end of the first full week of the 2015-2016 school year shows a re-enrollment rate of approximately 86%.

Student demographics and subgroup enrollment for Monte Del Sol Charter School for the 2016-17 40 day reporting, as compared to Santa Fe Public School's data is provided below. The STARS data indicates the school has a slightly higher percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students and students with disabilities enrolled than does Santa Fe Public Schools. Monte Del Sol Charter School has a slightly lower percentage of English Learners than does Santa Fe Public Schools.



The school has a slightly higher percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander and Caucasian student and a slightly lower population of Hispanic students than does Santa Fe Public Schools.



Additional Analysis

The school has provided several documents in support of its request. It has included a copy of the notification to families, which was sent on

December 16, 2017 in both English and Spanish. The letter notes that the school will “stop serving Free and Reduced Lunches in January.” In that letter, the school also notes that it will try to “assist those for whom this will be difficult” and that it will “be exploring if [the school] can resume the Free and Reduced Program next year.”

The school has also included the communications between it and the food service provider in which it cancelled the service contract. The communication notes that the provider “agrees to cancel the contract in good standing relationship with Monte del Sol.”

Lastly, the school provided a narrative. In that narrative, the school explains the reason for the cancellation of the program. The school notes that it has a decrease in its annual budget at the beginning of the year due to “fewer Special Education students and shifting Training and Experience numbers.” The school further explains its financial challenges noting it “had to enter a Reduction in Force to lay off three staff members in order to avoid being over budget by year end.” The school notes that the staffing reductions include: “a .5 counselor; an attendance coordinator/college counselor and; .5 Assistant Director of Mentorship. The school recognizes the change may cause “some families hardships” but it says it will seek to mitigate those challenges. It further indicated it is currently the “only charter high school (out of three) in Santa Fe to offer free and reduced lunches.” In an email to CSD the school noted it “does not anticipate significant attrition” based on this move because “there are no other high school charter schools in Santa Fe.”

The school’s governing body has not voted on the amendment request, but will do so on January 10th, prior to the PEC’s consideration of this request.

Proposed Motions

- **Move** to deny the amendment request presented by Monte Del Sol Charter School requesting to amend the food service terms of its contract because [PEC TO PROVIDE RATIONALE].
- **Move** to approve the amendment request presented by Monte Del Sol Charter School requesting to amend the food service terms of its contract with the condition that the school provide the approved governing body minutes to the CSD.

STATE CHARTER SCHOOL CHANGE/AMENDMENT REQUEST FORM

This Request Form **MUST** include a copy of the governing body minutes from the meeting at which the amendment was approved.

Please complete and submit this form to: **Attorney for the Public Education Commission**, New Mexico Attorney General's Office, P.O. Box 1508, Santa Fe, NM 87504

And

Amendment Request, Public Education Department, Charter Schools Division, Room 301, 300 Don Gaspar, Santa Fe, NM 87501, charter.schools@state.nm.us

Name of State-Chartered School: Monte del Sol Charter School

Date submitted: 1/3/2017 Contact Name: Robert Jessen

E-mail arjessen@montedelsol.org

Current Charter Application or Contract Section and Page	Current Charter Statement(s)	Proposed Revision/Amendment Statement(s)	Rationale for Revision/Amendment	Date of Governing Body Approval
(xvi) Food Service, page 389	<p>AND/OR</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will provide free and reduced lunch. Food services shall be provided in a manner that is in compliance with applicable laws regarding public school food programs.</p>	<p>AND/OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> will provide free and reduced lunch. Food services shall be provided in a manner that is in compliance with applicable laws regarding public school food programs.</p>	<p>-Owing to budget pressures Monte del Sol Charter School is requesting an amendment to our contract that will allow us to cease serving Free and Reduced school lunches.</p> <p>-Through legislative action during the special session, we suffered a reduction in our SEG of \$43,000 and additional transportation cost reductions of over \$20,000 and reductions in instructional materials.</p> <p>-We had to enter a Reduction in Force to lay off three staff members in order to avoid being over budget by year end.</p> <p>-Monte del Sol began serving Free and Reduced lunches in 2010, 10 years after its founding. Each year the school has had to subsidize the cost of the program by almost</p>	1/10/2017

STATE CHARTER SCHOOL CHANGE/AMENDMENT REQUEST FORM

This Request Form **MUST** include a copy of the governing body minutes from the meeting at which the amendment was approved.

			\$40,000. This year we cannot afford to do so.	
--	--	--	--	--

Original Signature of Governing Council President or Designee: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name of Governing Council President or Designee: _____Cassandra Reid_____

Public Education Commission use only

Public Education Commission Chair: _____ Date: _____

☐ APPROVED

☐ DENIED

From: arjessen@montedelisol.org
Subject: Change in School Lunch Program
Date: December 16, 2016 at 10:27 AM
To: robert@jessen.org



Hello families of Monte del Sol,

Owing to the state's reduction of funds to schools as part of its solution of its budget shortfall, we are going to have to stop serving Free and Reduced Lunches in January.

We receive \$3.00 from the federal government for each free lunch that we serve. However, it costs more to serve that lunch. For the last several years the school has been able to pay the difference, but this year we can not.

We will still be serving lunches, and with the service that we are exploring we expect the quality to go up.

However, each student will have to pay. We are trying to come up with creative ideas to assist those for whom this will be difficult. If any of you have some good ideas, please let me know.

We will also be exploring if we can resume the Free and Reduced Program next year.

On a happier note, I wish everyone happy holidays with family and friends! Hug your loved ones and save a pat on the back for all others!

Hola familias de Monte del Sol,

Debido a la reducción del estado de los fondos a las escuelas como parte de su solución de su déficit presupuestario, vamos a tener que dejar de servir almuerzos gratuitos y reducidos en enero.


Recibimos \$ 3.00 del gobierno federal por cada almuerzo gratis que servimos. Sin embargo, cuesta más servir ese almuerzo. Durante los últimos años la escuela ha sido capaz de pagar la diferencia, pero este año no podemos.

Seguiremos sirviendo comidas, y con el servicio que estamos explorando esperamos que la calidad suba.

Sin embargo, cada estudiante tendrá que pagar. Estamos tratando de encontrar ideas creativas para ayudar a aquellos a quienes esto será difícil. Si alguno de ustedes tiene algunas buenas ideas, por favor hágamelo saber.

También estaremos explorando si podemos reanudar el Programa Libre y Reducido el próximo año.

En una nota más feliz, deseo a todos buenas fiestas con la familia y amigos! Abrazar a sus seres queridos y guardar una palmadita en la espalda para todos los demás!

From: Tami Clark (A) Tami@aptability.net 
Subject: Cancellation Letter for Food Service Contract
Date: December 15, 2016 at 12:49 PM
To: Max Luft (Max.I@nmaces.org) Max.I@nmaces.org
Cc: John McCarthy JohnM@canteen-nm.com, Griego, Felix, PED Felix.Griego@state.nm.us, arjessen@montedelsol.org



Hi Max,
Monte del Sol Charter School is cancelling the food service contract held with Canteen through ACES. Please find the attached cancellation letter. Please feel free to contact Robert or myself with any questions. Thank you.

