**Implementation Guidance for Beacon Charter School Academy’s Alternative Performance Framework**

### **Developed by Momentum Strategy & Research**

### **for Beacon Charter Academy**

### **February 2017**

**Introduction**

This document is meant to provide Beacon Charter Academy with the guidance and information that will be needed to implement their newly developed alternative performance framework. Unless otherwise noted, the outcomes of the measures that will be provided are based on students that were enrolled in Beacon for at least 91 consecutive days.
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# Status Measures 1.a. & 1.b. End of Year Scores on NWEA MAP Reading and Math

Metric: Difference in the average end of year scale scores in math and reading compared to nationally normed group of similar students.

Applicable grade levels: All grades, all students

Selected Assessments: Northwest Education Association’s Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) in reading and mathematics

NWEA MAP is a widely used set of assessments which is popular with alternative schools because schools can measure students’ academic skill up to three times during the typical academic year (summer assessment is an additional option). As such, schools not only receive snapshots of how students are performing academically throughout the year but scale scores (called RIT, for Raush Unit) can also be used to determine how students’ academic skills have progressed overtime.

Normative data: Due to its popularity with alternative schools, Momentum Strategy & Research (Momentum) has conducted a series of studies exploring the typical performance and growth trends for alternative schools and students across the country. In Momentum’s *2015 Alternative Norms Using NWEA* report a sample of over 300 alternative schools that also use NWEA assessments were studied to arrive at the typical performance of students in each grade level. Like the NWEA normative data, the data based on the alternative student norming sample can be used to assess whether students attending specific schools are performing at least as well as the average alternative students in each grade level.

The NWEA normative data for alternative students in grades 9-12 are provided below for NWEA MAP math and reading assessments. Results for both winter and spring are provided so that the school is able to also use data for students that assessed in the winter assessment window, but left the school prior to the spring assessment window.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Winter and Spring Math RIT for Alternative Students by Grade** | | |
|  | **Winter (Mid-Year)** | **Spring (End-Year)** |
| **Student's in Grade…** | **AEC Mean 2015 (Std. Dev.)** | **AEC Mean 2015 (Std. Dev.)** |
| **9** | 216.4 (18.1) | 217.3 (18.7) |
| **10** | 217.8 (18.3) | 219.2 (19.0) |
| **11** | 219.9 (18.0) | 219.3 (19.2) |
| **12** | 220.1 (18.4) | 220.1 (19.3) |
| Source: Momentum Strategy & Research (2016). *Alternative Accountability User's Guide* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Winter and Spring Reading RIT for Alternative Students by Grade** | | |
|  | **Winter (Mid-Year)** | **Spring (End-Year)** |
| **Student's in Grade…** | **AEC Mean 2015 (Std. Dev.)** | **AEC Mean 2015 (Std. Dev.)** |
| **9** | 210.0 (18.1) | 210.2 (18.4) |
| **10** | 210.2 (18.4) | 211.3 (18.9) |
| **11** | 212.5 (17.7) | 212.2 (18.6) |
| **12** | 213.0 (17.5) | 212.6 (18.6) |
| Source: Momentum Strategy & Research (2016). *Alternative Accountability User's Guide* | | |

## Computation of the Metric

For each grade level you will compute the average scores for all non-exempted students (see Exemptions section below for a list of students that should not be included in the metric’s computations)

For each grade level compute the average RIT score. For example, the average spring RIT for 9th grade students is computed as follows:

Sum of spring RIT values for all 9th graders with valid scores / the number of 9th grade students with valid spring RIT

Do this for each grade level, separately. If the school has a group of students that do not have a valid spring RIT, but do have valid winter RIT then also compute the average outcomes for each grade level for winter.

## student inclusion rules

* All students with valid assessment results that were enrolled at Beacon for at least 91 days during the school year, and at least 8 weeks prior to taking the spring assessment.

