

STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY



2025 Renewal Performance Report for Futuro Academy

Per [NRS 388A.285](#) and [NAC 388A.415](#)

Issued June 26, 2025

CHARTER SCHOOL RENEWAL REPORT CONTENTS

1. School Overview.....	3
a. Address:	3
b. Campus Location and Enrollment Cap:	3
c. Governing Board Members.....	3
d. Academic Data Overview - NRS 388A.285(1)(a)	3
e. Financial Data Overview - NRS 388A.285(1)(a)	4
f. Organizational Data Overview - NRS 388A.285(1)(a).....	4
g. Enrollment History.....	5
2. Summary of Issued Notices and Identified Deficiencies – NRS 388A.285(1)(b)	5
a. Academic	5
b. Financial.....	6
c. Organizational.....	6
d. Site Evaluations	6
3. Summary of Overall Performance	6
4. Requirements for the Renewal Application – NRS 388A.285 (1)(c)	7
5. Criteria to be Used for Making a Renewal Decision – NRS 388A.285 (1)(d)	8
Appendix A: Nevada School Performance Framework Star Rating Descriptors / Score Ranges and School Reports	9
Appendix B: SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Rating Descriptors / Score Ranges and School Reports	11
Appendix C: Site Evaluation Reports	13
Appendix D: SPCSA Financial Performance Framework Results for 2020–21, 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24	14
Appendix E: SPCSA Organizational Performance Framework Results for 2020–21, 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24.....	15

1. School Overview

- a. Address:
 - i. 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV 89110
- b. Campus Location and Enrollment Cap:
 - i. Clark County
 - ii. Enrollment Cap:

	2024–25	2025–26
Grade Levels	K – 5	K – 5
Enrollment Cap	450	450

- c. Governing Board Members¹
 - i. Chair – Jennifer Roberts
 - ii. Secretary – Ela Garcia
 - iii. Member – Erik Simpkins
 - iv. Member – Julio Meza
 - v. Member – Khanh Andersen

- d. Academic Data Overview - NRS 388A.285(1)(a)²

Academic data available for the current charter term are displayed below, including:

- Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) index scores and star ratings. Due to COVID-19, 2018–19 NSPF data were applied to the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years, and for the 2021–22 school year, only NSPF index scores were calculated. NSPF star rating descriptors and score ranges are found in Appendix A, along with NSPF rating reports for each campus / school level.
- SPCSA Academic Performance Framework scores and ratings. Due to COVID-19 and a lack of NSPF ratings, the SPCSA did not publish Academic Framework ratings for the 2020–21 school year. SPCSA Academic Performance Framework rating descriptors and score ranges are found in Appendix B, along with SPCSA Academic Performance Framework rating reports for each campus / school level.
- Four-year graduation rates for high school campuses with graduating classes.
- If the school was identified by NDE as: CSI (Comprehensive Support and Improvement) – a very low performing school; TSI (Targeted Support and Improvement) – a school with consistently underperforming student groups; and/or ATSI (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement) – a school with very low performing student groups.³

¹ Board Member information based on Epicenter Board Center

² For schools applying for a third charter term and beyond, NAC 388A.415 provides that the SPCSA will give the academic performance of pupils a greater weight than that assigned to it on the first renewal. SPCSA staff will include academic performance data for any previous charter term for the Authority’s consideration.

³ Low-performing school identifications required of NDE under federal law ([20 USC §6311](#)).

2021–22 NSPF Index Score	Elementary: 20.0
2021–22 SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Score / Rating	Elementary: 25.0 / Does Not Meet Standard
2022–23 NSPF Index Score / Star Rating	Elementary: 57.5 / 3-star
2022–23 SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Score / Rating	Elementary: 69.5 / Meets Standard
2023–24 NSPF Index Score / Star Rating	Elementary: 52.5 / 3-star
2023–24 SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Score / Rating	Elementary: 65.5 / Meets Standard
Four-Year Graduation Rate	N/A
CSI, TSI, or ATSI Identification	Elementary: None

e. Financial Data Overview - NRS 388A.285(1)(a)

Year	Findings & Framework Results
2020–21	Meets the Standard
2021–22	Meets the Standard
2022–23	Meets the Standard
2023–24	Meets the Standard

f. Organizational Data Overview - NRS 388A.285(1)(a)

Year	Findings & Framework Results
2020–21	Meets Standard
2021–22	Meets Standard
2022–23	Meets Standard
2023–24	Meets Standard

g. Enrollment History

The grade count and student group enrollment rate data below are from the NDE October validation day for the last five school years, or the years within the current charter contract.⁴

Total Enrollment (Number of Students) by Grade Across All Existing Campuses:

Grade	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
K	72	70	65	73	86
1	88	72	74	67	85
2	111	80	77	81	73
3	99	100	76	72	83
4	65	93	90	76	76
5	0	61	80	87	70
Total	435	476	462	456	473

Enrollment Rates by Population:

Year	Total Enrolled	A %	B %	C %	H %	I %	M %	P %	ELL %	FRL %	IEP %
2020-21	435	0.9	8.2	5.2	81.8	0.6	2.7	0.2	46.2	>95.0	6.4
2021-22	476	1.0	7.5	5.0	83.1	0.0	2.9	0.2	46.4	>95.0	7.3
2022-23	462	1.2	9.7	4.7	80.9	0.2	2.5	0.4	44.8	>95.0	6.4
2023-24	456	0.8	9.2	4.1	83.3	0.0	1.9	0.4	44.5	>95.0	8.7
2024-25	473	0.6	11.4	4.6	79.7	0.0	3.1	0.4	42.7	>95.0	12.4

2024-25 Enrollment Rates for State, SPCSA, and Local County School District:

Entity	ELL %	FRL %	IEP %
State of Nevada	14.4	85.0	14.1
SPCSA	10.3	63.9	10.7
Clark County	16.2	95.8	14.3

2. Summary of Issued Notices and Identified Deficiencies – NRS 388A.285(1)(b)

The Authority Board has issued the following Notices to Futuro Academy:

a. Academic

The Authority Board has not issued any Academic Notices to Futuro Academy during the current charter term.

⁴ Abbreviations as follows: A – Asian; B – Black / African American; C – Caucasian / White; H – Hispanic / Latino; I – American Indian / Alaskan Native ; M – two or more races; P – Pacific Islander; ELL – English Language Learner; FRL – students qualifying for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch; IEP – students with an Individualized Education Program. To protect student privacy, rates associated with FRL, IEP, and ELL populations less than 10 students are displayed with an asterisk (*), and values less than 5 or greater than 95 percent are shown as <5.0 and >95.0, respectively. N/A indicates the population did not exist.

- b. Financial
The Authority Board has not issued any Financial Notices to Futuro Academy during the current charter term.
- c. Organizational
The Authority Board has not issued any Organizational Notices to Futuro Academy during the current charter term.
- d. Site Evaluations
SPCSA staff has not identified deficiencies during a site evaluation at Futuro Academy during the current charter term.

3. Summary of Overall Performance

Regarding academic performance, Futuro Academy currently offers instruction at the elementary school level, grades K-5, at one campus. As demonstrated by three Nevada School Performance Framework and SPCSA Academic Framework ratings over the current charter contract term, academic performance has been mixed, however, over the last two years, the school has met state and SPCSA academic standards. Copies of the NSPF and SPCSA Academic Performance Framework ratings are included as Appendices A and B.

Regarding the financial performance and viability of the school, SPCSA staff finds the financial performance of Futuro Academy to be strong. The school has earned a Meets the Standard rating on all of the SPCSA Financial Performance Framework rating cycles throughout the current charter term. Copies of the Financial Performance Framework reports are included as Appendix D.

The organizational health and performance of the school has been strong over the current charter term. Futuro Academy earned a Meets Standard rating on all of the SPCSA Organizational Performance Framework rating cycles throughout the current charter term. Copies of the Organizational Performance Framework reports are included as Appendix F.

Finally, SPCSA staff has conducted three site evaluations of Futuro Academy during the current charter term. SPCSA staff found many positive takeaways during these evaluations, including communication with students, consistency with the leadership team and governing board, and strong academic tiered levels of support to meet the needs of specialized populations. The most recent site evaluation from 2024–25 identified challenges related to chronic absenteeism and meeting the needs of an increasing population of students with special needs. See Appendix C for more details on the Futuro Academy site evaluations.

4. Requirements for the Renewal Application – [NRS 388A.285 \(1\)\(c\)](#)

Applicants for renewal will receive an application template to populate and submit to Authority staff between October 1 – October 15, 2025⁵. This template will be provided to schools no later than July 31, 2025.

Schools which are contemplating material amendments, e.g. changes to the mission statement, grade levels served, enrollment, facilities expansion, academic program, instructional delivery, management agreement, etc. will be permitted to submit such amendment requests in the event that the school is renewed. Schools are permitted to draft such amendment requests during the renewal process for filing immediately following the renewal decision, but the SPCSA will not give weight to such materials or testimony related to any contemplated changes during the renewal process. The inclusion of amendment materials will result in the return of the renewal application and a request for resubmission of a compliant and complete application from SPCSA staff.

It is the responsibility of the school to ensure that the content is accurate and reflects information provided by NDE and the SPCSA. Any discrepancies between the data submitted and data previously provided by NDE or the SPCSA will result in a request for resubmission of a compliant and complete application from SPCSA staff.

Schools are required to submit the agenda and draft minutes for the meeting where the governing body voted to approve the submission of the renewal application into the appropriate areas in Epicenter prior to filing the renewal application. Failure to submit the agenda and draft minutes showing a school board's approval will result in the return of the renewal application and a request for resubmission of a compliant and complete application from SPCSA staff.

⁵ [NRS 388A.285 \(3\)](#)

5. Criteria to be Used for Making a Renewal Decision – [NRS 388A.285 \(1\)\(d\)](#)

Renewal decisions for schools operating under charter contracts are based on historic academic, organization, and financial performance data as evidenced by both the Nevada School Performance Framework as well as the SPCSA Performance Framework. Historical anecdotes or unsolicited data, e.g. leadership changes or past programmatic adjustments, may be included in the application but will be given less weight when considered by the Authority in making renewal decisions. In accordance with [NAC 388A.415](#)(10) academic performance of pupils as measured by the SPCSA's Academic Performance Framework and the Nevada School Performance Framework will be given the greatest weight in the renewal decision. Renewal decisions will also be based on the overall financial and organizational health of the public charter school. Evidence from both the financial framework and financial audits will be used to assess the overall financial health of the public charter school. The Epicenter platform will be used to inform the assessment of the organizational health of a school as well as the SPCSA Organizational Performance Framework. It bears repeating, however, that historical academic performance, as evidenced by the Nevada School Performance Framework and the SPCSA's Academic Performance Framework will be given the greatest weight.

For schools applying for a third charter term and beyond, [NAC 388A.415](#) provides that the State Public Charter School Authority will give the academic performance of pupils a greater weight than that assigned to it on the first renewal. SPCSA staff will include academic performance data for any previous charter term for the Authority's consideration.

Finally, it is noteworthy that SB 451 from the 80th Legislative Session (2019), now codified in [NRS 388A.285](#)(6) allows the Authority to renew charter schools for variable lengths, from three to ten years. If a school is recommended for renewal, SPCSA staff will generally recommend a six-year term for schools that consistently meet performance expectations according to the Nevada School Performance Framework and the SPCSA's Academic Performance Framework. Schools that exceed expectations may be recommended for a term longer than six years. If recommended for renewal, schools that do not consistently meet expectations are likely to be recommended for a term of less than six years.

Appendix A: Nevada School Performance Framework Star Rating
Descriptors / Score Ranges and School Reports


NSPF star rating descriptors and score ranges, summarized per the most recent [NDE NSPF Manual](#).

NSPF Star Rating	NSPF Star Rating Descriptor	NSPF Score Range
1 Star	A school not meeting state academic standards.	Elementary and high: <27 Middle: <29
2 Stars	A school partially meeting state academic standards.	Elementary and high: ≥ 27 to <50 Middle: ≥ 29 to <50
3 Stars	An adequate school meeting state academic standards.	Elementary: ≥ 50 to <67 Middle and high: ≥ 50 to <70
4 Stars	A commendable school above state academic standards.	Elementary: ≥ 67 to <84 Middle: ≥ 70 to <80 High: ≥ 70 to <82
5 Stars	A superior school exceeding state academic standards.	Elementary: ≥ 84 to 100 Middle: ≥ 80 to 100 High: ≥ 82 to 100


Futuro Academy Elementary

School Year 2021-2022 Nevada School Rating

School Level: Elementary School
Grade Levels: KG-04
District: State Public Charter School Authority
School Address: 920 N. Lamb Blvd
 Las Vegas, NV 89110



School Type: SPCSA
School Designation: No Designation
 95% Assessment Participation: Warning




Student Race/Ethnicity

5.0% White
 7.5% BI/Afr Am
 83.1% Hisp/Latino
 1.0% Asian
 N/A% Am Ind/AK Nat
 0.2% Pac Isl
 2.9% Two or More

School Performance History

School Year	Index Score/Star Rating
2020-2021	22.5 NR
2019-2020	22.5 NR

Additional Student Groups



What does my school rating mean?

In accordance with the U.S. Department of Education's addendum in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, flexibility was offered with State accountability reporting for the 2021-2022 school year. Star ratings are not calculated for SY21-22, but all schools have been provided with index scores 1-100 in order to meaningfully differentiate schools. Additionally, schools that have the required Indicators and Measures to be evaluated for CSI, TSI, or ATSI supports are evaluated for designated supports.

How are star ratings determined based on total index score?

In accordance with the U.S. Department of Education's addendum for accountability, school star ratings are not calculated for the 2021-2022 school year.

How are school star ratings determined?

Schools receive points based on student performance across various Indicators and Measures. These points are totaled and divided by the points possible to produce an index score from 1-100.