Kind Regards,

Tami Clark
Business Manager
tami@aptability.net
505-252-0424

From: Arthur Robert Jessen [<mailto:arjessen@montedelsol.org>]
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2016 12:42 PM
To: Tami Clark (A) <Tami@aptability.net>
Subject: Fwd: Scanned image from MX-M503N

Begin forwarded message:

From: scans@montedelsol.org <scans@montedelsol.org>
Subject: Scanned image from MX-M503N
Date: December 15, 2016 at 12:58:31 PM MST
To: rjessen@montedelsol.org
Reply-To: <rjessen@montedelsol.org>

Reply to: Robert Jessen <rjessen@montedelsol.org>
Device Name: MDS
Device Model: MX-M503N
Location: Lounge

File Format: PDF MMR(G4)
Resolution: 200dpi x 200dpi

Attached file is scanned image in PDF format.
Use Acrobat(R)Reader(R) or Adobe(R)Reader(R) of Adobe Systems Incorporated to view the document.
Adobe(R)Reader(R) can be downloaded from the following URL:
Adobe, the Adobe logo, Acrobat, the Adobe PDF logo, and Reader are registered trademarks or trademarks of Adobe Systems Incorporated in the

United States and other countries.

<http://www.adobe.com/>



MONTES DEL SOL CHARTER SCHOOL, 4157 WALKING RAIN RD. Santa Fe, NM 87507

December 14, 2016

ACES - Association of Charter School Education Services
Attn: Max Luft
PO Box 4168
Santa Fe, NM 87502

Dear Max,

Please accept this notice as cancellation of Food Service Contract with Canteen, through ACES. Monte del Sol has budgeted \$10,000 to supplement the NSLP food service program at the school for the 2016-17 school year.

On September 28, 2017, Monte del Sol Charter School met with Canteen to discuss and plan for additional ways to decrease the cost of the food service program at the school. Canteen's staff worked to reduce the cost diligently but overall the food service program is still running a deficit in which the school is not financially able to support using operational funds. In addition, the SEG will be decreased by 1.5% and, the school has been required to supplement Transportation cost, and Instructional Materials costs with operational funds to meet the Legislative mandate from second special session (SB-9).

Considering these developments Monte del Sol will end their participation in the National School Lunch Program effective December 31, 2016. Canteen has agreed to service the school through December 15, 2016 and agrees to cancel the contract in good standing relationship with Monte del Sol.

Canteen will complete an exit inventory and retrieve all unbroken inventory and complete a final bill submitted through ACES to Monte del Sol for payment.

Please contact me, Head Learner, Robert Jessen, arjessen@montedelisol.org or the Business Manager, Tami Clark, tami@aptability.net if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Robert Jessen".

A. Robert Jessen
Head Learner

CC: John McCarthy, Canteen
Felix Griego, PED Student Nutrition Dept

Monte del Sol Charter School

January 3, 2017

Memo: amendment of contract to drop Free and Reduced school lunches

To: Charter School Division/ Public Education Commission

From: A. Robert Jessen, Head Learner, Monte del Sol Charter School

Owing to budget pressures Monte del Sol Charter School is requesting an amendment to our contract that will allow us to cease serving Free and Reduced school lunches.

These pressures started during the budget process for the 2016-17 school year, when we had a reduction of over \$200,000 to our budget even though our student enrollment was consistent. (The reduction was due mostly to fewer Special Education students and shifting Training and Experience numbers.)

We balanced the budget in part by planning on contracting with a food provider that would be able to economically meet the requirements for the school lunch program. However, that provider was not successful in the RFP process, which resulted in using Canteen as our food provider. As the email from September 28 shows, we were working with Canteen to keep their costs down. They were unable to do so and we exceeded what we had budgeted by over 50%.

Owing to legislative action during the special session, we suffered a reduction in our SEG of \$43,000 and additional transportation cost reductions of over \$20,000 and reductions in instructional materials.

We had to enter a Reduction in Force to lay off three staff members in order to avoid being over budget by year end.

Monte del Sol began serving Free and Reduced lunches in 2010, 10 years after its founding. Each year the school has had to subsidize the cost of the program by almost \$40,000. This year we cannot afford to do so.

We realize that this will cause some families hardships, and will seek to find ways to mitigate them. However, the school does not have the ability to continue. Currently, we are the only charter high school (out of three) in Santa Fe to offer free and reduced lunches.

We notified families via email on December 16, 2016, that we would no longer be able to maintain the program.

Owing to the financial exigencies, we have had to act fast to save money. We have reduced staffing in areas only outside the classroom: a .5 counselor; an attendance coordinator/ college counselor and; .5 Assistant Director of Mentorship. As a small school we are not able to cut further into classes, since many of them are single classes.

The Governing Board will have voted on 1/10, prior to the session of the PEC on 1/13/2017.

4157 Walking Rain Rd.
Santa Fe NM 87507



School Grade Report Card 2016

Certified

Final Grade

D

Monte Del Sol Charter School

















District: State Charters


Grade Range: 7 - 12

Code: 564001

This School 

Statewide C Benchmark 

Current Standing		Grade	School Points	Possible Points
How did students perform in the most recent school year? What percent of students are on grade level? Did students improve more or less than expected?	  12.5	F	5.86	30
School Growth				
Did the school as a whole improve student performance more or less than expected?	  5.8	F	2.28	10
Student Growth of Highest Performing Students				
Are the highest performing students in math and reading improving more or less than expected? The highest performing students are in the top three quarters (75%) of past performance of their school.	  3.6	D	2.13	10
Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students				
Are the lowest performing students in math and reading improving more or less than expected? The lowest performing students are in the bottom quarter (25%) of past performance in their school.	  7.7	F	3.34	10
Opportunity to Learn				
Do parents and students believe their school is a good place to learn? Is student attendance high?	  6.0	B	7.16	8
Graduation				
Are students graduating in four years? What percent of students are graduating in 4, 5, or 6 years? And is the school improving its graduation rate over time?	  12.8	C	12.97	17
College and Career Readiness				
What percent of students are participating in college preparation or career pathway programs while in high school? What percent are meeting expectations when presented with those opportunities?	  9.0	B	9.90	15
Bonus Points				
Does the school earn additional credit for reducing truancy, promoting extracurricular activities, and engaging parents and students?	  1.6		2.00	5



Final School Grade		Total Points
75.0 to < 100.0	A	45.64
65.0 to < 75.0	B	
50.0 to < 65.0	C	
35.0 to < 50.0	D	
0.0 to < 35.0	F	

Details of Each Grade Indicator

These next pages show the school's results divided into smaller groups to show how specific classes of students are doing. The information explains how a school compares to other schools and identifies groups within the school that are performing well or that need additional instructional support based on achievement. Points that the school earned on each of the indicators are provided in more detail and when summed will equal the totals on the first page summary.


Current Standing

Knowing how many students are proficient in a given year is a measure of the school's overall success. Single-year performance will vary with differing classes of students. Therefore, Current Standing uses up to 3 years of data to provide a more accurate picture of the school's achievement. Current Standing is augmented with Value-Added Modeling (VAM) by capturing the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Guide at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>.