## Exemptions

* Students enrolled at the school for fewer than 91 consecutive days
* Students receiving “did not test” codes, because they were not enrolled or were absent throughout the spring testing window
* Students with invalidated scores, by vendor or due to test irregularities

## Summarizing the Results

For summarizing the results, Momentum recommends summarizing the difference between each grade level’s outcome, compared to the NWEA Alternative Norming Sample outcomes for the same grade and assessment period. The following provides an example of how data could be summarized for scoring:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Example Method of Summarizing NWEA End of Year Reading RIT Outcomes Compared to  NWEA Alternative Norming Sample Averages | | | | | |
| Grade | **Assessment Term** | **Number of Students with Valid Reading RIT Scores** | **Average Reading RIT** | **NWEA Alt Norm** | **Difference** |
| 9 | Winter | 22 | 206.5 | 210.0 | -3.5 |
| 9 | Spring | 60 | 204.0 | 210.2 | -6.2 |
| 10 | Winter | 3 | 199.0 | 210.2 | -11.2 |
| 10 | Spring | 52 | 207.7 | 211.3 | -3.6 |
| 11 | Winter | 25 | 209.0 | 212.5 | -3.5 |
| 11 | Spring | 40 | 210.0 | 212.2 | -2.2 |
| 12 | Winter | 55 | 212.3 | 213.0 | -0.7 |
| 12 | Spring | 42 | 211.5 | 212.6 | -1.1 |
| Weighted Average of the Differences | | | | | **-3.1** |

Summarizing the results as a weighted average is important so that drastically different outcome based on only a few students (such as the large differences shown here for the 10th grade winter average, based on only 3 student) do not have a disproportionate influence on the overall outcome.

To arrive at the weighted average of the differences, multiply the number of students by the difference for each results, sum the products, and divide by the sum total number of students, as follows:

(22\*-3.5) + (60\*-6.2) + (3\*-11.2) + (52\*-3.6) + (25\*-3.5) + (40\*-2.2) + (55\*-0.7) + (42\*-1.1)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(22 + 60 + 3 + 52 + 25 + 40 + 55 +42)

## Ratings and Targets

Below is the table outing the target for each of the possible ratings for NWEA spring assessment results. We recommend rating the school on outcomes for math and reading separately, so that school improvement strategies may be aligned with the school’s strengths and challenges, which are then tied to their accountability with the Authority.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Performance Ratings** | **Targets** | **Points** |
| **Exceptional** | The weighted average of the differences between Beacon’s end of year reading RIT and that of the NWEA alternative norming sample was +2 or higher. | 97.5 |
| **Exceeds** | The weighted average of the differences between Beacon’s end of year reading RIT and that of the NWEA alternative norming sample was between +1.1 and +1.9. | 85.0 |
| **Adequate** | The weighted average of the differences between Beacon’s end of year reading RIT and that of the NWEA alternative norming sample was between +0.1 and +1.0 | 62.5 |
| **Approaches** | The weighted average of the differences between Beacon’s end of year RIT and the NWEA alternative norming sample was between -0.9 and 0.0 | 37.5 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | The weighted average of the differences between Beacon’s end of year RIT and the NWEA alternative norming sample was between -1.9 and -1.0 | 15.0 |
| **Critical** | The weighted average of the differences between Beacon’s end of year RIT and the NWEA alternative norming sample was -2 or lower. | 2.5 |

# Growth Measures 2a and 2b. Growth Using the NWEA MAP Assessments in Math and Reading

Metric: Nearest percentile rank on NWEA MAP growth, based on average RIT growth for each grade level and growth period

Applicable grade levels: All grades, all students

Target Growth: Each year, the average NWEA RIT growth in math and reading (separately) will meet or exceed the 50th percentile for each grade level and growth period, compared to the NWEA Alternative School Rank Percentile Distributions

Computation Method: For a full description of how to compute the average RIT growth using NWEA MAP assessments and determine the corresponding percentile ranks for each grade and growth period, please review Momentum’s *Alternative Accountability User’s Guide: NWEA School Rank Percentile Distributions.*

## Student inclusion rules

* All valid assessment results should be used. If the proctor has reason to suspect that the student “clicked through” the test, they need to signal the test as invalid to NWEA immediately and the student should take the test again at a later date. Reasons for invalidating tests are listed in the NWEA Proctor Handbook.
* If a student enrolls after the fall assessment window, their winter and spring assessments should be used and the student’s growth included in the calculation of average growth for that time period.
* If a student leaves the school prior to the spring assessment window, but has fall and winter test results, then those results are used and the student’s growth included in the calculation of average growth for that time period.