2021-2022 School Performance



Academic Achievement Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Pooled Proficiency	16.0	49.2
Math Proficiency	12.7	49.2
ELA Proficiency	23.0	55.4
Science Proficiency	<5	30.4
Read-by-Grade-3 Proficiency	19.3	51.8



Growth Indicator

Measure	School Median	District Median
Math MGP	35.0	52.0
ELA MGP	45.0	53.0
School Rate		District Rate
Met Math AGP Target	20.4	53.1
Met ELA AGP Target	44.4	61.2



English Language Proficiency Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Met EL AGP Target	26.0	38.4



Student Engagement Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Chronic Absenteeism	51.7	21.7
Climate Survey Participation	>95	N/A



Closing Opportunity Gaps Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Prior Non-Proficient Met Math AGP Target	18.9	40.9
Prior Non-Proficient Met ELA AGP Target	42.3	52.2

Climate Survey Participation is not a point-earning measure.



Academic Achievement

Academic Achievement is a measure of student performance based on a single administration of the State assessment. Cut scores are set that determine the achievement level needed to be proficient on the assessment. Student Proficiency is determined by calculating the percent of students in the school who met (Level 3) and exceed standards (Level 4) on the Smarter Balanced, Nevada Science, and Nevada Alternate assessments. Points are earned based on a pooled average (total number of students proficient on all three assessments divided by total number of students taking all three assessments). Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.


Pooled Proficiency Points Earned: 1/20

	2022 %	2022 % District	2021 %	2021 % District
Pooled Proficiency	16.0	49.2		

Math Proficient

Groups	2022 %	2022 % District	2022 % MIP	2021 %	2021 % District	2021 % MIP
All Students	12.7	49.2	51.1			
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	28.5	37.6			
Asian	-	72.8	70.4			
Black/African American	5.2	30.3	35.7			
Hispanic/Latino	11.6	37.9	42.7			
Pacific Islander	N/A	47.2	50.9			
Two or More Races	-	55.6	57.5			
White/Caucasian	-	60.7	61.3			
Special Education	<5	26.3	32.1			
English Learners Current + Former	11.8	34.9	39			
English Learners Current	9.9	25.5				
Economically Disadvantaged	12.7	35.6	42			

Math Assessments % Proficient






Academic Achievement

ELA Proficient

Groups	2022 %	2022 % District	2022 % MIP	2021 %	2021 % District	2021 % MIP
All Students	23.0	55.4	59.2			
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	40.8	45.4			
Asian	-	74.9	76.7			
Black/African American	21.0	39.8	45.4			
Hispanic/Latino	20.7	45.1	50.8			
Pacific Islander	N/A	53.7	60			
Two or More Races	-	61.5	66.2			
White/Caucasian	-	65.5	69			
Special Education	11.1	25.5	33.5			
English Learners Current + Former	19.5	37.4	44.4			
English Learners Current	13.5	24.4				
Economically Disadvantaged	23.0	42.8	49.4			


ELA Assessments % Proficient



Science Proficient

Groups	2022 %	2022 % District	2021 %	2021 % District
All Students	<5	30.4		
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	17.6		
Asian	N/A	52.9		
Black/African American	-	17.6		
Hispanic/Latino	<5	19.2		
Pacific Islander	N/A	28.3		
Two or More Races	N/A	34.9		
White/Caucasian	-	40.8		
Special Education	-	11.6		
English Learners Current + Former	<5	15.8		
English Learners Current	<5	<5		
Economically Disadvantaged	<5	19.4		

Science Assessments % Proficient






Academic Achievement

Read by Grade 3 Proficient

Read by Grade 3 Points Earned: 1/5

Groups	2022 %	2022 % District	2021 %	2021 % District
All Students	19.3	51.8		
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	33.3		
Asian	-	71.7		
Black/African American	-	33.0		
Hispanic/Latino	17.3	43.5		
Pacific Islander	N/A	49.2		
Two or More Races	N/A	57.4		
White/Caucasian	-	60.8		
Special Education	-	23.7		
English Learners Current + Former	14.8	37.1		
English Learners Current	14.8	30.7		
Economically Disadvantaged	19.3	40.5		


Read by Grade 3
% Proficient

**Academic Achievement****Participation on State Assessments**

At least 95% of all students and 95% of students in each subgroup must participate in the state Math and ELA assessments. Any group or subgroup that does not meet 95% participation on each assessment will be flagged. In the first year of flags, a school will receive a “participation warning” but will have no points deducted. A second consecutive year of flags will result in a school receiving a “participation penalty” and points will be deducted from the Academic Achievement Indicator, based upon the number of flags. Subsequent consecutive years of flags will result in points deducted. Note that the same subgroups do not need to be flagged each year to receive warnings/penalties. Only Math and ELA assessments impact participation warnings/penalties.

Participation Penalty:**Yellow indicates 95% participation requirement not met.**

Groups	2022 % Math	2022 % ELA	2021 % Math	2021 % ELA
All Students	94.0%	94.4%		
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	N/A		
Asian	-	-		
Black/African American	90.4%	90.4%		
Hispanic/Latino	>=95%	>=95%		
Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A		
Two or More Races	-	-		
White/Caucasian	-	-		
Special Education	-	-		
English Learners Current + Former	N/A	N/A		
English Learners Current	>=95%	>=95%		
Economically Disadvantaged	94.0%	94.4%		



Student Growth

Student growth is a measure of performance on the state assessments over time.

- Student Growth Percentile (SGP) is a measure of student achievement over time and compares the achievement over time and compares the achievement of similar subgroups of students from one test administration to the next. An SGP from 35 to 65 is considered typical growth.
- Median Growth Percentile (MGP) is a summary of the SGPs in a school. A school's MGP is determined by rank ordering all the SGPs in the school from the lowest to highest and finding the median or middle number.
- Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) describes the amount of growth a student needs to remain or become proficient on the state assessment in three years. This is the minimum SGP a student must meet or exceed to be on track to target.

Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

MGP Growth Data

Math MGP Points Earned: 2/10

ELA MGP Points Earned: 4/10

Groups	2022 Math MGP	2022 District Math MGP	2022 ELA MGP	2022 District ELA MGP	2021 Math MGP	2021 District Math MGP	2021 ELA MGP	2021 District ELA MGP
All Students	35.0	52.0	45.0	53.0				
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	54.0	N/A	60.5				
Asian	N/A	60.0	N/A	59.0				
Black/African American	-	49.0	-	53.0				
Hispanic/Latino	36.0	49.0	45.0	51.0				
Pacific Islander	N/A	57.0	N/A	57.0				
Two or More Races	-	54.5	-	53.0				
White/Caucasian	-	55.0	-	55.0				
Special Education	-	46.0	-	43.0				
English Learners Current + Former	35.0	47.0	42.0	49.0				
English Learners Current	36.0	44.0	42.0	44.0				
Economically Disadvantaged	35.0	49.0	45.0	49.0				

AGP Growth Data

Math AGP Points Earned: 0.5/7.5

ELA AGP Points Earned: 2.5/7.5

Groups	2022 Math AGP	2022 District Math AGP	2022 ELA AGP	2022 District ELA AGP	2021 Math AGP	2021 District Math AGP	2021 ELA AGP	2021 District ELA AGP
All Students	20.4	53.1	44.4	61.2				
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	45.7	N/A	66.6				
Asian	N/A	68.8	N/A	73.9				
Black/African American	-	41.8	-	55.8				
Hispanic/Latino	20.7	45.0	43.8	55.4				
Pacific Islander	N/A	50.4	N/A	61.9				
Two or More Races	-	59.6	-	62.7				
White/Caucasian	-	59.6	-	65.1				
Special Education	-	35.9	-	41.3				
English Learners Current + Former	15.5	41.2	36.7	52.0				
English Learners Current	11.4	32.5	30.7	43.1				
Economically Disadvantaged	20.4	43.7	44.4	53.5				

For additional information, please see <https://ngma.bighorn.doe.nv.gov/nvgrowthmodel/>.




English Language

English Language Proficiency is a measure of English Learners (ELs) achieving English Language proficiency on the state English Language Proficiency assessment, WIDA. The NSPF includes Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGPs) to determine if ELs are meeting the goal toward English Language proficiency. Students meeting their growth targets should be on track to become English proficient and exit EL status in five years. Schools need to have ten records in the EL subgroup to receive points. Any school with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

English Language Points Earned: 1/10

	2022 number of ELs With AGP Target	2022 % of EL Meeting AGP	2022 % District	2021 number of ELs With AGP Target	2021 % of EL Meeting AGP	2021 % District
ELPA	169	26.0	38.4			



For additional information, please see <https://ngma.bighorn.doe.nv.gov/nvgrowthmodel/>



Closing Opportunity Gaps

Closing Opportunity Gaps is a measure of non-proficiency. This measure includes students who were non-proficient on the previous year's state assessment and determines if those students in the current assessment administration succeeded in meeting their Adequate Growth Percentile target. Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

Groups	Math AGP Points Earned: 2/10				ELA AGP Points Earned: 6/10			
	2022 % Meeting AGP Math	2022 % District Math	2022 % Meeting AGP ELA	2022 % District ELA	2021 % Meeting AGP Math	2021 % District Math	2021 % Meeting AGP ELA	2021 % District ELA
All Students	18.9	40.9	42.3	52.2				
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	40.7	N/A	57.6				
Asian	N/A	50.6	N/A	63.3				
Black/African American	-	36.1	-	49.4				
Hispanic/Latino	18.5	36.3	39.4	49.2				
Pacific Islander	N/A	43.2	N/A	54.6				
Two or More Races	-	44.5	-	55.0				
White/Caucasian	-	47.9	-	55.2				
Special Education	-	27.6	-	35.9				
English Learners Current + Former	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
English Learners Current	12.1	27.6	29.7	41.7				
Economically Disadvantaged	18.9	35.5	42.3	47.6				



Student Engagement

Chronic absenteeism is a measure of Student Engagement. Research shows that attendance is tied to student achievement. Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing 10 percent, or more, of school days for any reason, including excused, unexcused, or disciplinary absences. Students who are absent due to school-sponsored activities are not considered absent for the purposes of this calculation. Schools that reduce their chronic absenteeism rate by 10 percent or more over the prior year may receive incentive points up to the maximum points possible. Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with a population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.


Chronic Absenteeism

Chronic Absenteeism Points Earned: 0/10

Groups	2022 % Chronically Absent	2022 % District	2021 % Chronically Absent	2021 % District
All Students	51.7	21.7		
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	15.8		
Asian	-	11.9		
Black/African American	55.2	27.6		
Hispanic/Latino	51.5	25.8		
Pacific Islander	-	32.8		
Two or More Races	50.0	22.2		
White/Caucasian	56.0	16.9		
Special Education	55.8	25.4		
English Learners Current + Former	N/A	N/A		
English Learners Current	50.9	22.6		
Economically Disadvantaged	51.7	29.3		

Reducing Chronic Absenteeism by 10% Points Earned: NA


Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)




Futuro Academy Elementary

School Year 2022-2023 Nevada School Rating

School Level: Elementary School
Grade Levels: KG-05
District: State Public Charter School Authority
School Address: 920 N. Lamb Blvd
 Las Vegas, NV 89110



School Type: SPCSA
School Designation: No Designation
95% Assessment Participation: Met




Student Race/Ethnicity

4.7% White
 9.7% BI/Afr Am
 80.9% Hisp/Latino
 1.2% Asian
 0.2% Am Ind/AK Nat
 0.4% Pac Isl
 2.5% Two or More

School Performance History

School Year	Index Score/Star Rating
2021-2022	20.0 NR
2020-2021	22.5 NR

Additional Student Groups




What does my school rating mean?

Three-Star school: Identifies an **adequate** school that has met the state's standard for performance. The all-students group has met expectations for academic achievement or growth. Subgroups meet expectations for academic achievement or growth with little exception; however, no group is far below standard. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard.

How are school star ratings determined?

Schools receive points based on student performance across various Indicators and Measures. These points are totaled and divided by the points possible to produce an index score from 1-100. This index score is associated with a one- to five-star school rating.

How are star ratings determined based on total index score?



2022-2023 School Performance



Academic Achievement Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Pooled Proficiency	28.1	50.0
Math Proficiency	24.7	52.0
ELA Proficiency	39.1	54.6
Science Proficiency	5.2	29.8
Read-by-Grade-3 Proficiency	28.5	52.6



Growth Indicator

Measure	School Median	District Median
Math MGP	70.0	55.0
ELA MGP	72.0	55.0
School Rate		District Rate
Met Math AGP Target	48.9	50.8
Met ELA AGP Target	57.8	52.9



English Language Proficiency Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Met EL AGP Target	18.3	41.5



Student Engagement Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Chronic Absenteeism	29.7	22.9
Climate Survey Participation	87.0	N/A




Closing Opportunity Gaps Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Prior Non-Proficient Met Math AGP Target	42.4	31.9
Prior Non-Proficient Met ELA AGP Target	50.8	37.1

** Reduction in Chronic Absenteeism (CA): Received 1 points in Student Engagement for reducing CA rate by 10% or more over prior year.

Climate Survey Participation is not a point-earning measure.