	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Reading											
Proficient and Advanced (%)	22.8	33.6	12.7	26.5	-	19.5	50.0	-	17.3	2.3	<2.0
Proficient and Advanced (Pts)	1.71										
Value-Added Model (Pts)	0.72										
Math											
Proficient and Advanced (%)	8.7	9.7	7.7	12.3	-	5.2	40.0	-	5.9	<2.0	<2.0
Proficient and Advanced (Pts)	0.65										
Value-Added Model (Pts)	2.78										

3-Year Summary


Performance is considered on grade level when students score either Proficient or Advanced.



Reading (%)



Math (%)



School Growth

School growth compares the students enrolled in the current year to the same students from prior years. Unlike Current Standing, School Growth accounts for improvement of all students, not just those reaching proficiency.

Growth in proficiency is calculated with Value-Added Modeling (VAM), which accounts for the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Guide at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>.

	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Math</i>
Value-Added Score	-1.110	-0.460
Points Earned	0.67	1.61

School growth is expressed as a score that can be both negative and positive. When it is positive, the school performed better than was expected relative to its peers with the same size, mobility, and prior student performance.

Student Growth

Just like schools, individual student achievement is expected to improve over time. Student growth is shown as a value-added score (VAS) that accounts for all students in each group for up to 3 years. Student groups are further divided into highest and lowest performing subgroups. Every student's prior test scores are used to estimate how they should perform today.

- Above 0 means that the group, in general, scored higher than expected. This is an exciting finding when students are below the proficiency line, because they are closing the achievement gap and catching up to their higher-performing classmates.
- Near 0 means that the group scored about as expected compared to their academic peers. While some students may have performed better than anticipated (positive growth), they were balanced by students that did poorer (negative growth).
- Below 0 means that the group performed below expectations and students are losing ground when compared to their peers.

Details of student growth and value added scores are explained in PED's School Grading Technical Guide at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>. Note that separate analytic techniques are used for the school overall and for the subgroups.

	School Overall		Subgroup Analysis									Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
			Female	Male	White	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Am Indian	Econ Disadv			
Reading Growth													
Highest 75% (VAS)	-1.25		-0.24	-0.12	-0.09	-0.34	-0.19	-0.38	-0.99	-0.07	-0.08	-0.01	
Highest 75% (Pts)	0.53												
Lowest 25% (VAS)	-0.93		-0.07	-0.47	-0.32	-	-0.30	-1.28	0.35	-0.37	-0.49	-0.30	
Lowest 25% (Pts)	0.88												
Math Growth													
Highest 75% (VAS)	-0.47		0.23	0.00	0.03	0.16	0.11	0.31	1.01	0.13	0.08	0.50	
Highest 75% (Pts)	1.60												
Lowest 25% (VAS)	-0.02		0.04	-0.11	-0.53	0.22	-0.01	0.36	0.23	0.03	-0.30	0.01	
Lowest 25% (Pts)	2.46												

Opportunity to Learn (OTL)

The successful school invites students to be part of a thriving learning culture that uses proven teaching methods. A school's learning environment is reflected in a survey of classroom practices and in student attendance.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Attendance (Average)	96.0	96	96	94	98	96	99	95	96	94	98
Attendance (Points)	3.03										

Survey (Average)	37.2	Surveys consisted of 10 questions with answers from 0 (Never) to 5 (Always), yielding a maximum score of 50. A typical question includes "My teacher introduces a new topic by connecting to things I already know." Schools that scored higher demonstrated better classroom teaching practices.
Survey (Points)	4.13	
Count of Surveys (N)	684	

Graduation

Students are expected to graduate in 4 years. However, some students require longer and are captured in 5-year and 6-year rates. Similar to school and student growth, the expectation is that the school increase the percent of successful 4-year graduates over time. SAM (Supplemental Accountability Model) schools are a subset of schools that target returning dropouts or students with disabilities. These schools receive an additional rate that reflects their ability to graduate any student, not just cohort members, in a given year. Details of the federally approved graduation rules are in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website at: <http://ped.state.nm.us/Graduation/index.html>.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Cohort of 2015 - 4-Year Rate											
Cohort Graduation (%)	82.05	84.6	80.0	88.1	-	73.5	-	-	76.1	58.5	76.1
Non-Cohort Graduation (%)	-										
SAM Adjustment (Weighted %)				This school did not qualify to be a SAM school.							
Points Earned	6.56										
Cohort of 2014 - 5-Year Rate											
Graduation (%)	67.86	68.9	66.9	58.4	-	70.2	-	-	76.4	39.0	72.2
Points Earned	2.04										
Cohort of 2013 - 6-Year Rate											
Graduation (%)	69.55	71.6	66.4	68.1	-	67.4	-	-	66.7	39.7	-
Points Earned	1.39										
Growth in 4-Year Rates											
Growth takes into account three years of graduation rates.		Growth Index		.65							
		Points Earned		2.98							

College and Career Readiness (CCR)

High school students are expected to participate in at least one college or career readiness program. These activities include one of the following:

- 1) College entrance assessments (SAT, SAT Subject Test, PSAT, ACT, PLAN, Compass, ACT Aspire, or Accuplacer)
- 2) Evidence that the student can pass a college-level course (Advanced Placement, Dual Credit, or IB)
- 3) Eligibility for an industry recognized certification (Career Technical Education, SAM School Supplemental)

Points are given separately for students' participation and for their success. To be considered successful, students must meet established benchmarks. Details are in the School Grading Technical Guide on the PED website at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>.

CCR follows the Shared Accountability model used for cohort graduation rates. Cohorts are fully described in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website at <http://ped.state.nm.us/Graduation/index.html>.

		All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
			F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Participation (% of Cohort)		52.3	58.1	47.5	59.4	57.1	42.2	-	>98.0	58.7	12.8	63.7
Participation (Pts)		2.61										
Success (% of Participants)		72.9	82.5	63.4	81.7	>98.0	63.5	-	<2.0	67.7	65.1	50.0
Success (Pts)		7.29										
Percent of School's Cohort of 2015												
Participating in Each CCR Opportunity	ACT	7.8	10.0	6.0	7.5	<2.0	8.9	-	<2.0	7.7	4.5	6.0
	PLAN	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
	ASPIRE	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
	SAT	8.7	15.6	3.2	14.0	<2.0	3.9	-	<2.0	7.4	<2.0	8.0
	PSAT	17.0	25.8	9.9	25.4	<2.0	9.6	-	<2.0	12.5	<2.0	10.0
	AccuPlacer	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	2.5	-	<2.0	<2.0	2.4	<2.0
	Advanced Placement	34.9	38.9	31.6	38.4	57.1	27.0	-	>98.0	44.5	<2.0	47.8
	Dual Credit	19.3	10.7	26.2	22.3	57.1	14.1	-	<2.0	20.0	8.3	15.9
	International Baccalaureate	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
	Career Technical Education	3.4	7.1	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	6.0	-	<2.0	4.9	<2.0	8.0
	Compass	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
	SAT Subject Test	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
SAM School Supplemental		<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	

Bonus Points

While most schools provide a sampling of athletics, club participation opportunities, and parent meetings, a few schools stand out among the rest. These schools are recognized for their extraordinary dedication to keeping students invested in school and their efforts in empowering parents to engage actively in their child's education.