## Exemptions

* Students enrolled at the school for fewer than 91 consecutive days
* Students receiving “did not test” codes for either the pre- or post-test, because they were not enrolled or were absent throughout one of the testing window
* Students with invalidated pre- or post-test scores, by vendor or due to test irregularities

## Summarizing the Results

Similar to the method outlined in the NWEA end of year outcomes, we provide below our recommendation for summarizing the NWEA growth measures. (See table below).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Example Method of Summarizing NWEA RIT Growth Outcomes Compared to  NWEA School Percentile Distributions, using Fictional Results in Mathematics | | | | | |
| Grade | **Assessment Term** | **Number of Student w/ Pre- and Post-Test Results** | **Average RIT Growth** | **Nearesta Growth Value in Percentile Rank Chart** | **Nearest Rank Decile** |
| 9 | Fall-Winter | 32 | 1.08 | 0.93 | 40th |
| 9 | Winter-Spring | 15 | -2.15 | -2.59 | 20th |
| 9 | Fall-Spring | 50 | 1.33 | 1.03 | 40th |
| 10 | Fall-Winter | 28 | 1.60 | 1.55 | 50th |
| 10 | Winter-Spring | 12 | -0.04 | 0.15 | 50th |
| 10 | Fall-Spring | 44 | 3.0 | 2.87 | 60th |
| 11 | Fall-Winter | 45 | 2.24 | 2.32 | 60th |
| 11 | Winter-Spring | 22 | -1.1 | -1.29 | 40th |
| 11 | Fall-Spring | 68 | 3.20 | 3.54 | 70th |
| 12 | Fall-Winter | 42 | 2.95 | 2.31 | 60th |
| 12 | Winter-Spring | 30 | 1.88 | 1.63 | 60th |
| 12 | Fall-Spring | 65 | 5.78 | 6.39 | 80th |
| Weighted Average of the Nearest Deciles | | | | | **58** |

a. By nearest growth value in the percentile rank chart, we mean the value with the nearest absolute value, whether higher or lower than the school’s average growth value.

Also as with the previous example method, we recommend using a weighted average of the nearest rank deciles to arrive at an overall school-wide growth outcome for each of the subject areas.

## Ratings and Targets

Below is a table outlining the targets for each possible NWEA RIT growth rating. Again, we recommend rating math and reading separately.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Performance Ratings** | **Targets** | **Points** |
| **Exceptional** | The weighted average of the nearest deciles is 70 or higher | 97.5 |
| **Exceeds** | The weighted average of the nearest deciles is between 60 and 69 | 85.0 |
| **Adequate** | The weighted average of the nearest deciles is between 50 and 59 | 62.5 |
| **Approaches** | The weighted average of the nearest deciles is between 40 and 49 | 37.5 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | The weighted average of the nearest deciles is between 30 and 39 | 15.0 |
| **Critical** | The weighted average of the nearest deciles is 29 or lower | 2.5 |

# College & Career Readiness Measure 3.a. Credits Earned

Metrics: Average number of credits earned by students each quarter

Applicable grade levels: All students, all grade levels

Average number of credits earned per quarter, per student should first be computed using the following equation:

Number of Credits Earned during the Year

Number of Quarters Enrolled that Year

Then the percentage of students meeting the 1.5 credit average is computed as follows:

### Numerator

Number of students with an average credit per quarter equal to 1.5 or higher

### Denominator

Number of Students enrolled that year

## Exempted Students

* Students enrolled at the school for fewer than 91 consecutive days

## Ratings and targets

The table below outlines the targets for the percent of students achieving a quarterly credit earning rate of 1.5 credits, under each of the possible ratings.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Performance Ratings** | **Targets** | **Points** |
| **Exceptional** | Between 90 and 100 percent of students averaged 1.5 credits earned per quarter enrolled | 97.5 |
| **Exceeds** | Between 75 and 89.9 percent of students averaged 1.5 credits earned per quarter enrolled | 85.0 |
| **Adequate** | Between 60 and 74.9 percent of students averaged 1.5 credits earned per quarter enrolled | 62.5 |
| **Approaches** | Between 45 and 59.9 percent of students averaged 1.5 credits earned per quarter enrolled | 37.5 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | Between 30 and 44.9 percent of students averaged 1.5 credits earned per quarter enrolled | 15.0 |
| **Critical** | Less than 29.9 percent of students averaged 1.5 credits earned per quarter enrolled | 2.5 |

# College & Career Readiness Measure 3.b. Transition Success

Metric: Percent of students to complete high school or transfer to another degree granting public education entity

Applicable grade levels: All grades, all students

Following are the exit codes, and a short description of the definition for each code (as published by the Nevada Department of Education), for the exit type that are considered successful, non-successful, and neutral transitions. (NOTE: “Neutral transitions” here refer to the school and whether the student remains in an educational option, or not, and the ability for the school to impact whether a student exits for a particular reason. For example, a school should not be held responsible for a student becoming incarcerated when they are not on school grounds. Neutral transitions do not imply that the transition is neutral for the student).