**Academic Achievement**


Academic Achievement is a measure of student performance based on a single administration of the State assessment. Cut scores are set that determine the achievement level needed to be proficient on the assessment. Student Proficiency is determined by calculating the percent of students in the school who met (Level 3) and exceed standards (Level 4) on the Smarter Balanced, Nevada Science, and Nevada Alternate assessments. Points are earned based on a pooled average (total number of students proficient on all three assessments divided by total number of students taking all three assessments). Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

Pooled Proficiency Points Earned: 2/20

	2023 %	2023 % District	2022 %	2022 % District
Pooled Proficiency	28.1	50.0	16.0	49.2

Math Proficient

Groups	2023 %	2023 % District	2023 % MIP	2022 %	2022 % District	2022 % MIP
All Students	24.7	52.0	53.5	12.7	49.2	51.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	35.7	40.7	N/A	28.5	37.6
Asian	-	74.5	71.9	-	72.8	70.4
Black/African American	35.0	31.4	38.9	5.2	30.3	35.7
Hispanic/Latino	22.4	42.2	45.5	11.6	37.9	42.7
Pacific Islander	-	49.0	53.4	N/A	47.2	50.9
Two or More Races	-	57.8	59.6	-	55.6	57.5
White/Caucasian	36.3	63.7	63.3	-	60.7	61.3
Special Education	<5	29.1	35.5	<5	26.3	32.1
English Learners Current + Former	18.4	38.1	42	11.8	34.9	39
English Learners Current	13.7	27.6		9.9	25.5	
Economically Disadvantaged	24.7	39.0	44.9	12.7	35.6	42


**Math Assessments
% Proficient**



Academic Achievement


ELA Proficient

Groups	2023 %	2023 % District	2023 % MIP	2022 %	2022 % District	2022 % MIP
All Students	39.1	54.6	61.2	23.0	55.4	59.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	48.2	48.1	N/A	40.8	45.4
Asian	-	74.1	77.8	-	74.9	76.7
Black/African American	45.0	37.5	48.2	21.0	39.8	45.4
Hispanic/Latino	36.3	45.9	53.2	20.7	45.1	50.8
Pacific Islander	-	49.0	62	N/A	53.7	60
Two or More Races	-	60.7	67.9	-	61.5	66.2
White/Caucasian	63.6	64.4	70.6	-	65.5	69
Special Education	9.0	27.4	36.8	11.1	25.5	33.5
English Learners Current + Former	31.9	37.6	47.2	19.5	37.4	44.4
English Learners Current	25.6	24.1		13.5	24.4	
Economically Disadvantaged	39.1	42.0	51.9	23.0	42.8	49.4

ELA Assessments
% Proficient

Science Proficient

Groups	2023 %	2023 % District	2022 %	2022 % District
All Students	5.2	29.8	<5	30.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	27.7	N/A	17.6
Asian	-	51.0	N/A	52.9
Black/African American	-	15.3	-	17.6
Hispanic/Latino	5.0	19.5	<5	19.2
Pacific Islander	N/A	18.7	N/A	28.3
Two or More Races	-	34.5	N/A	34.9
White/Caucasian	-	40.9	-	40.8
Special Education	-	12.2	-	11.6
English Learners Current + Former	6.2	15.1	<5	15.8
English Learners Current	<5	<5	<5	<5
Economically Disadvantaged	5.2	17.6	<5	19.4

Science Assessments
% Proficient




Academic Achievement

Read by Grade 3 Proficient

Read by Grade 3 Points Earned: 2/5

Groups	2023 %	2023 % District	2022 %	2022 % District
All Students	28.5	52.6	19.3	51.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	44.0	N/A	33.3
Asian	N/A	68.5	-	71.7
Black/African American	-	33.9	-	33.0
Hispanic/Latino	26.7	44.2	17.3	43.5
Pacific Islander	-	48.4	N/A	49.2
Two or More Races	-	62.3	N/A	57.4
White/Caucasian	-	62.5	-	60.8
Special Education	-	29.5	-	23.7
English Learners Current + Former	27.2	36.1	14.8	37.1
English Learners Current	23.8	27.6	14.8	30.7
Economically Disadvantaged	28.5	40.3	19.3	40.5

Read by Grade 3
% Proficient



Academic Achievement

Participation on State Assessments

At least 95% of all students and 95% of students in each subgroup must participate in the state Math and ELA assessments. Any group or subgroup that does not meet 95% participation on each assessment will be flagged. In the first year of flags, a school will receive a “participation warning” but will have no points deducted. A second consecutive year of flags will result in a school receiving a “participation penalty” and points will be deducted from the Academic Achievement Indicator, based upon the number of flags. Subsequent consecutive years of flags will result in points deducted. Note that the same subgroups do not need to be flagged each year to receive warnings/penalties. Only Math and ELA assessments impact participation warnings/penalties.

Participation Penalty: 0

Yellow indicates 95% participation requirement not met.

Groups	2023 % Math	2023 % ELA	2022 % Math	2022 % ELA
All Students	>=95%	>=95%	94.0%	94.4%
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	-	-	-	-
Black/African American	>=95%	>=95%	90.4%	90.4%
Hispanic/Latino	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
Pacific Islander	-	-	N/A	N/A
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-
White/Caucasian	-	-	-	-
Special Education	>=95%	>=95%	-	-
English Learners Current + Former	>=95%	>=95%	N/A	N/A
English Learners Current	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
Economically Disadvantaged	>=95%	>=95%	94.0%	94.4%

'N/A' indicates that this population was not present. '**' indicates that the data was not available. '-' indicates data not presented for groups fewer than 10.



Student Growth

Student growth is a measure of performance on the state assessments over time.

- Student Growth Percentile (SGP) is a measure of student achievement over time and compares the achievement over time and compares the achievement of similar subgroups of students from one test administration to the next. An SGP from 35 to 65 is considered typical growth.
- Median Growth Percentile (MGP) is a summary of the SGPs in a school. A school's MGP is determined by rank ordering all the SGPs in the school from the lowest to highest and finding the median or middle number.
- Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) describes the amount of growth a student needs to remain or become proficient on the state assessment in three years. This is the minimum SGP a student must meet or exceed to be on track to target.

Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

MGP Growth Data

Math MGP Points Earned: 10/10

ELA MGP Points Earned: 10/10

Groups	2023 Math MGP	2023 District Math MGP	2023 ELA MGP	2023 District ELA MGP	2022 Math MGP	2022 District Math MGP	2022 ELA MGP	2022 District ELA MGP
All Students	70.0	55.0	72.0	55.0	35.0	52.0	45.0	53.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	46.0	N/A	52.0	N/A	54.0	N/A	60.5
Asian	-	61.0	-	61.0	N/A	60.0	N/A	59.0
Black/African American	66.0	52.0	75.0	50.0	-	49.0	-	53.0
Hispanic/Latino	66.5	54.0	71.0	53.0	36.0	49.0	45.0	51.0
Pacific Islander	N/A	60.5	N/A	55.5	N/A	57.0	N/A	57.0
Two or More Races	-	54.0	-	55.0	-	54.5	-	53.0
White/Caucasian	-	56.0	-	57.0	-	55.0	-	55.0
Special Education	40.0	49.0	39.0	51.0	-	46.0	-	43.0
English Learners Current + Former	64.5	55.0	66.5	54.0	35.0	47.0	42.0	49.0
English Learners Current	60.0	54.0	65.0	53.0	36.0	44.0	42.0	44.0
Economically Disadvantaged	70.0	54.0	72.0	53.0	35.0	49.0	45.0	49.0

AGP Growth Data

Math AGP Points Earned: 6.5/7.5

ELA AGP Points Earned: 6/7.5

Groups	2023 Math AGP	2023 District Math AGP	2023 ELA AGP	2023 District ELA AGP	2022 Math AGP	2022 District Math AGP	2022 ELA AGP	2022 District ELA AGP
All Students	48.9	50.8	57.8	52.9	20.4	53.1	44.4	61.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	41.3	N/A	48.2	N/A	45.7	N/A	66.6
Asian	-	66.5	-	67.6	N/A	68.8	N/A	73.9
Black/African American	58.3	38.1	66.6	42.1	-	41.8	-	55.8
Hispanic/Latino	45.9	43.8	58.0	46.9	20.7	45.0	43.8	55.4
Pacific Islander	N/A	52.8	N/A	51.4	N/A	50.4	N/A	61.9
Two or More Races	-	52.0	-	56.1	-	59.6	-	62.7
White/Caucasian	-	58.8	-	58.9	-	59.6	-	65.1
Special Education	21.4	32.3	14.2	34.0	-	35.9	-	41.3
English Learners Current + Former	40.2	41.8	47.2	43.1	15.5	41.2	36.7	52.0
English Learners Current	34.3	33.5	43.7	33.8	11.4	32.5	30.7	43.1
Economically Disadvantaged	48.9	43.0	57.8	45.2	20.4	43.7	44.4	53.5

For additional information, please see <https://ngma.bighorn.doe.nv.gov/nvgrowthmodel/>.




English Language

English Language Proficiency is a measure of English Learners (ELs) achieving English Language proficiency on the state English Language Proficiency assessment, WIDA. The NSPF includes Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGPs) to determine if ELs are meeting the goal toward English Language proficiency. Students meeting their growth targets should be on track to become English proficient and exit EL status in five years. Schools need to have ten records in the EL subgroup to receive points. Any school with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

English Language Points Earned: 1/10

	2023 number of ELs With AGP	2023 % of EL Meeting AGP	2023 % District	2022 number of ELs With AGP	2022 % of EL Meeting AGP	2022 % District
	Target	AGP		Target	AGP	
ELPA	158	18.3	41.5	169	26.0	38.4



For additional information, please see <https://ngma.bighorn.doe.nv.gov/nvgrowthmodel/>



Closing Opportunity Gaps

Closing Opportunity Gaps is a measure of non-proficiency. This measure includes students who were non-proficient on the previous year's state assessment and determines if those students in the current assessment administration succeeded in meeting their Adequate Growth Percentile target. Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

Groups	Math AGP Points Earned: 10/10				ELA AGP Points Earned: 9/10			
	2023 % Meeting AGP Math	2023 % District Math	2023 % Meeting AGP ELA	2023 % District ELA	2022 % Meeting AGP Math	2022 % District Math	2022 % Meeting AGP ELA	2022 % District ELA
All Students	42.4	31.9	50.8	37.1	18.9	40.9	42.3	52.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	26.3	N/A	28.5	N/A	40.7	N/A	57.6
Asian	-	42.0	-	48.2	N/A	50.6	N/A	63.3
Black/African American	54.5	25.9	-	29.9	-	36.1	-	49.4
Hispanic/Latino	40.1	29.9	51.0	34.4	18.5	36.3	39.4	49.2
Pacific Islander	N/A	33.3	N/A	41.2	N/A	43.2	N/A	54.6
Two or More Races	-	31.3	-	40.3	-	44.5	-	55.0
White/Caucasian	-	37.8	-	42.6	-	47.9	-	55.2
Special Education	21.4	20.8	7.6	25.2	-	27.6	-	35.9
English Learners Current + Former	35.9	27.5	40.6	31.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Learners Current	31.0	25.4	38.5	30.3	12.1	27.6	29.7	41.7
Economically Disadvantaged	42.4	28.7	50.8	33.1	18.9	35.5	42.3	47.6



Student Engagement

Chronic absenteeism is a measure of Student Engagement. Research shows that attendance is tied to student achievement. Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing 10 percent, or more, of school days for any reason, including excused, unexcused, or disciplinary absences. Students who are absent due to school-sponsored activities are not considered absent for the purposes of this calculation. Schools that reduce their chronic absenteeism rate by 10 percent or more over the prior year may receive incentive points up to the maximum points possible. Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with a population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.


Chronic Absenteeism

Chronic Absenteeism Points Earned: 0/10

Groups	2023 % Chronically Absent	2023 % District	2022 % Chronically Absent	2022 % District
All Students	29.7	22.9	51.7	21.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	24.0	N/A	15.8
Asian	-	12.9	-	11.9
Black/African American	36.8	30.1	55.2	27.6
Hispanic/Latino	29.3	27.5	51.5	25.8
Pacific Islander	-	31.6	-	32.8
Two or More Races	41.6	21.4	50.0	22.2
White/Caucasian	28.5	17.1	56.0	16.9
Special Education	31.5	26.7	55.8	25.4
English Learners Current + Former	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Learners Current	30.0	25.4	50.9	22.6
Economically Disadvantaged	29.7	30.4	51.7	29.3

Reducing Chronic Absenteeism by 10% Points Earned: 1

Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)




School Level: Elementary School

Grade Levels: KG-05

District: State Public Charter School Authority

School 920 N. Lamb Blvd

Address: Las Vegas, NV 89110




52.5
Total Index Score

School Type: SPCSA

School Designation: No Designation

95% Assessment Participation: Met




Student Race/Ethnicity
4.1% White
9.2% BI/Afr Am
83.3% Hisp/Latino
0.8% Asian
N/A% Am Ind/AK Nat
0.4% Pac Isl
1.9% Two or More

School Performance History

School Year	Index Score/Star Rating
2022-2023	57.5 ★★★★★
2021-2022	20.0 NR

Additional Student Groups



What does my school rating mean?
Three-Star school: Identifies an **adequate** school that has met the state's standard for performance. The all-students group has met expectations for academic achievement or growth. Subgroups meet expectations for academic achievement or growth with little exception; however, no group is far below standard. The school must submit an improvement plan that identifies supports tailored to subgroups and indicators that are below standard.

How are school star ratings determined?
Schools receive points based on student performance across various Indicators and Measures. These points are totaled and divided by the points possible to produce an index score from 1-100. This index score is associated with a one- to five-star school rating.

How are star ratings determined based on total index score?
Below 27 ★
At or above 27 but less than 50 ★★
At or above 50 and less than 67 ★★★
At or above 67 and less than 84 ★★★★
At or above 84 ★★★★★

2023-2024 School Performance



5/25

Academic Achievement Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Pooled Proficiency	30.2	48.3
Math Proficiency	27.5	51.2
ELA Proficiency	41.5	54.6
Science Proficiency	7.1	21.2
Read-by-Grade-3 Proficiency	34.3	51.2




29.5/35

Growth Indicator

Measure	School Median	District Median
Math MGP	65.0	52.0
ELA MGP	71.0	54.0

	School Rate	District Rate
Met Math AGP Target	34.6	44.4
Met ELA AGP Target	58.5	54.0



7/10

English Language Proficiency Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Met EL AGP Target	49.6	48.4



**2/10

Student Engagement Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Chronic Absenteeism	22.3	20.7
Climate Survey Participation	93.0	N/A



9/20

Closing Opportunity Gaps Indicator

Measure	School Rate	District Rate
Prior Non-Proficient Met Math AGP Target	21.4	22.5
Prior Non-Proficient Met ELA AGP Target	42.5	36.5

** Reduction in Chronic Absenteeism (CA): Received 1 points in Student Engagement for reducing CA rate by 10% or more over prior year.