- ☐ Student and Parent Engagement
 ☐ Truancy Improvement
- ☐ Extracurricular Activities
 ☒ Other

Participation

Schools must include all of their enrolled students in the annual statewide assessment. If the percentage of students is less than 95%, the school's letter grade is reduced by one grade. Supplemental Accountability Model (SAM) schools and small schools with fewer than 100 students receive special consideration.

Reading (%) 97
Math (%) 97

Supplemental Information

Similar Schools While statewide comparisons are helpful, schools may want to see how they rank next to their peers that have similar students and settings. The figures below show how this school contrasts with other schools in the state that are most like it in student characteristics.

Schools are grouped into categories that have similar proportions of English language learners (ELL), students with disabilities (SWD), ethnicities, economically disadvantaged (ED), and mobile students. Different schools are in each category set. A composite score incorporates all categories into a general measure of at-risk students.

		School Rank											
		ELL		SWD		Ethnicity		ED		Mobility		Composite	
Students (% Tested)		18.3		14.4		72.8		67.4		4.4			
		Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total
Current Standing		30	(37)	33	(37)	32	(37)	32	(37)	29	(36)	31	(37)
School Growth		34	(37)	34	(37)	34	(37)	34	(37)	29	(36)	32	(37)
Student Growth, Highest 75%		33	(37)	35	(37)	34	(37)	34	(37)	31	(36)	33	(37)
Student Growth, Lowest 25%		23	(37)	29	(37)	25	(37)	22	(37)	24	(36)	25	(37)
Opportunity to Learn		21	(36)	23	(37)	22	(37)	26	(37)	25	(36)	19	(36)
Graduation		8	(36)	7	(37)	13	(37)	10	(37)	16	(36)	10	(36)
College and Career Readiness		22	(36)	29	(37)	33	(37)	32	(37)	29	(36)	23	(36)

End Notes

- 1 The Statewide C grade was established in the first year of A-F School Grading as the midpoint of all schools. It was fixed in 2011 as the framework for all future letter grades and is not recalculated each year.
- 2 For high schools that do not have members of 4-year, 5-year, or 6-year graduation cohorts, the scale is abbreviated, and letter grades are adjusted to account for the school's remaining non-cohort indicators or non-cohort years.
- 3 A dash is substituted where a school has too few students (N<10) to meet confidentiality requirements for reporting.
- 4 Feeder schools are schools that do not have students in tested grades 3-11.
- 5 Schools that administered tests on computers received bonus credit based on the number of students participating.

Note for Families: If your child is enrolled in a school that has earned two "F" grades in the last four years, New Mexico state law allows you to transfer your child to a school with a higher school grade. Please call (505) 827-6909 to learn more. For information about other schools in your community and their grading history, please see the school grading web page at <http://aae.ped.state.nm.us/>.

Monte Del Sol Charter









District: Santa Fe Public Schools


Grade Range: 07 - 12

Code: 71014

This School 

Statewide C Benchmark 

		Grade	School Points	Possible Points
Current Standing How did students perform in the most recent school year? Students are tested on how well they met targets for their grade level.		F	3.74	30
School Growth In the past 3 years, did the school as a whole increase performance? For example, did a schoolwide reading program advance reading scores over the prior years?		F	1.10	10
Student Growth of Highest Performing Students How well did the school help individual students improve? The highest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the top three quarters (75%) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark.		F	1.14	10
Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students How well did the school help individual students improve? The lowest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the bottom quarter (25%) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark.		F	2.04	10
Opportunity to Learn Does the school foster an environment that facilitates learning? Are teachers using recognized instructional methods, and do students want to come to school?		B	7.09	8
Graduation How does the school contribute to on-time graduation? On-time means within 4 years, and, to a lesser extent, within 5 and 6 years for students who require longer.		D	11.07	17
College and Career Readiness Are students prepared for what lies ahead after high school? Schools receive credit when students participate in college entrance exams and coursework leading to dual credit and vocational certification. The school receives additional credit when students meet success goals.		C	9.48	15
Bonus Points Does the school show exceptional aptitude for involving students and parents in education, reducing truancy, and promoting extracurricular activities?			2.00	5



3-Year Average

60.7

C

Final School Grade

75.0 to < 100.0	A
65.0 to < 75.0	B
50.0 to < 65.0	C
35.0 to < 50.0	D
0.0 to < 35.0	F

Total Points

37.66

Details of Each Grade Indicator

These next pages show the school's results divided into smaller groups to show how specific classes of students are doing. The information explains how a school compares to other schools, and identifies groups within the school that are performing well or that need additional instructional support based on achievement. Points that the school earned on each of the indicators are provided in more detail, and when summed will arrive at the totals on the first page summary.


Current Standing

Knowing how many students are proficient in a given year is a measure of the school's overall success. Single-year performance will vary with differing classes of students. Therefore, Current Standing uses up to 3 years of data to provide a more accurate picture of the school's achievement. Current Standing is augmented with Value Added Modeling (VAM) by capturing the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Guide at: <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>.


	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Reading											
Proficient and Advanced (%)	27.1	35.2	19.6	41.9		20.1	50.0	50.0	18.9	2.5	<2.0
Proficient and Advanced (Pts)	1.35										
Value Added Model (Pts)	1.75										
Math											
Proficient and Advanced (%)	6.8	6.9	6.7	15.3		3.8	<2.0	<2.0	5.4	<2.0	<2.0
Proficient and Advanced (Pts)	0.34										
Value Added Model (Pts)	0.30										

3-Year Summary


Performance is considered on grade level when students score either Proficient or Advanced.



Reading (%)



Math (%)



School Growth

School growth compares the students enrolled in the current year to the same students from prior years. Unlike Current Standing, School Growth accounts for improvement of all students, not just those reaching proficient.

Growth in proficiency is calculated with Value Added Modeling (VAM), which accounts for the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Guide at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>

	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Math</i>
Value Added Score	-0.860	-1.951
Points Earned	0.97	0.13

School growth is expressed as a score that can be both negative and positive. When it is positive the school performed better than was expected relative to its peers with the same size, mobility, and prior student performance.

Student Growth

Just like schools, individual student achievement is expected to improve over time. Student growth is shown as a value added score (VAS) that accounts for all students in each group for up to 3 years. Student groups are further divided into highest and lowest performing subgroups. Every student's prior test scores are used to estimate how they should perform today.

- Above 0 means that the group, in general, scored higher than expected. This is an exciting finding when students are below the proficiency line, because they are closing the achievement gap and catching up to their higher-performing classmates.
- Near 0 means that the group scored about as expected compared to their academic peers. While some students may have performed better than anticipated (positive growth), they were equally balanced by students that did poorer (negative growth).
- Below 0 means that the group performed below expectations and students are losing ground when compared to their peers.

Details of student growth and value added scores are explained in PED's School Grading Technical Guide at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>. Note that separate analytic techniques are used for the school overall and for the subgroups.