Successful transition: Students that exit the school with the following exit codes

* B18: Standard diploma
* B19: Advanced diploma
* B21: Adjusted diploma
* W1a: Different grade/track, same school and year
* W1b: Successful transfer to another public school in the same district, not a charter
* W2a: Successful transfer to another public school in the state
* W2f, W1c: Successful transfer to a charter school
* W3d1: Successful transfer to an adult education option offering a GED
* W3d2, W3d3: Successful transfer to an adult education option offering an adult diploma
* W1a1: Completed the school year, but did not graduate
* W3f: 12 grade completed

Non-Successful Transition: Students that exit the school with the following exit codes:

* W3a1: Withdrawn: credit deficient
* W3a2: Withdrawn: pregnant/parenting
* W3a3: Withdrawn: marriage
* W3a4: Withdrawn: employment
* W3a6: Withdrawn: per juvenile court
* W3e7: Withdrawn: self/parent support
* W3a8: Withdrawn: apprenticeship
* W3a9: Withdrawn: other
* W3b: Age exceeds restrictions
* W3c1: Permanent expulsion
* W3c2: Discipline or eligible reason
* W3e1: 10 day absence withdrawal/whereabouts unknown
* W3e2: Absence for the entire state for a month

Neutral transitions: The following transitions are considered neutral with respect to accountability and are, therefore, not included in either the numerator or the denominator when computing the percent of student to transition successfully.

* W2b: Transfer to private school
* W2c: Transfer to homeschool
* W2d: Move out of state
* W2e: Move out of country
* W3a5: Withdrawn: Mental or psychological condition
* W3c3: Incarceration
* W4a: Deceased

At the time this document was developed, the Nevada Department of Education had shared a draft of their own alternative accountability framework with Beacon Academy. This metric overlaps significantly with the graduation index found in that draft, with respect to the types of transitions that receive points (positive transitions) and the types of transitions that are left out of the index calculations altogether (neutral transitions), present in the draft framework. Beacon will continue to follow the Department with respect to exit codes and their assignment to successful, non-successful, or neutral transitions.

## Computation of the Metric

### Numerator

All exiting students from the current year with exit codes that are included in the Successful transition list

### Denominator

All exiting students with successful transition exit codes

PLUS

All exiting students with non-successful transition exit codes

## Exempted students

* Students that exit with codes included in the neutral transition list
* Students enrolled at the school for fewer than 91 consecutive days
* Non-exiting students/continued enrollees

## Ratings and Targets

The table below outlines that targets for the proportion of exiting students that have successful transitions that falls under each rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Performance Ratings** | **Targets** | **Points** |
| **Exceptional** | 90-100 percent of students that exit the school, each year, will transition successfully through graduation, completion, or school transfer | 97.5 |
| **Exceeds** | Between 80-89.9 percent of students that exit the school, each year, will transition successfully through graduation, completion, or school transfer | 85.0 |
| **Adequate** | Between 70-79.9 percent of students that exit the school, each year, will transition successfully through graduation, completion, or school transfer | 62.5 |
| **Approaches** | Between 50-69.9 percent of students that exit the school, each year, will transition successfully through graduation, completion, or school transfer | 37.5 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | Between 30-49.9 percent of students that exit the school, each year, will transition successfully through graduation, completion, or school transfer | 15.0 |
| **Critical** | Fewer than 30 percent of students that exit the school, each year, will transition successfully through graduation, completion, or school transfer | 2.5 |

# College & Career Readiness Measure 3.c. Cohort Graduation

Metric: 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

Data collected by Momentum Strategy & Research from alternative schools from a number of states show that the average percent of alternative students to graduate with their 4-year cohort is approximately 30 percent (see Attachment A). However, states differed in their respective averages and these within state averages tended to be stable over the two to three years of observed data. Therefore, we recommend setting a tentative goal of graduating 30% of the 4-year cohort students but not count the outcomes toward the accountability framework until there is a better set of local data to use for benchmarking and target setting purposes—as the Nevada alternative schools currently included in the analysis are those that were in place prior to the recently enacted alternative charter school legislation and include only schools that serve 100% special education and/or facility bound students.