Climate Survey Participation is not a point-earning measure.

5/25

Academic Achievement


Academic Achievement is a measure of student performance based on a single administration of the State assessment. Cut scores are set that determine the achievement level needed to be proficient on the assessment. Student Proficiency is determined by calculating the percent of students in the school who met (Level 3) and exceed standards (Level 4) on the Smarter Balanced, Nevada Science, and Nevada Alternate assessments. Points are earned based on a pooled average (total number of students proficient on all three assessments divided by total number of students taking all three assessments). Schools need to have ten records in the “all students” group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

Pooled Proficiency Points Earned: 3/20

	2024 %	2024 % District	2023 %	2023 % District
Pooled Proficiency	30.2	48.3	28.1	50.0

Math Proficient

Groups	2024 %	2024 % District	2024 % MIP	2023 %	2023 % District	2023 % MIP
All Students	27.5	51.2	55.8	24.7	52.0	53.5
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	40.7	43.7	N/A	35.7	40.7
Asian	-	74.8	73.3	-	74.5	71.9
Black/African American	23.8	31.7	42	35.0	31.4	38.9
Hispanic/Latino	26.7	41.7	48.2	22.4	42.2	45.5
Pacific Islander	-	45.9	55.7	-	49.0	53.4
Two or More Races	-	57.2	61.6	-	57.8	59.6
White/Caucasian	-	62.7	65.1	36.3	63.7	63.3
Special Education	9.0	26.9	38.8	<5	29.1	35.5
English Learners Current + Former	21.2	38.7	44.9	18.4	38.1	42
English Learners Current	10.3	27.5		13.7	27.6	
Economically Disadvantaged	27.5	40.4	47.7	24.7	39.0	44.9






Academic Achievement


ELA Proficient

Groups	2024 %	2024 % District	2024 % MIP	2023 %	2023 % District	2023 % MIP
All Students	41.5	54.6	63.1	39.1	54.6	61.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	57.4	50.7	N/A	48.2	48.1
Asian	-	75.3	78.9	-	74.1	77.8
Black/African American	42.8	36.5	50.8	45.0	37.5	48.2
Hispanic/Latino	38.7	46.0	55.6	36.3	45.9	53.2
Pacific Islander	-	48.3	63.9	-	49.0	62
Two or More Races	-	60.4	69.5	-	60.7	67.9
White/Caucasian	-	65.2	72.1	63.6	64.4	70.6
Special Education	<5	25.8	39.9	9.0	27.4	36.8
English Learners Current + Former	32.7	39.5	49.8	31.9	37.6	47.2
English Learners Current	14.9	25.3		25.6	24.1	
Economically Disadvantaged	41.5	44.1	54.4	39.1	42.0	51.9



Science Proficient

Groups	2024 %	2024 % District	2023 %	2023 % District
All Students	7.1	21.2	5.2	29.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	16.6	N/A	27.7
Asian	-	35.5	-	51.0
Black/African American	-	10.4	-	15.3
Hispanic/Latino	7.1	12.9	5.0	19.5
Pacific Islander	N/A	19.1	N/A	18.7
Two or More Races	-	27.2	-	34.5
White/Caucasian	-	29.6	-	40.9
Special Education	-	7.6	-	12.2
English Learners Current + Former	<5	10.4	6.2	15.1
English Learners Current	<5	<5	<5	<5
Economically Disadvantaged	7.1	12.4	5.2	17.6






Academic Achievement

Read by Grade 3 Proficient			Read by Grade 3 Points Earned: 2/5	
Groups	2024 %	2024 % District	2023 %	2023 % District
All Students	34.3	51.2	28.5	52.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	60.0	N/A	44.0
Asian	N/A	71.0	N/A	68.5
Black/African American	-	32.7	-	33.9
Hispanic/Latino	32.7	43.7	26.7	44.2
Pacific Islander	N/A	45.9	-	48.4
Two or More Races	-	58.4	-	62.3
White/Caucasian	-	60.7	-	62.5
Special Education	-	27.0	-	29.5
English Learners Current + Former	17.2	36.6	27.2	36.1
English Learners Current	11.1	28.5	23.8	27.6
Economically Disadvantaged	34.3	42.4	28.5	40.3

Read by Grade 3
% Proficient





Academic Achievement


Participation on State Assessments

At least 95% of all students and 95% of students in each subgroup must participate in the state Math and ELA assessments. Any group or subgroup that does not meet 95% participation on each assessment will be flagged. In the first year of flags, a school will receive a “participation warning” but will have no points deducted. A second consecutive year of flags will result in a school receiving a “participation penalty” and points will be deducted from the Academic Achievement Indicator, based upon the number of flags. Subsequent consecutive years of flags will result in points deducted. Note that the same subgroups do not need to be flagged each year to receive warnings/penalties. Only Math and ELA assessments impact participation warnings/penalties.

Participation Penalty: 0

Yellow indicates 95% participation requirement not met.

Groups	2024 % Math	2024 % ELA	2023 % Math	2023 % ELA
All Students	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	-	-	-	-
Black/African American	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
Hispanic/Latino	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	-	-	-	-
White/Caucasian	-	-	-	-
Special Education	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
English Learners Current + Former	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
English Learners Current	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%
Economically Disadvantaged	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%	>=95%



Student Growth

Student growth is a measure of performance on the state assessments over time.

- Student Growth Percentile (SGP) is a measure of student achievement over time and compares the achievement over time and compares the achievement of similar subgroups of students from one test administration to the next. An SGP from 35 to 65 is considered typical growth.
- Median Growth Percentile (MGP) is a summary of the SGPs in a school. A school's MGP is determined by rank ordering all the SGPs in the school from the lowest to highest and finding the median or middle number.
- Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) describes the amount of growth a student needs to remain or become proficient on the state assessment in three years. This is the minimum SGP a student must meet or exceed to be on track to target.

Schools need to have ten records in the "all students" group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

MGP Growth Data		Math MGP Points Earned: 10/10				ELA MGP Points Earned: 10/10		
Groups	2024 Math MGP	2024 District Math MGP	2024 ELA MGP	2024 District ELA MGP	2023 Math MGP	2023 District Math MGP	2023 ELA MGP	2023 District ELA MGP
All Students	65.0	52.0	71.0	54.0	70.0	55.0	72.0	55.0
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	40.0	N/A	57.5	N/A	46.0	N/A	52.0
Asian	-	57.0	-	62.0	-	61.0	-	61.0
Black/African American	50.0	46.0	83.0	49.0	66.0	52.0	75.0	50.0
Hispanic/Latino	64.5	50.0	70.0	52.0	66.5	54.0	71.0	53.0
Pacific Islander	-	53.0	-	54.0	N/A	60.5	N/A	55.5
Two or More Races	-	53.0	-	53.0	-	54.0	-	55.0
White/Caucasian	-	53.0	-	57.0	-	56.0	-	57.0
Special Education	37.0	46.0	41.0	48.0	40.0	49.0	39.0	51.0
English Learners Current + Former	64.5	53.0	70.5	53.0	64.5	55.0	66.5	54.0
English Learners Current	59.0	49.0	56.0	51.0	60.0	54.0	65.0	53.0
Economically Disadvantaged	65.0	51.0	71.0	52.0	70.0	54.0	72.0	53.0

AGP Growth Data		Math AGP Points Earned: 3.5/7.5				ELA AGP Points Earned: 6/7.5		
Groups	2024 Math AGP	2024 District Math AGP	2024 ELA AGP	2024 District ELA AGP	2023 Math AGP	2023 District Math AGP	2023 ELA AGP	2023 District ELA AGP
All Students	34.6	44.4	58.5	54.0	48.9	50.8	57.8	52.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	24.3	N/A	50.0	N/A	41.3	N/A	48.2
Asian	-	63.8	-	69.4	-	66.5	-	67.6
Black/African American	20.0	28.9	60.0	41.4	58.3	38.1	66.6	42.1
Hispanic/Latino	33.5	36.9	55.1	48.1	45.9	43.8	58.0	46.9
Pacific Islander	-	42.7	-	51.1	N/A	52.8	N/A	51.4
Two or More Races	-	49.5	-	55.5	-	52.0	-	56.1
White/Caucasian	-	52.8	-	61.4	-	58.8	-	58.9
Special Education	6.6	27.2	13.3	32.4	21.4	32.3	14.2	34.0
English Learners Current + Former	31.7	38.8	53.6	46.0	40.2	41.8	47.2	43.1
English Learners Current	20.6	27.5	37.9	35.8	34.3	33.5	43.7	33.8
Economically Disadvantaged	34.6	36.5	58.5	46.7	48.9	43.0	57.8	45.2

For additional information, please see <https://ngma.bighorn.doe.nv.gov/nvgrowthmodel/>.

7/10

English Language


English Language Proficiency is a measure of English Learners (ELs) achieving English Language proficiency on the state English Language Proficiency assessment, WIDA. The NSPF includes Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGPs) to determine if ELs are meeting the goal toward English Language proficiency. Students meeting their growth targets should be on track to become English proficient and exit EL status in five years. Schools need to have ten records in the EL subgroup to receive points. Any school with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

English Language Points Earned: 7/10

	2024 number of ELs With AGP	2024 % of EL Meeting AGP	2024 % District	2023 number of ELs With AGP	2023 % of EL Meeting AGP	2023 % District
	Target			Target		
ELPA	127	49.6	48.4	158	18.3	41.5

% English Learners Meeting AGP on WIDA

2023-2024 Futuro Academy Elementary 2023-2024 District



For additional information, please see <https://ngma.bighorn.doe.nv.gov/nvgrowthmodel/>



Closing Opportunity Gaps

Closing Opportunity Gaps is a measure of non-proficiency. This measure includes students who were non-proficient on the previous year’s state assessment and determines if those students in the current assessment administration succeeded in meeting their Adequate Growth Percentile target. Schools need to have ten records in the “all students” group to receive points. Any subgroup with an assessed population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

Groups	Math AGP Points Earned: 3/10				ELA AGP Points Earned: 6/10			
	2024 % Meeting AGP Math	2024 % District Math	2024 % Meeting AGP ELA	2024 % District ELA	2023 % Meeting AGP Math	2023 % District Math	2023 % Meeting AGP ELA	2023 % District ELA
All Students	21.4	22.5	42.5	36.5	42.4	31.9	50.8	37.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	12.5	N/A	40.9	N/A	26.3	N/A	28.5
Asian	-	36.7	-	44.8	-	42.0	-	48.2
Black/African American	8.3	15.8	40.0	29.4	54.5	25.9	-	29.9
Hispanic/Latino	21.3	20.4	40.2	34.4	40.1	29.9	51.0	34.4
Pacific Islander	-	29.4	-	32.8	N/A	33.3	N/A	41.2
Two or More Races	-	26.4	-	37.7	-	31.3	-	40.3
White/Caucasian	-	27.2	N/A	43.4	-	37.8	-	42.6
Special Education	6.6	14.6	13.3	23.4	21.4	20.8	7.6	25.2
English Learners Current + Former	20.8	23.3	38.9	34.1	35.9	27.5	40.6	31.6
English Learners Current	19.6	20.0	33.9	31.2	31.0	25.4	38.5	30.3
Economically Disadvantaged	21.4	20.8	42.5	33.4	42.4	28.7	50.8	33.1

'N/A' indicates that this population was not present. '**' indicates that the data was not available. '-' indicates data not presented for groups fewer than 10.



Student Engagement

Chronic absenteeism is a measure of Student Engagement. Research shows that attendance is tied to student achievement. Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing 10 percent, or more, of school days for any reason, including excused, unexcused, or disciplinary absences. Students who are absent due to school-sponsored activities are not considered absent for the purposes of this calculation. Schools that reduce their chronic absenteeism rate by 10 percent or more over the prior year may receive incentive points up to the maximum points possible. Schools need to have ten records in the “all students” group to receive points. Any subgroup with a population less than ten will not be reported on the given Measures. Only students who have been enrolled at the school at least half the year will be included in the Measures in this Indicator.

Chronic Absenteeism


Chronic Absenteeism Points Earned: 1/10

Groups	2024 % Chronically Absent	2024 % District	2023 % Chronically Absent	2023 % District
All Students	22.3	20.7	29.7	22.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	N/A	27.7	N/A	24.0
Asian	-	10.0	-	12.9
Black/African American	28.2	28.9	36.8	30.1
Hispanic/Latino	21.8	25.0	29.3	27.5
Pacific Islander	-	26.3	-	31.6
Two or More Races	-	18.5	41.6	21.4
White/Caucasian	15.7	14.9	28.5	17.1
Special Education	37.2	24.7	31.5	26.7
English Learners Current + Former	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Learners Current	18.3	23.1	30.0	25.4
Economically Disadvantaged	22.3	26.8	29.7	30.4

Reducing Chronic Absenteeism by 10% Points Earned: 1

Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)

2023-2024 Futuro Academy Elementary2023-2024 District



'N/A' indicates that this population was not present. '**' indicates that the data was not available. '-' indicates data not presented for groups fewer than 10.

**Appendix B: SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Rating
Descriptors / Score Ranges and School Reports**

SPCSA Academic Performance Framework rating descriptors and score ranges, summarized per the most recent [SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Manual](#).

SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Rating	SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Rating Descriptor	SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Score Range
Below Standard	A school below SPCSA academic standards.	<20
Does Not Meet Standard	A school not meeting SPCSA academic standards.	≥ 20 to <50
Meets Standard	A school meeting SPCSA academic standards.	≥ 50 to <80
Exceeds Standard	A school exceeding SPCSA academic standards.	≥ 80 to 100



2020-21 School Year: Academic Performance Framework

In the Academic Performance Framework, schools earn points for performance, which are totaled to a final score and performance level. See the [Framework Technical Guide](#) for details.

Futuro Academy ES

Address: 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV, 89110

Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>

Oct. 1 2020 Enrollment: 435

2020-21 Grades Served: K-4

2020-21 NSPF Rating: N/A

Comparison District: Clark

2020-21 Comparison School: Ronnow ES

2020-21

N/A

An Academic Performance Framework rating cannot be calculated. A 2020-21 NSPF star rating is unavailable, which is required for this rating.

2019-20

N/A


2019-20 Framework ratings were not calculated.

SCORING TABLE

<20 BELOW STANDARD	≥20 and <50 DOES NOT MEET STANDARD	≥50 and <80 MEETS STANDARD	≥80 EXCEEDS STANDARD
--------------------------	--	----------------------------------	----------------------------

NEVADA SCHOOL RATINGS INDICATOR (60 POINTS)



60% of charter school score in Nevada school ratings (NSPF).




This indicator cannot be calculated, as 2020-21 NSPF index scores are unavailable.

GEOGRAPHICAL COMPARISONS INDICATOR (25 POINTS)

Charter school NSPF performance vs. comparison district/school(s).



NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON DISTRICT (10 POINTS)




NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON SCHOOL (15 POINTS)

This indicator and its measures cannot be calculated, as 2020-21 NSPF index scores are unavailable.

ENROLLMENT DIVERSITY INDICATOR (15 POINTS)

Charter school FRL, IEP, and EL enrollment rates vs. comparison district.



Bonus Indicator Points: 0

One point per group with at least 25% increase over prior year rate, up to indicator maximum.

10/1/20 CHARTER VS. DISTRICT K-5 ENROLLMENT RATES (5 POINTS EACH)

	GRP.	CHARTER	DISTRICT	DIFF.	BONUS
	FRL	≥95	89.5	▲	✗
	IEP	≥5 and <10	12.5	▼	✗
	EL	≥45 and <50	18.6	▲	✗

SCHOOL PROGRESS INDICATOR (NO POINTS)

Charter school changes in Math/ELA non-proficiency.

Non-Proficiency Rates (%)

2019-20	2020-21	
N/A	80.3	Lacks 2 years of Math data
N/A	74	Lacks 2 years of ELA data


2021-22 Clear Filters

- ☐ Amplus Durango MS
- ☐ Amplus Rainbow ES
- ☐ Beacon Acad HS
- ☐ CASLV Centennial ES
- ☐ CASLV Centennial MS
- ☐ CASLV Eastgate ES
- ☐ CASLV Eastgate MS
- ☐ CASLV Nellis AFB ES
- ☐ CASLV Nellis AFB MS
- ☐ CASLV Sandy Ridge HS
- ☐ CASLV Sandy Ridge MS
- ☐ CASLV Tamarus ES
- ☐ CASLV Windmill ES
- ☐ CASLV Windmill MS
- ☐ CIVICA ES
- ☐ CIVICA MS
- ☐ Discovery Hillpointe ES
- ☐ Discovery Hillpointe MS
- ☐ Discovery Sandhill ES
- ☐ Doral Cactus ES
- ☐ Doral Cactus MS
- ☐ Doral Fire Mesa ES
- ☐ Doral Fire Mesa MS
- ☐ Doral North NV ES
- ☐ Doral North NV MS
- ☐ Doral Red Rock ES
- ☐ Doral Red Rock HS
- ☐ Doral Red Rock MS
- ☐ Doral Saddle ES
- ☐ Doral Saddle MS
- ☐ Doral W Pebble ES
- ☐ Doral W Pebble MS
- ☐ DP Agassi ES

SCHOOL INFORMATION

All information is for the 2021-22 school year.

Address: 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV, 89110

Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>

Validation Day Enrollment: 476

Grades Served: K-5

NSPF Rating: N/A

Comparison District: Clark

Comparison School: Ronnow ES

OVERALL FRAMEWORK SCORE/RATING (100 POINTS)

Rating calculated from total points earned across indicators/measures.

25

DOES NOT MEET STANDARD

PRIOR YEAR RATING

N/A

NOT CALCULATED

ABOUT

Nevada law requires charter school sponsors to use an Academic Performance Framework. In this Framework, schools earn points for performance, which are totaled to a final score and rating. See the [Framework Technical Guide](#) for details.

Futuro Academy ES

[How to Print](#)

NEVADA SCHOOL RATINGS INDICATOR (60 POINTS)

60% of SPCSA school score in Nevada school ratings (NSPF).

12/60

Sixty percent of the school's 2021-22 NSPF score (20) earned in indicator.

GEOGRAPHICAL COMPARISONS INDICATOR (25 POINTS)

SPCSA school NSPF performance vs. comparison district/school(s).

0/25

0 automatic points in indicator.

A 4- or 5-star equivalent NSPF score earns 15 or 25 automatic points.

NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON DISTRICT (10 POINTS)

0/10

NSPF score difference of -29.1 between school (20 points) and comparison district (49.1 points).

NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON SCHOOL (15 POINTS)

0/15

NSPF score difference of -27.5 between school (20 points) and comparison school (47.5 points).

SCHOOL PROGRESS INDICATOR (NO POINTS)

SPCSA school changes in Math/ELA non-proficiency.

- ✗ ELA non-proficiency increased from 74% (prior year) to 77% (current year).
- ✗ Math non-proficiency increased from 80.3% (prior year) to 87.3% (current year).

ENROLLMENT DIVERSITY INDICATOR (15 POINTS)

SPCSA school FRL, IEP, and EL enrollment rates vs. comparison district.

13/15

0 bonus points in indicator.

One bonus point per group with 25%+ increase over prior year.

ENROLLMENT RATES VS. COMPARISON DISTRICT (5 POINTS EACH)

5/5

School FRL rate of $\geq 95\%$ compared to district GrK-5 FRL rate of $> 95\%$.

3/5

School IEP rate of ≥ 5 to $< 10\%$ compared to district GrK-5 IEP rate of 11.9%.

5/5

School EL rate of ≥ 45 to $< 50\%$ compared to district GrK-5 EL rate of 19.3%.

OVERALL SCORE/RATING TABLE

<20 BELOW STANDARD	≥ 20 and <50 DOES NOT MEET STANDARD	≥ 50 and <80 MEETS STANDARD	≥ 80 EXCEEDS STANDARD
--------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------

INDICATOR/MEASURE POINTS EARNED LEGEND

<20% OF PTS EARNED	$\geq 20\%$ to <50% OF PTS EARNED	$\geq 50\%$ to <80% OF PTS EARNED	$\geq 80\%$ OF PTS EARNED
-----------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------



2022-23 School Year: SPCSA Academic Performance Framework

2022-23 Clear Filters

Futuro Academy ES

[How to Print](#)

- ☐ Alpine Acad HS
- ☐ Amplus Durango ES
- ☐ Amplus Durango HS
- ☐ Amplus Durango MS
- ☐ Amplus Rainbow ES
- ☐ Battle Born ES
- ☐ Battle Born MS
- ☐ Beacon Acad HS
- ☐ CASLV Cadence ES
- ☐ CASLV Cadence MS
- ☐ CASLV Centennial ES
- ☐ CASLV Centennial MS
- ☐ CASLV Eastgate ES
- ☐ CASLV Eastgate MS
- ☐ CASLV Nellis AFB ES
- ☐ CASLV Nellis AFB MS
- ☐ CASLV Sandy Ridge HS
- ☐ CASLV Sandy Ridge MS
- ☐ CASLV Tamarus ES
- ☐ CASLV Windmill ES
- ☐ CASLV Windmill MS
- ☐ CIVICA ES
- ☐ CIVICA MS
- ☐ Discovery Hillpointe ES
- ☐ Discovery Hillpointe MS
- ☐ Discovery Sandhill ES
- ☐ Doral Cactus ES
- ☐ Doral Cactus MS
- ☐ Doral Fire Mesa ES
- ☐ Doral Fire Mesa MS
- ☐ Doral North NV ES
- ☐ Doral North NV MS
- ☐ Doral Red Rock ES

SCHOOL INFORMATION

All information is for the 2022-23 school year.

Address: 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV, 89110

Website: <http://futuroacademytv.org/>

Validation Day Enrollment: 462

Grades Served: K-5

NSPF Rating: 3

Comparison District: Clark

Comparison School: Ronnow ES

OVERALL FRAMEWORK SCORE/RATING (100 POINTS)

Rating calculated from total points earned across indicators/measures.

69.5
MEETS STANDARD

PRIOR YEAR RATING

25
DOES NOT MEET STANDARD

ABOUT

Nevada law requires charter school sponsors to use an Academic Performance Framework. In this Framework, schools earn points for performance, which are totaled to a final score and rating. See the [Framework Technical Guide](#) for details.

NEVADA SCHOOL RATINGS INDICATOR (60 POINTS)

60% of SPCSA school score in Nevada school ratings (NSPF).

34.5/60

Sixty percent of the school's 2022-23 NSPF score (57.5) earned in indicator.

GEOGRAPHICAL COMPARISONS INDICATOR (25 POINTS)

SPCSA school NSPF performance vs. comparison district/school(s).

23/25

0 automatic points in indicator.

A 4- or 5-star equivalent NSPF score earns 15 or 25 automatic points.

NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON DISTRICT (10 POINTS)

8/10

NSPF score difference of 18.6 between school (57.5 points) and comparison district (38.9 points).

NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON SCHOOL (15 POINTS)

15/15

NSPF score difference of 45.5 between school (57.5 points) and comparison school (12 points).

SCHOOL PROGRESS INDICATOR (NO POINTS)

SPCSA school changes in Math/ELA non-proficiency.



ELA non-proficiency decreased from 77% (prior year) to 60.9% (current year).



Math non-proficiency decreased from 87.3% (prior year) to 75.3% (current year).

ENROLLMENT DIVERSITY INDICATOR (15 POINTS)

SPCSA school FRL, IEP, and EL enrollment rates vs. comparison district.

12/15

0 bonus points in indicator.

One bonus point per group with 25%+ increase over prior year.

ENROLLMENT RATES VS. COMPARISON DISTRICT (5 POINTS EACH)

5/5

School FRL rate of $\geq 95\%$ compared to district GrK-5 FRL rate of $> 95.0\%$.

2/5

School IEP rate of ≥ 5 to $< 10\%$ compared to district GrK-5 IEP rate of 13.1%.

5/5

School EL rate of ≥ 40 to $< 45\%$ compared to district GrK-5 EL rate of 18.5%.

OVERALL SCORE/RATING TABLE

<20 BELOW STANDARD	≥ 20 and <50 DOES NOT MEET STANDARD	≥ 50 and <80 MEETS STANDARD	≥ 80 EXCEEDS STANDARD
--------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------

INDICATOR/MEASURE POINTS EARNED LEGEND

<20% OF PTS EARNED	$\geq 20\%$ to <50% OF PTS EARNED	$\geq 50\%$ to <80% OF PTS EARNED	$\geq 80\%$ OF PTS EARNED
-----------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------



2023-24 School Year: SPCSA Academic Performance Framework

2023-24 Clear Filters

- Alpine Acad HS
- Amplus Durango ES
- Amplus Durango HS
- Amplus Durango MS
- Amplus Rainbow ES
- Battle Born ES
- Battle Born MS
- Beacon Acad HS
- CASLV Cadence ES
- CASLV Cadence HS
- CASLV Cadence MS
- CASLV Centennial ES
- CASLV Centennial MS
- CASLV Eastgate ES
- CASLV Nellis AFB ES
- CASLV Nellis AFB MS
- CASLV Sandy Ridge HS
- CASLV Sandy Ridge MS
- CASLV Tamarus ES
- CASLV Windmill ES
- CASLV Windmill MS
- CIVICA ES
- CIVICA HS
- CIVICA MS
- Democracy Prep ES
- Democracy Prep HS
- Democracy Prep MS
- Discovery Hillpointe ES
- Discovery Hillpointe MS
- Discovery Sandhill ES
- Doral Cactus ES
- Doral Cactus MS
- Doral Fire Mesa ES

SCHOOL INFORMATION

All information is for the 2023-24 school year.

Address: 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV, 89110
Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>
Validation Day Enrollment: 456
Grades Served: K-5
NSPF Rating: 3
Comparison District: Clark
Comparison School: Ronnow ES

OVERALL FRAMEWORK SCORE/RATING (100 POINTS)

Rating calculated from total points earned across indicators/measures.

65.5
MEETS STANDARD

PRIOR YEAR RATING

69.5
MEETS STANDARD

ABOUT

Nevada law requires charter school sponsors to use an Academic Performance Framework. In this Framework, schools earn points for performance, which are totaled to a final score and rating. See the [Framework Technical Guide](#) for details.

Futuro Academy ES

How to Print

NEVADA SCHOOL RATINGS INDICATOR (60 POINTS)

60% of SPCSA school score in Nevada school ratings (NSPF).

31.5/60

Sixty percent of the school's 2023-24 NSPF score (52.5) earned in indicator.

GEOGRAPHICAL COMPARISONS INDICATOR (25 POINTS)

SPCSA school NSPF performance vs. comparison district/school(s).

21/25

0 automatic points in indicator.
A 4- or 5-star equivalent NSPF score earns 15 or 25 automatic points.

NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON DISTRICT (10 POINTS)

6/10

NSPF score difference of 12.5 between school (52.5 points) and comparison district (40 points).

NSPF SCORE VS. COMPARISON SCHOOL (15 POINTS)

15/15

NSPF score difference of 33.5 between school (52.5 points) and comparison school (19 points).