	School Overall	Subgroup Analysis									
		Female	Male	White	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Am Indian	Econ Disadv	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
Reading Growth											
Highest 75% (VAS)	-0.85	-0.20	-0.26	-0.32	-	-0.17	0.09	-1.50	-0.27	-0.22	-0.26
Highest 75% (Pts)	0.98										
Lowest 25% (VAS)	-0.75	-0.46	-0.31	-0.33	-	-0.38	0.45	-	-0.35	-0.46	-0.48
Lowest 25% (Pts)	1.13										
Math Growth											
Highest 75% (VAS)	-1.86	0.02	0.06	0.14	-	-0.04	0.69	0.36	-0.01	0.17	-0.15
Highest 75% (Pts)	0.15										
Lowest 25% (VAS)	-0.90	-0.24	-0.31	-0.21	-	-0.29	-	-	-0.28	-0.57	-0.15
Lowest 25% (Pts)	0.91										

Opportunity to Learn (OTL)

The successful school invites students to be part of a thriving learning culture that uses proven teaching methods. A school's learning environment is reflected in a survey of classroom practices and in student attendance.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Attendance (Average)	96.2	96.3	96.0	95.8	-	96.4	-	-	96.3	96.3	97.4
Attendance (Points)	3.04										
Survey (Average)	36.4	Surveys consisted of ten questions with answers from 0 (Never) to 5 (Always), yielding a maximum score of 50. A typical question includes "My teacher introduces a new lesson by reminding us of things we already know." Schools that scored higher demonstrated better classroom teaching practices.									<i>Reading</i> NA
Survey (Points)	4.0										<i>Math</i> NA
Count of Surveys (N)	1,632										<i>General</i> 36.4

Graduation

Students are expected to graduate in 4 years. However, some students require longer and are captured in 5-year and 6-year rates. Similar to school and student growth, the expectation is that the school increase the percent of successful 4-year graduates over time. SAM (Supplemental Accountability Model) schools are a subset of schools that target returning dropouts or students with disabilities. These schools receive an additional rate that reflects their ability to graduate any student, not just cohort members, in a given year. Details of the federally approved graduation rules are in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website at: <http://ped.state.nm.us/Graduation/index.html>.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Cohort of 2014 - 4-Year Rate											
Cohort Graduation (%)	67.9	68.9	66.9	58.4	-	70.2	-	-	76.4	39.0	72.2
Non-Cohort Graduation (%)	-										
SAM Adjustment (Weighted %)				This school did not qualify to be a SAM school.							
Points Earned	5.43										
Cohort of 2013 - 5-Year Rate											
Graduation (%)	69.5	71.6	66.4	68.1	-	67.4	-	-	66.7	39.7	-
Points Earned	2.1										
Cohort of 2012 - 6-Year Rate											
Graduation (%)	68.6	71.6	65.0	71.5	-	59.7	-	-	62.0	66.6	62.6
Points Earned	1.4										

Growth in 4-Year Rates

Growth takes into account three years of graduation rates.	Growth Index	-19
	Points Earned	2.18

College and Career Readiness (CCR)

High school students are expected to participate in at least one college or career readiness program. These activities include one of the following:

- 1) College entrance assessments (SAT, SAT Subject Test, PSAT, ACT, PLAN, Compass, or Accuplacer)
- 2) Evidence that the student can pass a college-level course (Advanced Placement, Dual Credit, or IB)
- 3) Eligibility for an industry recognized certification (Career Technical Education, SAM School Supplemental)

Points are given separately for students' participation and for their success. To be considered successful, students must meet established benchmarks. Details are in the School Grading Technical Guide on the PED website at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>.

CCR follows the Shared Accountability model used for cohort graduation rates. Cohorts are fully described in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website at <http://ped.state.nm.us/Graduation/index.html>.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Participation (% of Cohort)	76	74	77	67	100	78	-	100	82	68	79
Participation (Pts)	3.78										
Success (% of Participants)	57	60	54	71	100	48	-	64	53	15	51
Success (Pts)	5.70										
Percent of School's Cohort of 2014 Participating in Each CCR Opportunity											
ACT	43.1	43.5	42.8	39.9	>98.0	42.3	-	63.6	49.6	<2.0	54.8
PLAN	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
SAT	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
PSAT	49.8	50.9	48.8	43.7	>98.0	48.7	-	>98.0	51.1	67.9	53.4
AccuPlacer	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	2.2	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	2.1	<2.0	<2.0
Advanced Placement	44.9	51.7	38.6	45.3	>98.0	42.3	-	63.6	50.7	<2.0	58.5
Dual Credit	10.2	7.4	12.8	10.8	<2.0	10.8	-	<2.0	9.2	6.4	11.0
International Baccalaureate	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
Career Technical Education	<2.0	2.2	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	27.3	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
Compass	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
SAT Subject Test	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0
SAM School Supplemental	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0

Bonus Points

While most schools provide a sampling of athletics, club participation opportunities, and parent meetings, a few schools stand out among the rest. These schools are recognized for their extraordinary dedication to keeping students invested in school and their efforts in empowering parents to engage actively in their child's education. Bonus points indicate those schools that have gone above and beyond the others.

- ☐ Student Engagement
- ☐ Parental Engagement
- ☐ Extracurricular Activities
- ☐ Truancy Improvement
- ☒ Other

Participation

Schools must include all of their enrolled students in the annual statewide assessment. If the percentage of students is less than 95%, the school's letter grade is reduced by one grade. Supplemental Accountability Model (SAM) schools and small schools with fewer than 100 students receive special consideration.

Reading (%) 98
Math (%) 100

Supplemental Information

Similar Schools

While statewide comparisons are helpful, schools may want to see how they rank next to their peers that have similar students and settings. The figures below show how this school contrasts with other schools in the state that are most like it in student characteristics.

Schools are grouped into categories that have similar proportions of English language learners (ELL), students with disabilities (SWD), ethnicities, economically disadvantaged (ED), and mobile students. Different schools are in each category set. A composite score incorporates all categories into a general measure of at-risk students.

		School Rank											
		ELL		SWD		Ethnicity		ED		Mobility		Composite	
Students (% Tested)		18.8		15.1		69.3		62.7		6.9			
		Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total
Current Standing		29	(36)	35	(36)	30	(35)	33	(36)	31	(35)	32	(36)
School Growth		35	(36)	35	(36)	32	(35)	36	(36)	34	(35)	35	(36)
Student Growth, Highest 75%		33	(36)	35	(36)	32	(35)	33	(36)	33	(35)	35	(36)
Student Growth, Lowest 25%		25	(36)	31	(36)	31	(35)	29	(36)	34	(35)	31	(36)
Opportunity to Learn		12	(36)	15	(36)	13	(36)	12	(36)	17	(35)	17	(36)
Graduation		21	(36)	23	(36)	27	(36)	28	(36)	28	(35)	25	(36)
College and Career Readiness		25	(36)	27	(36)	32	(36)	32	(36)	30	(35)	26	(36)

School Growth Targets

Customized targets, called School Growth Targets (SGTs), guide a school's path toward proficiency. These goals increase every year and challenge schools to identify student groups that might be struggling to keep up with their peers.

				Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		Target	All Students	F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Growth Lowest 25% (Q1)	Reading	.0038	N	N	N	N	.	N	Y	.	N	N	N
	Math	-.0334	N	N	N	N	.	N	.	.	N	N	N
Growth Highest 75% (Q3)	Reading	-.0481	N	N	N	N	.	N	Y	N	N	N	N
	Math	-.0613	N	Y	Y	Y	.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Proficiency	Reading	33.3%	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y	Y	N	N	N
	Math	17.6%	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N
Graduation	4-Year Cohort	75.6%	N	N	N	N		N			Y	N	N

School History

Student performance over time can demonstrate the success of interventions and school reform. Students who score proficient or higher are considered to be performing at grade level. For a more detailed history, see the NMPED website: <http://www.ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AcademicGrowth/NMSBA.html>.