# College & Career Readiness Measure 3.d. CCR Assessments

Metric: Percent of eligible students to participate in college and career ready assessments (including ACT Aspire, ACT, and WorkKeys), annually

Eligibility: To ensure that students only take the assessments once they have had the opportunity to learn the requisite material, student eligibility for the college and career ready assessments will be determined by the number of credits that students have accrued by the end of the second quarter, each year; as outlined in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Credits Required for a Student to be Eligible for the Assessment | College/Career Ready Assessment |
| 0-5 credits earned | ACT Aspire for 9th grade students |
| 6-11 credits earned | ACT Aspire for 10th grade students |
| 12-17 credits earned | ACT |
| 17 or more credits earned | WorkKeys |

In years 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19, Beacon will be held accountable for participation rates. However, Beacon will report also on the performance outcomes of each assessment during this time. Beginning in 2019-2020, data from 2016-17 through 2018-19 will be used to establish benchmarks for individual students’ progress on the ACT Aspire and ACT assessments and goals will be set for a progress measure moving forward.

## Exemptions

* Students enrolled at the school for fewer than 91 consecutive days
* Students that were not enrolled or absent during the test registration window (students must register to take the ACT assessments two weeks prior to the test administration in order to sit for the tests)

## Ratings and Targets

The targets for ACT Aspire participation rates follow in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Performance Ratings** | **Targets** | **Points** |
| **Exceptional** | Between 95-100 percent of eligible students participate in the ACT Aspire assessments annually | 97.5 |
| **Exceeds** | Between 75-94.9 percent of eligible students participate in the ACT Aspire assessments annually | 85.0 |
| **Adequate** | Between 50-74.9 percent of eligible students participate in the ACT Aspire assessments annually | 62.5 |
| **Approaches** | Between 25-49.9 percent of eligible students participate in the ACT Aspire assessments annually | 37.5 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | Between 5-24.9 percent of eligible students participate in the ACT Aspire assessments annually | 15.0 |
| **Critical** | Less than 5 percent of eligible students participate in the ACT Aspire assessments annually | 2.5 |

# Student Engagement Measure 4.a. Student Retention

Metric: The percent of non-graduating students from the end of the prior year that return in the current year.

Applicable grade levels: All grades, all students

## Computing the Metric

### Numorator

Number of students enrolled on October validation day of the current year that were also enrolled on the final day of the prior school year

### Denominator

Total number of student enrolled on the final day of school from the prior year

MINUS

Prior year graduates and summer graduates

MINUS

Prior year completers and summer completers

## Exempted Students

* Students that turn 21 prior to October validation day of the current year
* Deceased students
* Students that withdraw for medical reasons and whom cannot access online or home teacher support

## Ratings and Targets

The table below outlines the continuing student rate targets for each of the possible ratings.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Performance Ratings** | **Targets** | **Points** |
| **Exceptional** | 85-100 percent of non-graduating students from the previous year (as of the last day of the school year) re-enrolled in the current year (as of October validation day). | 97.5 |
| **Exceeds** | Between 70 and 84.9 percent of non-graduating students from the previous year (as of the last day of the school year) re-enrolled in the current year (as of October validation day). | 85.0 |
| **Adequate** | Between 55 and 69.9 percent of non-graduating students from the previous year (as of the last day of the school year) re-enrolled in the current year (as of October validation day). | 62.5 |
| **Approaches** | Between 40 and 54.9 percent of non-graduating students from the previous year (as of the last day of the school year) re-enrolled in the current year (as of October validation day). | 37.5 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | Between 25 and 39.9 percent of non-graduating students from the previous year (as of the last day of the school year) re-enrolled in the current year (as of October validation day). | 15.0 |
| **Critical** | Less than 25 percent of non-graduating students from the previous year (as of the last day of the school year) re-enrolled in the current year (as of October validation day). | 2.5 |

# Student Engagement Measure 4.b. Student Attendance

Metric: Average daily attendance rates

Applicable students: All students, all grades

Target: Each year, the average daily attendance rate will be at least 87%, based on students that are continuously enrolled for at least 91 days of the school year.

Momentum performed a rank distribution on nearly 900 alternative schools across the country—using publically available school data on attendance rates from 2013-14 and 2014-15. The following tables outlines the respective attendance rates found at the 25th percentile, the 50th percentile (also known as the median), and the 75th percentile.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| School-level attendance rates from 857 alternative schools across the country | |
| Percentile | Attendance Rate |
| 25th | 79.2 |
| 50th | 86.3 |
| 75th | 91.8 |

These data were used to inform where Beacon set the school’s annual attendance rate target.