SCHOOL PROGRESS INDICATOR (NO POINTS)

SPCSA school changes in Math/ELA non-proficiency.

- ✓ ELA non-proficiency decreased from 60.9% (prior year) to 58.5% (current year).
- ✓ Math non-proficiency decreased from 75.3% (prior year) to 72.5% (current year).

ENROLLMENT DIVERSITY INDICATOR (15 POINTS)

SPCSA school FRL, IEP, and EL enrollment rates vs. comparison district.

13/15

Indicator bonus points for: IEP.
One bonus point per group with 25%+ increase over prior year.

ENROLLMENT RATES VS. COMPARISON DISTRICT (5 POINTS EACH)

5/5

School FRL rate of ≥95% compared to district GrK-5 FRL rate of >95.0%.

2/5

School IEP rate of ≥5 to <10% compared to district GrK-5 IEP rate of 14.6%.

5/5

School EL rate of ≥40 to <45% compared to district GrK-5 EL rate of 19%.

OVERALL SCORE/RATING TABLE

<20 BELOW STANDARD	≥20 and <50 DOES NOT MEET STANDARD	≥50 and <80 MEETS STANDARD	≥80 EXCEEDS STANDARD
--------------------------	--	----------------------------------	----------------------------

INDICATOR/MEASURE POINTS EARNED LEGEND

<20% OF PTS EARNED	≥20% to <50% OF PTS EARNED	≥50% to <80% OF PTS EARNED	≥80% OF PTS EARNED
-----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

Appendix C: Site Evaluation Reports



Nevada State Public Charter School Authority

Site Evaluation Report

Futuro Academy

Evaluation Date: 1/25/2021

Report Date: 2/17/2021

State Public Charter School Authority
775-687-9174
1749 North Stewart Street Suite 40
Carson City, Nevada 89706
2080 East Flamingo Road, Suite 230 Las Vegas, NV 89119

Contents

Introduction and School Background	3
Academic Performance.....	4
Focus Group Summaries	7
Classroom Observation Totals.....	12
Organizational Performance.....	17
Site Evaluation Findings	21

Appendices

A: Nevada State Performance Framework

<http://www.doe.nv.gov/Accountability/NSPF/>

B: SPCSA Academic Framework

http://charterschools.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/CharterSchoolsnvgov/content/News/2019/19062_2_8-Academic-Performance-Framework-Guidance-Document.pdf

C: SPCSA Organizational Framework

http://charterschools.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/CharterSchoolsnvgov/content/News/2019/19062_8-OPF-Att-1-Ratings-Scorecard.pdf

INTRODUCTION AND SCHOOL BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

This Site Evaluation Report offers an analysis of evidence collected during the school evaluation that took place on 1/25/2021 at Futuro Academy. The State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) conducts a comprehensive review of evidence related to all charters within the portfolio during the 1st, 3rd, and 5th year of operation. This comprehensive analysis addresses the academic success of the school and the effectiveness and viability of the school organization.

An analysis of the school's academic and operational success is undertaken by reviewing the most current versions of the Nevada State Performance Framework (Appendix A) and the State Public Charter School Authority Academic Framework (Appendix B) as well as the Organizational Framework (Appendix C).

In addition, the Site Evaluation Team conducts classroom observations within the areas of classroom environment and instruction. The purpose of these observations is to collect evidence using a rubric which has been normed by our team. All classroom rating outcomes will be displayed within this report so that school leaders have an overall idea of what is happening in general, at any time, in any classroom. The overall numbers will provide information about the school outcomes on this one day.

SPCSA staff will track "best practices", using a checklist and a summary of best practices observed, and will be contained within the report. Using information from focus groups of students, parents, staff, school leaders and the school's board, the SPCSA team will conduct focus groups and summarize results for schools within the report. The operational portion of the evaluation will be observed and take-aways recorded using a checklist and observing all aspects of the school's operational components as outlined in the SPCSA operational framework.

This evaluation has been designed to focus on teaching and learning (e.g. curriculum, instruction, assessment, and services for at-risk students) as well as leadership, organizational capacity, and board oversight. The SPCSA uses the established criteria on a regular basis to provide schools with a consistent set of expectations leading up to renewal.

SCHOOL BACKGROUND

Futuro Academy is located in Las Vegas, Nevada in a facility at 920 N. Lamb Blvd. The school serves 435 students (as of the most recent Validation Day and valid until October 2021) in Kindergarten – 4th grade. The mission of Futuro Academy is: "Thorough rigorous academics and personal excellence. Futuro Academy educates all K-4 scholars to excel through middle school into high school, and to the university of their choice."

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE


Futuro Academy Nevada School Performance Framework 2019

Futuro Academy serves 435 students in grades Kindergarten-4th grade

Futuro Academy Elementary

School Year 2018-2019 Nevada School Rating

School Level: Elementary School
Grade Levels: 0K-02
District: Achievement
School Address: 920 North Lamb Blvd
Las Vegas, NV 89110



Student Race/Ethnicity

4.5%	White
10.4%	Bl/Afr Am
78.2%	Hisp/Latino
1.5%	Asian
0.7%	Am Ind/AK Nat
0.3%	Pac Isl
3.7%	Two or More




School Performance History

School Year	Index Score/	Star Rating
2017-2018	0	NR
2016-2017	N/A	N/A

School Type: Achievement School District
School Designation: No Designation
95% Assessment Participation: Met

Additional Student Groups



Futuro Academy
Math and ELA Results
Nevada School Performance Framework
2019

Elementary Proficiency Rates

Math Proficient


Groups	2019 %	2019 % District	2019 % MIP	2018 %	2018 % District	2018 % MIP
All Students	-	36.1	48.5	N/A	38.1	45.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	-	-	34.3	N/A	-	30.9
Asian	-	-	68.8	N/A	-	67.2
Black/African American	-	29.1	32.3	N/A	32.6	28.8
Hispanic/Latino	-	42.7	39.6	N/A	42	36.5
Pacific Islander	-	-	48.3	N/A	-	45.6
Two or More Races	-	-	55.3	N/A	-	52.9
White/Caucasian	-	40	59.3	N/A	-	57.2
Special Education	-	16	28.6	N/A	9	24.8
English Learners Current + Former	-	44.7	35.8	N/A	39.5	32.4
English Learners Current	-	25.5		N/A	31.4	
Economically Disadvantaged	-	35.7	39	N/A	-	35.7

ELA Proficient

Groups	2019 %	2019 % District	2019 % MIP	2018 %	2018 % District	2018 % MIP
All Students	-	39.8	57	N/A	43.8	54.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	-	-	42.5	N/A	-	39.5
Asian	-	-	75.4	N/A	-	74.1
Black/African American	-	33.5	42.6	N/A	38.9	39.6
Hispanic/Latino	-	45.8	48.2	N/A	49.2	45.5
Pacific Islander	-	-	57.9	N/A	-	55.7
Two or More Races	-	-	64.4	N/A	-	62.6
White/Caucasian	-	53.2	67.4	N/A	-	65.7
Special Education	-	12	30	N/A	20	26.3
English Learners Current + Former	-	44.7	41.4	N/A	45.8	38.4
English Learners Current	-	20.8		N/A	34.2	
Economically Disadvantaged	-	39.6	46.8	N/A	-	44


SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Geographic Comparison Report

Elementary School



SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Diversity Comparison Results

Elementary School



FOCUS GROUP SUMMARIES

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY

Group	Number of Participants	Duration of Focus Group
Governing Board ¹	2	30 minutes
Parents/Families	11	30 minutes
Students	7	30 minutes
School Leadership	2	30 minutes
Staff	7	30 minutes

Governing Board¹:

- The Board shared that the mission of the school is to increase options of schools of choice for underrepresented populations. One Board member commented, “We believe college readiness starts in kindergarten and we help this to happen. We also help in underrepresented areas of Las Vegas that need assistance in offering residents additional options and choice for school attendance.”
- Board members reported that they believe academic performance for the school is trending to be above average; however, an area of great opportunity is that many students come from disadvantaged households, so some are already a bit behind. The Board reported that test results are showing high growth for many Futuro students. A board member said, “Over the school year the students are showing great potential to get to the benchmark.” Another board member added, “We knew there may be students below grade level when we opened the school. We have English Language Learners, and, in some cases, they are below average in English Language Arts. We do have great achievement in math. We know that we have a lot of makeup work to do.” The Board receives information about academic progress, and a dashboard of academic performance showing student achievement data using MAP, and step scores are in the process of being implemented. The Board said that they have a subcommittee for academic performance and they meet regularly.
- Regarding the hiring and retention at the school, the Board said the Executive Director does a great job of hiring excellent teachers. A member commented, “We have had some word of mouth and current employees let others know about the teaching opportunities.” The Board said that they receive reports on teacher evaluations and student attendance. Regarding teacher retention, the Board members shared that Futuro expects 100% of staff to return in the next school year.
- Board members shared that there are various teacher programs for professional learning offered throughout the year at Futuro. The school starts the year with rigorous teacher training and Board reports and there are some additional specific trainings also offered as needed. The Board shared that they meet about every other month on a regular basis, and that there are also committee meetings taking place quarterly and in between the full Board meetings. The meeting agendas are

¹The Board Focus group notes are copied from the site evaluation in May of 2020. Two members of the nine-member board participated. Quorum was not met, and Open Meeting Law was not violated.

created between Board Chair and the Executive Director. Board members went on to say that the Board Chair and Executive Director generally have weekly meetings that include updates from the school, and Board-related items can be added to the agenda. The Board added that they reference older agendas and have identified certain items for agendas which come up routinely throughout the year. The Board makes sure to finalize and post agendas at least one week prior to the meeting. According to focus group participants, Board membership is very stable. Of the eight members, half have been there since the beginning and the others have come on slowly over time. Board members also shared that those which have left done so at the end of their term.

- The Board said that they would characterize parent satisfaction as “very satisfied.” A board member stated, “We have had one or two parent complaints, but we have a parent on the Board. We have very supportive and involved parents. For example, during last year’s parent appreciation week, the parents got together as a group and made sure every teacher and teacher’s aide were acknowledged and appreciated.” The Board said that many parents help, volunteer, and take part in the school. Another board member added, “Parents want to see the school succeed and are very invested in the success of the school. We have a family newsletter that includes opportunities to volunteer.”
- Regarding fiscal policy and procedures, members of the Board said that there were revisions early on and there was a need for some changes. According to the Board, the fiscal condition of the school is measured by a financial statement and detailed information. A board member stated, “Considering this is a new charter, we are always looking at being responsible for spending and we have to tap credit lines at times. We have managed to handle it.”

Parents/Families:

- Family members shared that, with regard to virtual learning, they have noticed that their children are getting less sick since the pandemic began. One parent said that with distance learning, her son is doing well and is thriving because there are fewer distractions online than in the classroom. Although families said that they miss the social and emotional part of the in-person setting, they expressed satisfaction with the distance learning that is taking place at Futuro. A kindergarten parent shared that she does not have any complaints and as far as she can tell, her son is learning. Parents added that the online learning is very organized and they receive a calendar so they know which classes the students should be attending. Another parent said that the allotted timeframe of 35 minutes for each class is working well, going on to say that she believed that any additional time could be problematic as far as students becoming distracted.
- When speaking to the quality of relationships between students and teachers, family members said that relationships are strong. One parent said that her son is able to call his teacher on their cell phone any time he feels he needs to, and the parent expressed their appreciation of this. Parents and families also spoke of other communication methods that are used at Futuro, including e-mail, text, and using an application called *Classroom Tag* to communicate with the teacher. It was also shared that teachers provide a weekly communication with all families, which contains information about what is taking place all week at the school. The parents also stated that they use this same platform to monitor their child’s academic progress. There are private messages and classroom announcements on this platform as well.

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY continued

- Family members like that the teachers get back to the students quickly and sometimes this is on the weekend or in the evening. Parents know that they can have their student go to the teachers calendar during office hours and get the help he or she needs. Both parents and students are invited to go to office hours, send a text, or an e-mail message according to focus group participants. One parent commented, “The teacher also repeats things over and over to make sure students understand.” Another family member said that one of the teachers offers lunch with teacher and friends (virtually) and the students and teacher watch a movie and eat lunch together. The family members expressed high levels of thanks for the teachers.
- In all, the families said that they are especially thankful for the quick response of Futuro leaders and staff when the pandemic began. For example, the school has provided math activities, packets, and has made sure that each child had a computer. Family members said that Futuro is important in many ways, but one of the most appreciated is that students are motivated to go to school. The mission of going to college is repeated over and over according to parents. One parent said her son loves the ability to go from class to class and to have a college theme in each classroom every year.

Students:

- Students shared that they have many things they love about the school. Several students said that they love math and that the math is getting more difficult as the year moves forward. Students like learning about math online and they shared that they are aware that as they move forward the math is becoming more difficult. One student said that he likes that his teachers help him and make learning fun. In regard to virtual learning, students said they enjoy every class.
- As a group, students expressed that they are looking forward to returning to “in-person” learning at Futuro when they are able. One student said he likes doing Near Pod², but he would like some of the content to include additional items on history. For example, he mentioned that he would like to learn about the Aztec empire, Mayans, and World Wars I and II. Students said they find their classes are interesting. One student said she likes to learn about Native Americans, arrays, and multiplication. One student enjoys playing games in class to learn.
- In terms of academic progress, students take tests and they said they monitor their academic progress. This group of students explained that if they work hard on their tests they will improve. Another student said that his teachers share how much the students are reading. If a student gets a lower grade, students said that they have options and explained that they would log into the test again and re-take it until a better score is the result. Students explained that when class is over they can send a message to the teacher and then he or she can help. One student commented, “Sometimes I write down the questions I don’t understand and then I show this to my mom for help.”
- Students said that, with regard to questions in class, students use the chat box to answer questions, but only in the chat box. In the lower grades, students said they are able to raise their hands and ask questions. One student said he thinks that students can make school better by trying their best. Another student said he would like to see the school add another science class. A third student said, “I would like to see that other students have their video games closed during school”. Finally, students stated that they would like to see additional Near Pods² used during class for those students who need a break.