		All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
			F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
<i>Reading Proficiency</i>	2015 (%)	27.1	35.2	19.6	41.9		20.1	50.0	50.0	18.9	2.5	<2.0
	2014 (%)	58.6	62.5	54.5	72.0		49.3			45.1	27.8	37.0
	2013 (%)	58.6	60.9	56.7	73.2		49.4			48.1	12.5	37.7
<i>Math Proficiency</i>	2015 (%)	6.8	6.9	6.7	15.3		3.8	<2.0	<2.0	5.4	<2.0	<2.0
	2014 (%)	42.6	41.4	43.9	58.1		32.2			32.3	19.4	20.4
	2013 (%)	41.6	34.5	47.1	57.3		31.6			33.1	12.8	17.0

Student Promotion

Students who are prepared and progress to a higher grade each year (matriculate) indicate that the school is successfully moving students toward graduation. However, if the school's achievement in reading and math is subpar and yet most students are being promoted, the school may be inattentive to a student's need to repeat grade-level instruction before moving on.

Percent of students scoring Beginning Step (lowest) in the prior year advancing to the next grade .	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian			
Grade 9 to Grade 10 (%)											
Grade 10 to Grade 11 (%)	92.3	-	-	-	-	>98.0	-	-	90.9	-	-
Grade 11 to Grade 12 (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

End Notes

- 1 The Statewide C grade was established in the first year of A-F School Grading as the midpoint of all schools. It was fixed in 2011 as the framework for all future letter grades and is not recalculated each year.
- 2 For high schools that do not have members of 4-year, 5-year, or 6-year graduation cohorts, the scale is abbreviated, and letter grades are adjusted to account for the school's remaining non-cohort indicators or non-cohort years.
- 3 A dash is substituted where a school has too few students (N<10) to meet confidentiality requirements for reporting.
- 4 Feeder schools are schools that do not have students in tested grades 3-11.
- 5 During the 2013-2014 and 2014-15 school years, schools across New Mexico conducted assessments on computers. To recognize these efforts, schools that offered the SBA on computers received bonus credit based on the number of students participating.

Monte Del Sol Charter

District: Santa Fe Public Schools


Grade Range: 07 - 12

Code: 71014

This School

Statewide C Benchmark

Current Standing		Grade	School Points	Possible Points
How did students perform in the most recent school year? Students are tested on how well they met targets for their grade level.		A	19.69	30
School Growth In the past 3 years did the school increase grade level performance? For example did this year's 10th graders improve over last year's 10th graders?		C	5.50	10
Student Growth of Highest Performing Students How well did the school help individual students improve? The highest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the top three quarters (75%) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state		A	9.90	10
Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students How well did the school help individual students improve? The lowest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the bottom quarter (25%) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark.		C	7.33	10
Opportunity to Learn Does the school foster an environment that facilitates learning? Are teachers using recognized instructional methods, and do students want to come to school?		B	6.74	8
Graduation How does the school contribute to on-time graduation? On-time means within 4 years, and to a lesser extent, within 5 and 6 years for students who require longer.		D	10.60	17
College and Career Readiness Are students prepared for what lies ahead after high school? Schools receive credit when students participate in college entrance exams, and coursework leading to dual credit and vocational certification. The school receives additional credit when students meet success goals.		A	11.63	15
Bonus Points Does the school show exceptional aptitude for involving students and parents in education, reducing truancy, and promoting extracurricular activities?			1.59	5



Final School Grade

75.0 to < 100.0	A
65.0 to < 75.0	B
50.0 to < 65.0	C
35.0 to < 50.0	D
0.0 to < 35.0	F

Total Points

72.98

Details of Each Grade Indicator

These next pages show the school's results divided into smaller groups to show how specific classes of students are doing. The information explains how a school compares to other schools, and identifies groups within the school that are performing well or that need additional instructional support based on achievement. Points that the school earned on each of the indicators are provided in more detail, and when summed will arrive at the totals on the first page summary.

Current Standing



Knowing how many students are proficient in a given year is a measure of the school's overall success. Single-year performance will vary with differing classes of students. Therefore, Current Standing uses up to 3 years of data to provide a more accurate picture of the school's achievement.

Current Standing is augmented with Value Added Modeling (VAM) by capturing the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Manual at: <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian				
Reading												
Proficient and Advanced (%)	58.6	62.5	54.5	72.0	-	49.3	-	-	45.1	27.8	37.0	-
Proficient and Advanced (Pts)	5.97											
Value Added Model (Pts)	5.00											
Math												
Proficient and Advanced (%)	42.6	41.4	43.9	58.1	-	32.2	-	-	32.3	19.4	20.4	-
Proficient and Advanced (Pts)	3.72											
Value Added Model (Pts)	5.00											

3 Year Summary

Performance is considered on grade level when students score either Proficient or Advanced.



School Growth

School growth compares the students enrolled in the current year to students from prior years. While these are partly different sets of students, the school that is improving will do a better job each year of impacting their achievement. Unlike Current Standing, School Growth accounts for improvement of all students, not just those reaching proficient.

School Growth is augmented with Value Added Modeling (VAM) which accounts for the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Manual at: <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>

Difference from
Expected Growth (SS Points)

Reading

0.526

Math

0.396

Points Earned

3.19

2.31

School Growth is shown in scaled score points, which range from 0 to 80 for both reading and math. A school that grows an average of +2 scaled score points a year shows that the school is generally improving their ability to increase student achievement.

Student Growth

Just like schools, individual student achievement is expected to improve over time. Student growth is shown as the average change in scaled score (SS) points per year, and is averaged for all students in each group for up to 3 years. Student groups are further divided into highest and lowest performing subgroups.


Scores on the assessment range from 0 to 80, and a score of 40 indicates that a student is proficient or on grade level. A student's prior test scores are used to estimate how the student should perform today. When growth is positive (+) students score better than expected in the current year:

- Above 0 means that the group, in general, scored higher than expected. This is an exciting finding, especially when students are below the proficiency line, because they are closing the achievement gap and catching up to their higher-performing classmates.
- Near 0 means that the group scored about as expected. While some students may have performed better than anticipated (positive growth), they were equally balanced by students that did poorer (negative growth).
- Below 0 means that the group performed below expectations and students are losing ground when compared to their peers.