## Computing the Metric

Average daily attendance is computed by summing the total number of days attended by all students and dividing that by the total days enrolled for all students. For this metric, however, the students included in the computation of average daily attendance will be limited to those that were consecutively enrolled in Beacon Academy for at least 91 school days.

### Numerator

(# of days present *student 1*) + (# of days present *student 2*) + ….. (# days present *student n*)

### Denomenator

(# of days enrolled *student 1*) + (# of days enrolled *student 2*) + ….. (# days enrolled *student n*)

## Exempted Students

* Students enrolled at the school for fewer than 91 consecutive days

## Ratings and Targets

Below are the average daily attendance rate targets for each rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Performance Ratings** | **Targets** | **Points** |
| **Exceptional** | Average daily attendance is between 95 and 100 percent | 97.5 |
| **Exceeds** | Average daily attendance is between 90 and 94.9 percent | 85.0 |
| **Adequate** | Average daily attendance is between 85 and 89.9 percent | 62.5 |
| **Approaches** | Average daily attendance is between 80 and 84.9 percent | 37.5 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | Average daily attendance is between 75 and 79.9 percent | 15.0 |
| **Critical** | Average daily attendance is below 75 percent | 2.5 |

# Overall School Rating and Designation

The individual measures within the framework receive point values based on the school’s outcomes and points are assigned as outlined in each *Ratings and Targets* subsection within this document. The table below outlines how the individual results for each measure roll up under each indicator and shows the weight of each individual measure in the overall framework.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Measure | Weight |
| Status | End of Year RIT--Reading | 10% |
| Status | End of Year RIT--Math | 10% |
| Growth | RIT Growth--Reading | 15% |
| Growth | RIT Growth--Math | 15% |
| College & Career Readiness | Credits Earned | 20% |
| College & Career Readiness | Transition Success | 15% |
| College & Career Readiness | Cohort Graduation Rates | 0%\* |
| College & Career Readiness | College/Career Ready Assessment Participation Rates | 5% |
| Student Engagement | Student Retention | 5% |
| Student Engagement | Student Attendance | 5% |

\*Measure will be reported but will not count toward the school’s accountability framework until data-based benchmarks can be established.

The overall weighting of the Beacon framework is reflective of the school’s mission to help academically disadvantaged student decrease their level of credit deficiency and make progress toward graduation. Therefore, the heaviest weighting is on the *College* & Career *Readiness* indicator. As in the Authority’s traditional high school framework, the *Growth* indicator receives more weight in the framework than does the *Status* indicator. The addition of the Student Engagement indicator—another mission critical aspect of Beacon’s framework—reduced the weighting of Status to 20 percent in the overall framework. The table below outlines the comparable indicator weights for the Authority’s high school framework and that of Beacon’s framework.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Authority Traditional HS Weighting\* | Beacon’s Weighting |
| Status | 30 percent | 20 percent |
| Growth | 40 percent | 30 percent |
| College & Career Readiness | 30 percent | 40 percent |
| Student Engagement | n/a | 10 percent |

\*Source: Nevada Charter School Authority’s Draft Academic Framework Guidance Document. Received via email on February 13th, 2017.

The designation Beacon receives, based on the percent of total possible points received, will parallel that of the Authority’s high school framework and is outlined below (recreated from the Nevada Charter School Authority’s Draft Academic Framework Guidance Document, page 10).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Final School Designation** | **Percent of Total Possible Points Received** |
| **Exceptional** | 95.0-100.0 |
| **Exceeds** | 75.0-94.9 |
| **Adequate** | 50.0-74.9 |
| **Approaches** | 25.0-49.9 |
| **Unsatisfactory** | 5.0-24.9 |
| Critical | 0.0-4.9 |

2019-2020 Re-Evaluation and Considerations

In acknowledgement of the evolving student population at Beacon Academy, the measures presented in this sub-section will be reported to the Authority on an annual basis, but will not be included as part of Beacon Academy’s accountability framework during the 2016-17, 2017-18, or 2018-19 school years.

In the fall of 2019 the goals presented in the framework outlined in the prior sections will be re-evaluated for rigor and applicability, and the measures presented below will be evaluated for addition to Beacon’s accountability framework.