² Near Pod is a technology used to boost student participation with collaborative activities and formative assessments. It allows teachers to make lessons more interactive.

Leadership:

- Leaders shared that they use the Core Knowledge³ curriculum for ELA instruction at Futuro in Kindergarten through Fourth grade. For math, leadership indicated that the school has implemented Zearn⁴. Leaders explained that they have chosen this curriculum because it lends itself well to the distance learning which is currently a necessity. For writing, leaders said that they keep looking for a better suited writing program. This year they changed to Writing by Design⁵. Writing is definitely the area that the school leaders feel they have room for improvement. The school has implemented this writing curriculum and send journals home in order to provide stronger support to students, especially in the distance education format.
- The school has about 7% of their enrolled students identified for the Special Education program and school leaders shared that they feel these students are successful. Leaders explained that they looked at continuity of services during the pandemic and distance learning and believe they have been timely with all legal and time bound expectations. Leaders share that the chronic absenteeism is 3.1% compared to 6.5% overall within their IEP subcategory. About 40% of the students at Futuro are second language learners and school leaders said that they completed the WIDA screeners in the fall.
- In terms of culturally responsive practices, the school has put forth anti-racism classes for educators which was launched in the summer of 2020. The staff itself is diverse with greater than 70% of staff identifying as people of color according to school leadership. All staff, teachers, and administrators are evaluated on an annual basis. The school would like to implement a more robust teacher evaluation system in the future. The Executive Director is evaluated yearly with summative outcomes. These results are weighted heavily toward the end of the year and based on a variety of data outcomes.
- With very little turnover in staff, professional learning has been done through a learning management system. Leadership shared that staff is asked to complete a task at the end of the session designed to mirror and promote best practices. School leaders shared that some of their strengths include a strong staff and family culture. In addition, school leadership shared that Futuro has high levels of retention of staff. With regard to challenges, the transition to distance education has been difficult. The school has added a grade each year since 2017, and the school has not been rated since opening in 2017. To increase safety measures, bollards and double mag doors have been added. In addition, staff participated in suicide prevention, aversive interventions and are trained and compliant with regard to mandated reporting according to leadership.

³ Core Knowledge is a preschool through grade 5 program for teaching skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. It builds students' knowledge and vocabulary in literature, history, geography, and science.

⁴ A curriculum that unites hands-on instruction and immersive digital learning. It is top-rated by EDReports.

⁵ Writing by Design is a K-8 Common Core Writing Curriculum with proven effective remote and in-class instruction. It is individually paced with video lessons and online assessments.

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY continued

Staff:

- Teaching staff at Futuro said that they have made several adjustments to their teaching due to distance learning. For example, one teacher said he breaks up the students into small groups based on ability and so that he can differentiate his teaching based on the needs of the students. His groups are leveled this year as compared to the past when they were not. In kindergarten, the reading curriculum has changed and instead of flash cards, they use slides, according to teachers. Teachers also shared that they have been able to direct students to write on white boards instead of paper. In math the transfer to digital learning is challenging. For example, teachers cannot physically show students the counting like they used to. Staff said that writing instruction and practice is much more independent than in previous years.
- Staff said that good teaching is comprised of several indicators. One teacher explained that she can differentiate the students and provide interventions. One teacher added that another big part, especially with distance-learning, is making what you are teaching meaningful to students. One person commented that, "Checking for understanding, whether it is formal or informal, is a very important part to being a great teacher." This teacher added that having high expectations is also a critical part to this. The teachers said that engagement is very important, but they know this is something they continue to revise and improve upon as this school year moves forward.
- Regarding data driven decision making and monitoring of student learning, teachers remarked that they use the MAP testing three times per year, and the Star test once per month, as well as numerous formative assessments. One instructor remarked, "We are able to place our students into groups of red, yellow, green and from there we respond to needs based on each student." To provide targeted interventions the school uses spreadsheets to collect data. The data comes from small, short lessons which have been designed to meet the needs of each student. With special education, teachers shared that they progress monitor each week and that those informal tests are designed to meet the IEP goals and objectives.
- The Reading Specialist has helped train the staff on ways to assess basic literacy levels according to the staff at the school. Staff went on to say that the reading specialist has modeled strategies the rest of the staff could use and this was found to be very helpful. One important enhancement has been the social emotional social learning and how best to respond during the pandemic. One staff member commented, "We meet virtually every week as a staff and anything can be brought to the front. We learned about literacy, Zoom, Google, and Learn Cube." Staff said the professional learning has been very organized and the teachers said they learned by doing things by themselves and helping each other. Another person remarked, "It was teachers teaching other teachers and I really liked that." The staff has had very little turn over and teachers say this is because in comparison to other schools, the staff feel that Futuro has a strong sense of community. One person said, "I feel cared about as a person, not just as another colleague. There is so much collaboration at this school and I don't feel alone here. It is highly encouraged to talk to other teachers within grade levels and we feel super supported."

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION TOTALS

A total of 10 classrooms were observed for approximately 20 minute on the day of the evaluation.

I. CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT					
Areas 1 & 2 Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport Establishing a Culture for Learning	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
	Classroom interactions are highly respectful and the teacher demonstrates a passionate commitment to the subject.	Classroom interactions reflect general warmth and caring and a genuine culture for learning.	Classroom interactions are generally appropriate and free from conflict with a minimal culture for learning.	Classroom interactions between the teacher and students are negative and do not represent a culture for learning.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 1	Total: 7	Total: 2	Total:	Total:
	Students ensure maintenance of high levels of civility among classmates and assume much of the responsibility for establishing a culture for learning.	Interactions reflect cultural and developmental differences of students. Teacher and students are committed to the subject.	Interactions may be characterized by occasional displays of insensitivity and inconsistent expectations for student achievement.	Interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, and/or conflict. There is a low teacher commitment to the subject and few instances of students taking pride in their work.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total:	Total: 8	Total: 2	Total:	Total:
Areas 3 & 4 Managing Classroom Procedures Managing Student Behavior	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
	Classroom routines and procedures appear seamless and student behavior is entirely appropriate.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established and the teacher ensures smooth functioning with little loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures have been established but function inconsistently, with some loss of instruction time.	Classroom routines and procedures are nonexistent or inefficient, resulting in the loss of much instruction time.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 1	Total: 7	Total: 2	Total:	Total:
	There appears to be no misbehavior during the observation. The teacher monitoring of student behavior is subtle and/or preventative.	Teacher responds to student misbehavior in ways that are appropriate and respectful of the students.	Teacher tries to establish standards of conduct for students and monitor behavior. These efforts are not always successful.	Teacher is unsuccessful in monitoring student behavior.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 1	Total: 7	Total: 2	Total:	Total:

II. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Area 5	Not Observed				
	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Purpose and Explanation of Content, Lesson, Unit or Classroom Activity	The purpose of the lesson or unit is clear and connects with student's real-life experiences. The explanation of content is imaginative, and students contribute to the lesson by participating and/or explaining concepts to their peers.	The purpose for the lesson or learning activity is clear. The teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students.	The teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose with limited success. The explanation of the content is uneven. Some explanations are done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	The purpose for the lesson learning activity is unclear. Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear, confusing or uses inappropriate language.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 2	Total: 8	Total:	Total:	Total:
Area 6	Not Observed				
	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	A	Students formulate and ask high-level questions.	Teacher formulates and asks several high-level questions.	Teacher questioning and discussion techniques are uneven with some high-level questions.	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low level questions, limited student participation and little true discussion.
	Total:	Total: 6	Total: 3	Total:	Total: 1
	B	Students assume responsibility for the participation of most students in the discussion.	Teachers assumes responsibility for the discussion which includes most students.	There is some attempt by the teacher to initiate student discussion and student participation.	There is little to no student discussion even though the opportunity is there.
	Total:	Total: 9	Total: 1	Total:	Total:

II. CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION (continued)						
Engaging Students in Learning	Area 7 A	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
		Students are highly engaged throughout the lesson. The pacing and structure of the lesson allows high levels of student engagement.	Students appear to be intellectually engaged throughout most of the lesson. The pacing and structure of the lesson is suitable for this group of students.	Students are partially engaged throughout the lesson.	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
		Total:	Total: 8	Total: 2	Total:	Total:
	B	Students make contributions to the representation of content.	There are appropriate activities and materials and instructive representations of content.	The representation of content or structure/pacing is uneven.	There are inappropriate activities or materials, poor representations of content or lack of lesson structure/pacing.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
		Total: 1	Total: 9	Total:	Total:	Total:
Using Formative Assessment in Instruction	Area 8 A	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
		Students are aware of the learning goals/targets for themselves during this instructional timeframe.	Most of the students are aware of the learning goals/targets for themselves during this instructional timeframe.	Some of the students are aware of the learning goals/targets for themselves during this instructional timeframe.	Students are not aware of the learning goals/learning target during this instructional time frame.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
		Total: 1	Total: 8	Total: 1	Total:	Total:
	B	The teacher purposefully and consistently provides clear, descriptive feedback in regard to student's demonstration/understanding of the learning goal/target. The feedback is timely and is in a reasonable amount.	Much of the time, the teacher, provides clear, descriptive feedback regarding student's understanding/ demonstration of learning goal/target. The feedback is timely and is in a reasonable amount.	At times, the teacher provides clear, descriptive feedback but not in a consistent manner regarding learning goal/target. Observing where the work was meeting and where it was not. The feedback is timely and is in a reasonable amount.	The teacher does not provide clear, descriptive feedback regarding learning goal/target and does not observing where the work is and where it is not meeting. The feedback is not timely and is not in a reasonable amount.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
		Total:	Total: 7	Total: 3	Total:	Total:

The purpose of this portion of the report is to provide a numerical value to the total number of best practices seen during the classroom observational portion as a whole. This number is indicated at the end of each best practice descriptor/line.

Evidence of adapted materials/assessments: Area #5

- ☒ Lessons are designed to encourage student curiosity and learning beyond classroom time: 2
- ☒ The explanation of the content is imaginative: 2

Evidence of questioning and discussion techniques: Area #6

- ☒ Questions are planned ahead of time and tied to learning target(s): 5
- ☒ Teacher questions are open ended: 2
- ☒ Teacher allows time for students to answer — 3 seconds or more: 4
- ☒ Teacher extends the thinking and discussion by encouraging students to say more, restate or summarize: 3
- ☒ Teacher purposefully signals to entire group of students to wait/think before volunteering a response: 2
- ☒ Teacher provides the opportunity for all students to answer the question (think, pair, share, written response): 2

Evidence of engaging students in learning area: Area #7

- ☒ Active learning is taking place (rather than just listening or viewing): 3
- ☒ Students are using reasoning and critical thinking: 2
- ☒ The lesson is rigorous and includes cognitively complex tasks: 3
- ☒ Students engage in several types of activities during the lesson including:
 - ☒ Speaking ☒ Writing ☒ Reading ☒ Listening ☒ Discussing ☒ Creating ☒ Problem Solving
- ☐ Cooperative groups:
- ☐ Student-led classroom:
- ☒ Technology is integrated into learning/outcomes: 7
- ☐ Project-based learning:

Evidence of Formative Assessment During Instruction: Area #8

- ☒ Teachers provide the students feedback about their learning referring to examples taking anecdotal notes: 5
- ☒ Students incorporate the feedback by revising their work: 2
- ☒ Students receive frequent and meaningful feedback regarding their work: 3
- ☒ A wide range of instructional practices that are likely to motivate and engage most students are used during the lesson: 1

This image shows a blank sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

The SPCSA uses the Organizational Performance Framework to collect evidence of performance and evaluate schools, at least annually, to monitor schools throughout their charter terms, to report to schools and the public annually, to intervene in schools that do not meet expectations and to make high-stakes decisions, including: renewal, non-renewal, possible revocation, expansion, or replication. Most of this work is done through routine submissions by the school to the SPCSA.

A limited number of measures within the organizational performance framework may be at least partially evaluated during the site evaluation process. Measures are partially evaluated based upon evidence from school focus groups, school observations, documents reviewed and information from the school presentation portion of the evaluation. SPCSA staff will note the evidence provided by the school and also outline any questions or potential concerns.

Measure	Description	Evidence Collected Through	Takeaways
1a	The school implements material terms of the education program.	School Presentation Classroom Observations	ELA: K-2: Core Knowledge LA / G3-4 Expeditionary Learning Mathematics: K-4 – Zearn / CGI Writing: Writing by Design (newly implemented 2020-21).
1b	The school complies with applicable education requirements.	School Presentation Classroom Observations	TIER 1: Universal Screening: NWEA MAP and benchmark STAR CMB/STAR 360 assessments (ESGI in K) – utilized for screening and initial grouping and learning goals. TIER 2: Regularly administered bi-weekly or monthly assessments (STAR CBM for Tier 2, STAR 360 all students G2+) to provide strategic monitoring and assist with dosage of flexible interventions. TIER 3: STAR CBM – Weekly to support intensive interventions and instructional design, up to an including sub-separate group homogenous groupings across classes to provide targeted supports.

1c	The school protects the rights of students with disabilities.	School Presentation Classroom Observations	Continuity of services with minimum compensatory time throughout the pandemic Winter 2019-20 MAP MGP for IEP subgroup: ELA: 70, Math: 49 IEP chronic absenteeism is 3.1% compared to 6.5% overall due to close family communication.
1d	The school protects the rights of ELL students.	School Presentation Classroom Observations	95%+ participation and timely completion of WIDA screener in Fall 2020. Implementation of DataWorks Launch to Literacy curriculum in Fall 2020. 13% increase in students meeting EL AGP from 2018-19 to 2019-20.