Details of Student Growth and scaled scores are explained in the Technical Guide on the PED website:

<http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>

		Gender				Race / Ethnicity										Econ Disadv		Students with Disabilities		English Language Learners		Redesignated English Proficient	
		Female		Male		White		African American		Hispanic		Asian		Am Indian									
All Students		Range		Range		Range		Range		Range		Range		Range		Range		Range		Range			
Reading Growth																							
Highest 75% (SS/Yr)	1.6	-3.4	.9	-3.5	.7	-3.4	.9	-	-	-3.5	.7	-	-	-	-	-3.5	.7	-3.7	.6	-3.7	.6	-	-
Highest 75% (Pts)	4.90																						
Lowest 25% (SS/Yr)	1.1	-1.8	2.4	-1.6	2.7	-1.4	2.9	-	-	-1.8	2.5	-	-	-	-	-1.7	2.6	-2.0	2.3	-1.7	2.6	-	-
Lowest 25% (Pts)	4.01																						
Math Growth																							
Highest 75% (SS/Yr)	3.2	-3.1	1.0	-3.0	1.1	-2.9	1.2	-	-	-3.2	.9	-	-	-	-	-3.2	.9	-3.2	.9	-3.4	.7	-	-
Highest 75% (Pts)	5.00																						
Lowest 25% (SS/Yr)	.5	-2.4	1.7	-2.3	1.8	-2.1	2.0	-	-	-2.4	1.7	-	-	-	-	-2.5	1.6	-2.6	1.5	-2.4	1.7	-	-
Lowest 25% (Pts)	3.32																						



Remaining Gap Between Highest and Lowest Performing Students in 2014

Scaled Score Differences

Reading 12.0

Math 13.0

Growth for lower performing students must be sufficient to meaningfully close the achievement gap. Minimums required annually are:

Math +1.3 per year

Reading +1.7 per year

Opportunity to Learn (OTL)

The successful school invites students to be part of a thriving learning culture that uses proven teaching methods. A school's learning environment is reflected in a survey of classroom practices (OTL Survey) and in student attendance.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvant	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian				
OTL Attendance (Student Average)	95.9	96.1	95.6	95.7	-	95.9	-	-	96.1	96.2	97.1	-
OTL Attendance (Points Earned)	3.03											
OTL Survey (Average Total Score)	32.6	32.7	32.4	32.3	-	32.5	-	-	32.6	30.3	33.4	-
OTL Survey (Points Earned)	3.71											

OTL Survey Questions Reading

The answer to each question ranges from 0 (Never) to 5 (Always), with a midpoint score of 2.5. Schools that scored higher demonstrated better classroom teaching practices.

1. My teacher introduces a new topic by connecting to things I already know.	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	-	3.0	-	-	3.1	2.7	3.0	-
2. My teacher explains why what we are learning is important.	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	-	3.1	-	-	3.2	3.2	3.2	-
3. My teacher explains how learning a new topic is a foundation for other topics.	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	-	3.0	-	-	3.0	2.6	3.2	-
4. Every student gets a chance to answer questions.	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	-	3.8	-	-	3.7	3.3	3.7	-
5. My teacher wants me to explain my answers.	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	-	4.1	-	-	4.1	3.8	4.2	-
6. My teacher knows when I understand, and when I do not.	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	-	3.1	-	-	3.1	3.2	3.0	-
7. My teacher explains things in different ways so everyone can understand.	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	-	3.3	-	-	3.3	3.2	3.6	-
8. My teacher gives me helpful feedback on work I turn in.	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	-	3.6	-	-	3.7	3.5	3.7	-
9. My teacher checks our understanding.	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.3	-	3.0	-	-	3.1	2.7	3.1	-
10. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day.	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	-	3.0	-	-	3.1	2.1	2.6	-

OTL Survey Questions Math

1. My teacher introduces a new topic by connecting to things I already know.	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	-	3.4	-	-	3.5	2.9	3.3	-
2. My teacher explains why what we are learning is important.	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.3	-	3.6	-	-	3.6	3.3	3.6	-
3. My teacher explains how learning a new topic is a foundation for other topics.	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	-	3.4	-	-	3.5	3.0	3.6	-
4. Every student gets a chance to answer questions.	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.7	-	3.7	-	-	3.8	3.3	3.8	-
5. My teacher wants me to explain my answers.	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.9	-	4.1	-	-	4.1	3.9	4.0	-
6. My teacher knows when I understand, and when I do not.	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.2	-	3.3	-	-	3.2	3.2	3.3	-
7. My teacher explains things in different ways so everyone can understand.	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.3	-	3.4	-	-	3.3	3.2	3.3	-
8. My teacher gives me helpful feedback on work I turn in.	3.1	2.9	3.4	3.2	-	3.0	-	-	3.2	3.2	3.3	-
9. My teacher checks our understanding.	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.5	-	3.4	-	-	3.4	3.5	3.4	-
10. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day.	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	-	3.4	-	-	3.5	2.9	2.9	-

Color Key:

4 or 5, Rated High
2 or 3, Rated Mid
0 or 1, Rated Low

Graduation

Students are expected to graduate in 4 years. However, some students require longer and are captured in 5-year and 6-year rates. Similar to School Growth, the expectation is that the school increase the percent of successful 4-year graduates over time.

SAM schools (Supplemental Accountability Model) are a subset of schools that target returning dropouts or students with disabilities. These schools receive an additional rate that reflects their ability to graduate any student, not just cohort members, in a given year. Details of the federally approved graduation rules are in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian				
Cohort of 2013 - 4-Year Rate												
Percent Graduating	69.5	71.6	66.4	68.1	-	67.4	-	-	66.7	39.7	-	N/A
Points Earned	5.56											
Cohort of 2012 - 5-Year Rate												
Percent Graduating	68.6	71.6	65.0	71.5	-	59.7	-	-	62.0	66.6	62.6	N/A
Points Earned	2.06											
Cohort of 2011 - 6-Year Rate												
Percent Graduating	73.2	73.1	73.3	76.7	-	69.8	-	-	66.4	59.2	76.2	N/A
Points Earned	1.46											
Growth in 4-Year Rates		Growth Index (Increase)			-1.5			SAM Rates SAM Graduation (%) This school did not qualify to be a SAM school.				
Value Added Modeling takes into account the school's prior 3 years.		Points Earned			1.52							

College and Career Readiness (CCR)

High school students are expected to participate in at least one college or career readiness program. These activities include one of the following:

- 1) College entrance assessments (SAT, SAT Subject Test, PSAT, ACT, PLAN, Compass, or Accuplacer)
- 2) Evidence that the student can pass a college level course (Advanced Placement, Dual Credit, or IB)
- 3) Eligibility for an industry recognized certification (Career Technical Education, SAM School Supplemental)

Points are given separately for students' participation and for their success. To be considered successful students must meet established benchmarks. Details are in the School Grading Technical Guide on the PED website at <http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx>.