# Student Engagement Measure 4.c. Chronic absence/Truancy

Metric: Percent of students that are chronically absent, or truant

Applicable grade levels: All students aged 17 or younger

Chronic absence/truancy: Following Nevada’s statutory definition, student that are chronically absent, or truant, are those that miss 10 percent of the total possible number of school days each year (or 18 days for the typical 180 day school year). For students that enroll in the school later in the school year, the proportion of the school year missed will need to be prorated, based on the actual number of consecutive school days the student was enrolled.

# School Culture Measure 5.a. Student Well-Being

Metric: Percent of matched students to report and/or demonstrate positive changes in behavior and/or well-being

Methods of collecting data: The exact survey tool(s) and data collection rubrics have not yet been decided on. Momentum is assisting Beacon in the selection and/or development of surveys and data collection tools, which will be approved by the Authority prior to implementation. In general, data will be collected from multiple sources, including the students, their families, teachers and/or social workers that work with students, and possibly via an external evaluation process to be administered on a semi-regular basis.

The goal of the instruments will be to record student behaviors and attitudes toward school at multiple points in time to assess whether those behaviors and attitudes are changing overtime as a result of their experience with the school. The selection of these surveys, rubrics, data collection instruments will be based on 1) applicability to the students served by Beacon, 2) published reliability and validity information, 3) Beacon’s capacity to administer the tool(s) in a valid and reliable manner, 4) cost of administration, analysis, and interpretation, and 5) the utility of the resulting data to help Beacon staff educate and support the students.

# School Culture Measure 5.b. School Support

Metric: Percent of students reporting that the school provides supports that they need to be successful

Methods of collecting data: The exact survey has not yet been decided on. Momentum is assisting Beacon in the selection and/or development of a survey, which will be approved by the Authority prior to implementation.

The goal of the survey will be to evaluate whether students are utilizing the support opportunities offered by the school and whether they students feel that these supports are preparing them to be successful in life (broadly defined). The selection of the survey will be based on 1) applicability to the students served by Beacon, 2) published reliability and validity information, 3) Beacon’s capacity to administer the tool(s) in a valid and reliable manner, 4) cost of administration, analysis, and interpretation, and 5) the utility of the resulting data to help Beacon staff educate and support the students.

# School Culture Measure 5.c. Student Behavior

Metric: Percent of students that had behavioral incidents prior to enrolling in Beacon that decrease the frequency and/or severity of behavioral incidents while attending Beacon.

## Computing the Metric

### Numerator

Number of students enrolled throughout the year that had at least one behavior incident reported while attending the school for the current year AND had a history of behavior incidents within the three years prior to enrolling in the school

### Denominator

Total number of students with histories of behavior incidents within the three years prior to enrolling in the school

##### Attachment A: Alternative School Graduation Rates

The table below shows the average cohort graduation rates in Arizona, Nevada (schools identified prior to the 2015 legislation), New York City, and Ohio. Locations were selected based on 1) whether the state or district has clear policies to define and identify alternative schools and 2) the use of high school exit or graduation exams for statewide testing.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cohort Graduation Rates among Alternative Education Campuses Across Multiple Locations\* | | | |
|  | **4-Year** | **5-Year** | **6-Year** |
| **Location-Year/Class** | **Ave (# of schools with data)** | **Ave (# of schools with data)** | **Ave (# of schools with data)** |
| Arizona-Class of 2012 | 33% (161) | 40% (161) |  |
| Arizona-Class of 2013 | 33% (147) | 44% (148) |  |
| Nevada-Class of 2011 | 23% (6) |  |  |
| Nevada-Class of 2012 | 19% (4) |  |  |
| Nevada-Class of 2013 | 26% (6) |  |  |
| Nevada-Class of 2014 | 36% (5) |  |  |
| NYC-2008 |  |  | 44% (50) |
| NYC-2009 |  |  | 45% (51) |
| NYC-2010 | 23% (54) | 38% (52) |  |
| NYC-2011 | 23% (53) |  |  |
| Ohio-2013-14 | 27% (86) | 31% (84) | 30% (78) |
| Ohio-2014-15 | 25% (90) | 32% (90) | 33% (85) |
| **Weighted Average** | **30% (612)** | **38% (535)** | **37% (264)** |

Source: Data were obtained from department of education websites, via downloadable data files, and analyzed by Momentum Strategy & Research.