CCR follows the Shared Accountability model used for cohort graduation rates. Cohorts are fully described in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website at <http://ped.state.nm.us/Graduation/index.html>.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian				
Participation (% of Cohort)	94.5	92.1	>98.0	91.3	>98.0	>98.0	80.0	-	95.8	84.5	>98.0	N/A
Participation (Pts)	4.7											
Success (% of Participants)	69.1	76.0	59.0	73.5	>98.0	59.9	>98.0	-	69.6	50.2	46.2	N/A
Success (Pts)	6.9											
Percent of School's Cohort of 2013 Participating in Each CCR Opportunity												
ACT	51.4	54.7	46.3	52.1	>98.0	49.5	40.0	-	40.4	19.8	30.8	-
PLAN	3.7	3.6	3.8	4.0	<2.0	3.7	<2.0	-	3.9	<2.0	23.1	-
SAT	20.8	15.0	29.9	28.4	11.1	12.6	<2.0	-	20.9	<2.0	<2.0	-
PSAT	89.8	90.3	89.1	86.5	>98.0	94.9	80.0	-	88.5	84.5	>98.0	-
AccuPlacer	<2.0	<2.0	2.5	<2.0	<2.0	2.3	<2.0	-	<2.0	2.7	<2.0	-
Advanced Placement	37.9	37.8	37.9	44.6	<2.0	33.7	<2.0	-	40.9	<2.0	46.2	-
Dual Credit	8.4	8.6	8.1	11.0	88.9	2.3	<2.0	-	7.8	22.6	<2.0	-
International Baccalaureate	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-
Career Technical Education	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	11.1	2.3	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-
Compass	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-
SAT Subject Test	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-
SAM School Supplemental	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	-	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0	<2.0

Bonus Points

While most schools provide a sampling of athletics, club participation opportunities, and parent meetings, a few schools stand out among the rest. These schools are recognized for their extraordinary dedication to keeping students invested in school, and their efforts in empowering parents to engage actively in their child's education. Bonus points indicate those schools that have gone above and beyond the others.

☐ Student Engagement

☐ Parental Engagement

☐ Extracurricular Activities

☒ Truancy Improvement

Supplemental Information

Similar Schools

While statewide comparisons are helpful, schools may want to see how they rank next to their peers that have similar students and settings. The figures below show how this school contrasts with other schools in the state that are most like it in student characteristics.

Schools are grouped into categories that have similar proportions of English language learners (ELL), students with disabilities (SWD), ethnicities, economically disadvantaged (ED), and mobile students. Different schools are in each category set. A composite score incorporates all categories into a general measure of at-risk students. Higher ranking schools had more points in that indicator.

	School Rank											
	ELL		SWD		Ethnicity		ED		Mobility		Composite	
Students (% Tested)	20.3		14.7		60.8		52.5		33.1			
	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total	Rank	Total
Current Standing	1	(35)	12	(35)	18	(35)	11	(35)	11	(35)	1	(35)
School Growth	8	(35)	16	(35)	16	(35)	12	(35)	16	(35)	7	(34)
Student Growth, Highest 75%	14	(35)	14	(35)	14	(35)	10	(35)	10	(35)	19	(35)
Student Growth, Lowest 25%	27	(35)	29	(35)	30	(35)	27	(35)	27	(35)	33	(35)
Opportunity to Learn	7	(35)	9	(34)	9	(35)	10	(35)	16	(35)	5	(35)
Graduation	25	(35)	24	(34)	21	(35)	28	(35)	18	(35)	25	(35)
College and Career Readiness	14	(35)	16	(34)	23	(35)	18	(35)	12	(35)	10	(35)


School Growth Targets

Customized targets, called School Growth Targets (SGTs), guide a school's path toward proficiency. These goals increase every year and challenge schools to identify student groups that might be struggling to keep up with their peers. Students who are not proficient but have made large enough gains to become proficient in the next 3 years are considered "on track" to proficiency and are included in the percentages below.

			Gender		Race / Ethnicity								
All Students			F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian	Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
Reading	Highest 75% (%)	54.4	57.9	50.0	61.3	-	47.6	-	-	48.4	40.0	30.8	-
	Lowest 25% (%)	24.1	19.0	27.0	30.8	-	22.0	-	-	21.4	14.3	33.3	-
Math	Highest 75% (%)	46.6	43.4	50.0	57.1	-	36.5	-	-	37.4	40.0	17.5	-
	Lowest 25% (%)	11.3	10.3	12.1	25.0	-	7.1	-	-	2.4	.0	.0	-

Graduation Target 73.7%

For high schools graduation rates for the Cohort of 2013 are available on page 5.



Participation Schools must include all of their enrolled students in the annual statewide assessment. If the percentage of the All Students group is less than 95%, the school's letter grade is reduced by one grade. Supplemental Accountability Schools (SAM) and small schools with fewer than 40 students receive special consideration.

	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian				
Reading (%)	>98.0	>98.0	97.6	>98.0	-	>98.0	-	-	>98.0	97.3	>98.0	-
Math (%)	>98.0	>98.0	97.6	>98.0	-	>98.0	-	-	>98.0	97.3	>98.0	-

School History Student performance over time can demonstrate the success of interventions and school reform. Scaled scores (SS) range from 0 to 80, and 40 is the threshold for proficiency (on grade level). For a more detailed history see the NMPED website: <http://www.ped.state.nm.us/AssessmentAccountability/AcademicGrowth/NMSBA.html>

		All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
			F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian				
Reading	2014 (Avg SS)	40.5	41.6	39.3	43.8	-	38.5	-	-	38.4	31.6	36.7	-
	2013 (Avg SS)	41.0	42.2	40.0	43.8	-	39.4	-	-	39.2	28.8	37.5	-
	2012 (Avg SS)	43.2	44.1	42.2	46.4	-	41.1	-	-	41.6	33.5	36.7	-
Math	2014 (Avg SS)	38.3	37.9	38.6	41.8	-	36.0	-	-	35.5	31.2	34.0	-
	2013 (Avg SS)	37.4	37.1	37.7	40.3	-	35.7	-	-	35.5	29.1	34.0	-
	2012 (Avg SS)	40.2	39.8	40.6	43.5	-	38.5	-	-	38.6	30.9	35.0	-

Student Promotion Students that are prepared and progress to a higher grade each year (matriculate) indicate that your school is successfully moving students toward graduation. However, if the school's achievement in Reading and Math is subpar, and yet most students are being promoted, the school may be inattentive to a student's need to repeat grade-level instruction before moving on.

Percent of students scoring Beginning Step (lowest) in the prior year advancing to the next grade .	All Students	Gender		Race / Ethnicity					Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities	English Language Learners	Redesignated English Proficient
		F	M	White	Afr Amer	Hisp	Asian	Am Indian				
Grade 9 to Grade 10 (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 10 to Grade 11 (%)	>98.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 11 to Grade 12 (%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

End Notes

- 1 The Statewide C grade was established in the first year of school grading as the midpoint of all schools. It was fixed in 2011 as the framework for all future letter grades and is not recalculated each year.
- 2 Final letter grades are established at the 90th and 50th percentiles, which represent 75 and 50 points respectively. For high schools that do not have members of 4-year 5-year or 6-year graduation cohorts, the scale is abbreviated and letter grades are adjusted to account for the school's remaining non-cohort indicators or non-cohort years. However high schools that were graded on this restricted scale have their points adjusted upward to the 100 point scale in order to report 3-year averages.
- 3 A dash is substituted where a school has too few students (N<10) to meet confidentiality requirements for reporting.
- 4 Feeder schools are schools that do not have students in tested grades 3-8, 10, or 11. These school are rated using the performance of their alumni.
- 5 Redesignated English Proficient are students that were once English Language Learners and have since become fluent. New Mexico began this reporting category in 2012 and some data systems have not yet caught up. These fields are marked with "N/A" (not yet available).
- 6 During the 2013-2014 school year, schools across New Mexico piloted assessments on computers. To recognize these efforts, schools that offered the SBA on computers received bonus credit based on the number of students participating.