Measure	Description	Evidence Collected Through	Takeaways
3a	The school complies with governance requirements.	School Presentation Classroom Observations	Futuro Academy utilizes nimble communication systems and provides multiple channels of bilingual communication to maintain critical information flowing, but also consistent with the mission of family engagement and empowerment. Futuro Academy engages in annual planning and capacity audits of the Board of Trustees to consistently promote good governance. The board and its committees meet regularly, and review dashboard academic, operational, and financial information to perform all duties as spelled out in the charter application and contract.
3b	The school holds management accountable.	School Presentation	Futuro Academy utilizes a standard evaluation document to provide all employee classes an annual evaluation standardized by position. On the goal list for 2021-22 is to transition to a more robust document for instructional staff. Futuro Academy does not contract with an EMO and CMO, but the Board of Trustees, consistent with the spirit of the Open Meeting Law, evaluates the Executive Director annually in an open meeting, and utilizing the evaluation rubric in the ED contract.

4a	The school protects the rights of all students.	School Presentation Classroom Observations	Anti-Racism for Educators 101 Training – Summer 2020. Diverse Staff (greater than 70% staff who identify as people of color since founding).
5b	The school complies with health and safety requirements.	School Presentation Classroom Observations	100% of site staff First Aid/CPR/AED certified, 25% in-person onsite for First Aid/CPR/AED/BBP/Child & Infant. Facility design and operation changes (addition of bollards, double mag doors, etc.). Required Development including Suicide Prevention, Aversive Interventions, Mandated Reporting Prompt resolution of all 'handle with care' and Safe Voice tips.

SITE EVALUATION FINDINGS

STRENGTHS

A summary of strengths as observed through academic achievement indicators, classroom observations, focus group feedback and portions of the Organizational Performance Evidence are found within the body of the report and summarized here.

1. Futuro exhibits a strong sense of community.
 - Students, parents, teachers, and administrators shared that there is a strong sense of community during focus groups.
 - Staff is highly committed to the school and firmly believe in the mission statement.
 - Students indicated that they love attending Futuro, and one student remarked, “My teachers help me to learn and I love math!”
 - Parents spoke of having strong relationships in a warm atmosphere and a clear road to helping all learners understand that they are college bound.
 - There are high levels of year to year retention of staff and capacity development.
2. Futuro has a diverse student population in terms of FRL, and English Language learners. The staff is diverse which reflects the demographics of the community.
 - SPCSA staff noted that the staff at the campus appear to be diverse as well.
3. The teaching staff at Futuro appear to be caring and kind. SPCSA staff noticed that the teaching staff uses thoughtful words such as please and thank you whenever possible. Student names were used often. Teaching staff expressed excitement to the students and used some open ended questions. It was clear that the staff is reaching out and trying to develop relationships with students despite the inherent challenges of distance learning.

CHALLENGES

A summary of challenges as observed through academic achievement indicators, classroom observations, focus group feedback and portions of the Organizational Performance Framework Evidence are described within the body of the report and summarized here.

1. Due to the current distance learning environment, the entire Futuro staff has been faced with significant challenges in regard to pedagogy and access to technology.
2. With annual growth and added grade levels each year since 2017, operations and responsibility adjustments have been a challenge. In 2017 the school started with 115 students and today the school enrolls about 435 students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended items are provided so charters may increase their school-wide ratings as well as their overall success. SPCSA School Support Team members will follow up on each listed recommendation.

1. Continue with strong instructional practices and closely monitor the implementation of new curriculum in both writing and math. Reevaluate the outcomes of using these newer programs. Closely monitor levels of student achievement in response to newer curriculum. Continue the thoughtful use of technology to strengthen classroom learning environments and levels of student engagement.
2. To increase the levels of “learning relevance” with students, consider making a point of communicating the “why” for each learner. Consider allowing time to have students talk about and share the relevance of the learning to their real situations in life.
3. It is recommended that school staff continue to work on a variety of distance learning practices to become more schooled, purposeful, and intentional with this platform. In both distance learning and in person platforms, research has shown (*Fisher, Frey & Hattie, 2020*) that the following best practices apply.
 - Fostering student self-regulation is crucial for moving learning to deep and transfer levels.
 - Learning accelerates when the student, not the teacher, is taught to be in control of his or her learning.
 - There needs to be a diversity of instructional approaches.
 - Well-designed peer learning impacts understanding.
 - Feedback in a high-trust environment must be integrated into the learning cycle.(*Fisher et al.,2020*)

This recommendation is provided so that Futuro would consider using newly published materials based on Hattie’s 2020 research to further strengthen the online instruction. As virtual learning decreases, the same strong strategies will apply to the in-person learning environment as well.

DEFICIENCIES

There were no deficiencies identified for Futuro Academy during this site evaluation.



Nevada State Public Charter School Authority

Site Evaluation Report: Futuro Academy **Evaluation Date: 12/8/2022** **Initial Draft Report Date: 2/7/2023**

State Public Charter School Authority
775-687-9174
1749 North Stewart Street Suite 40
Carson City, Nevada 89706
2080 East Flamingo Road, Suite 230
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Contents

Introduction and School Background	3
Academic Performance	4
Focus Group Summaries	7
Classroom Observation Totals	10
Organizational Performance.....	14
Site Evaluation Findings	17

Appendices

A: Nevada School Performance Framework

<http://www.doe.nv.gov/Accountability/NSPF/>

B: SPCSA Academic Framework

<http://charterschools.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/CharterSchoolsnvgov/content/News/2019/190628-Academic-Performance-Framework-Guidance-Document.pdf>

C: SPCSA Organizational Framework

<http://charterschools.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/CharterSchoolsnvgov/content/News/2019/190628-OPF-Att-1-Ratings-Scorecard.pdf>

D: Optional School Response

INTRODUCTION AND SCHOOL BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

This Site Evaluation Report offers an analysis of evidence collected during the school evaluation that took place on 12/8/2022 at Futuro Academy. The State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) conducts a comprehensive review of evidence related to all charters within the portfolio during the first, third, and fifth year of operation. This comprehensive analysis addresses the academic success of the school and the effectiveness and viability of the school organization. Schools identified as having a rating of a two-star or below, and those schools with a Notice of Concern, Notice of Breach, or Notice of Termination, will have a differentiated procedure for their site evaluation or a Targeted evaluation. Futuro Academy is in year three of their charter contract thus meeting the criteria for a comprehensive site evaluation.

An analysis of the school's academic and operational success is undertaken by reviewing the most current versions of the Nevada State Performance Framework (Appendix A) and the State Public Charter School Authority Academic Framework (Appendix B) as well as the Organizational Framework (Appendix C).

In addition, the Site Evaluation Team conducts classroom observations within the areas of classroom environment and instruction. The purpose of these observations is to collect evidence using a rubric which has been normed by our team. All classroom rating outcomes will be displayed within this report so that school leaders have an overall idea of what is happening in general, at any time, in any classroom. The overall numbers will provide information about the school outcomes on this one day.

Members of the SPCSA evaluation team will note additional information regarding the classroom observations on one page of this report. This page will be located on the page immediately after the final classroom rubric ratings. Using information obtained from focus groups of students, parents, staff, school leaders and the school's board, the SPCSA team will summarize results for schools within the report. Observations and take-aways regarding some of the Organizational Framework components will be summarized and outlined in this site evaluation report.

This evaluation has been designed to focus on teaching and learning (e.g. curriculum, instruction, assessment, and services for at-risk students) as well as leadership, organizational capacity, and board oversight. The SPCSA uses the established criteria on a regular basis to provide schools with a consistent set of expectations leading up to renewal.

SCHOOL BACKGROUND

Futuro Academy is located in Las Vegas, Nevada in a facility at 920 N. Lamb Blvd. The school serves 462 students (as of the most recent Validation Day) in kindergarten through 5th grade. The mission of Futuro Academy is: "Through rigorous academics and personal excellence, Futuro Academy educates all K-5 scholars to excel through middle school into high school, and to the university of their choice."

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Nevada School Performance Framework 2022

This information is provided to assist in understanding the data sets impacted by the pandemic.

Elementary School

Futuro Academy Elementary

School Year 2021-2022 Nevada School Rating

School Level: Elementary School
Grade Levels: KG-04
District: State Public Charter School
Authority
School: 920 N. Lamb Blvd
Address: Las Vegas, NV 89110



School Type: SPCSA
School Designation: No Designation
95% Assessment Participation: Warning



5.0%	White
7.5%	Blk/Afr Am
83.1%	Hisp/Latino
1.0%	Asian
0.0%	Am Ind/AK Nat
0.2%	Pac Isl
2.9%	Two or More

School Performance History

School Year	Index Score/ Star Rating
2020-2021	22.5 NR
2019-2020	22.5 NR

Additional Student Groups



Math and ELA Results

Nevada School Performance Framework

2022

This information is provided to assist in understanding the data sets impacted by the pandemic.

Proficiency Rates

Elementary School

Math Proficient


Groups	2022 %	2022 % District	2022 % MIP	2021 %	2021 % District	2021 % MIP
All Students	12.7	49.2	51.1			
American Indian/Alaska Native	-	28.5	37.6			
Asian	-	72.8	70.4			
Black/African American	5.2	30.3	35.7			
Hispanic/Latino	11.6	37.9	42.7			
Pacific Islander	-	47.2	50.9			
Two or More Races	-	55.6	57.5			
White/Caucasian	-	60.7	61.3			
Special Education	<5	26.3	32.1			
English Learners Current + Former	11.8	34.9	39			
English Learners Current	9.9	25.5				
Economically Disadvantaged	12.7	35.6	42			

ELA Proficient

Groups	2022 %	2022 % District	2022 % MIP	2021 %	2021 % District	2021 % MIP
All Students	23.0	55.4	59.2			
American Indian/Alaska Native	-	40.8	45.4			
Asian	-	74.9	76.7			
Black/African American	21.0	39.8	45.4			
Hispanic/Latino	20.7	45.1	50.8			
Pacific Islander	-	53.7	60			
Two or More Races	-	61.5	66.2			
White/Caucasian	-	65.5	69			
Special Education	11.1	25.5	33.5			
English Learners Current + Former	19.5	37.4	44.4			
English Learners Current	13.5	24.4				
Economically Disadvantaged	23.0	42.8	49.4			


SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Geographic Comparison Report

Elementary School



SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Diversity Comparison Results

Elementary School



FOCUS GROUP SUMMARIES

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY

Group	Number of Participants	Duration of Focus Group
Governing Board	2	30 minutes
Parents/Families	4	30 minutes
Students	12	30 minutes
School Leadership	3	30 minutes
Staff	9	30 minutes

Governing Board¹:

- Governing board members discussed the expertise that each board member brings to Futuro's governing board. One board member said, "We have a parent, an educator, finance, multiple attorneys, marketing specialist, and an operations specialist. In addition, we just voted on an appointed position for education administration."
- Members of the governing board provided a high-level overview of the financial reports that the board reviews each month. One governing board member explained, "The finance sub-committee only meets when there is something outlying or if there needs to be a decision made. We set the budget every year and discuss adjustments. Additionally, we review finance reports every month."
- Governing board members discussed some areas of opportunity for school improvement according to their perspectives. Board members elaborated, "Coming back from distance learning and getting back on track with improving academic performance is our focus and what we continue to work on improving. This is an issue that is nationwide. Mitigating certain circumstances is beyond our control. Not everyone learns from an online setting."

Parents/Families:

- Several family members reported that Futuro has created a positive and welcoming school community. One family member shared, "I feel very welcome and comfortable at Futuro. We are treated like family." Another parent said, "Administration and staff know the names of our family members, and they are aware of what is going on at home. For example, we recently lost a family member, and my child had a hard time with that. The faculty was very good with him and supportive." A family member explained, "They are attentive to our needs. They make my concerns feel important and take the time to address my questions."
- Families reported that teachers at Futuro are good at communicating and keeping families up to date on the progress their children are making in each subject. One parent said, "I hear how each day went from my child and the teacher. I get emails regarding information about testing dates and test results." Another parent said, "If I do need to reach out to my child's teacher, I can easily make contact." One more parent said, "We

¹ Two members of the twelve member board participated. Quorum was not met, and Open Meeting Law was not violated.

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARIES

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY continued

get weekly messages as to what happened that week. At the beginning of school, families received email and phone numbers for each teacher.”

- Families reported one area of opportunity for improvement at Futuro. Several families affirmed the need to have space for a physical education (PE) class. One parent said, “There is currently no PE class. Students only get a 15-minute recess. Students receive one week of art and then one week of music, but adding PE would be really good for them.” Another parent elaborated, “We would like the school to build in more active time for brain breaks. Some teachers provide brain breaks but not all teachers do, and they are not that frequent.”

Students:

- Students reported several opportunities to participate in student-led activities in the classroom. One student shared, “We get to talk to our shoulder partner and work in groups.” Another student said, “We have opportunities to work with our peers in math class.”
- Students reported ways Futuro creates a positive and safe school environment. A student explained, “We have community meetings every week. We talk about focused expectations and character traits for the month.” Another student shared, “At the end of the month we have ceremonies for the student of the month and class of the month. It’s a time for us to come together as a community and our families are invited.”
- Several students reported challenges with adhering to Futuro’s uniform dress code. One student said his family has been struggling economically and washing clothes is a problem. Another student explained he is growing fast, and his mom can’t keep up with buying clothes. Multiple students shared they would like Futuro to have a place in the school where students can donate clothes they have to help alleviate this problem for other students and families.

Leadership:

- Leadership explained how they have supported teachers in increasing student voice in classrooms. One member of leadership shared, “We support teachers to make sure there is a certain amount of student-to-student interaction and the ratio to adult voice and student voice is balanced.” Another leadership member said, “We are making some changes to some of our curricular structures. We are piloting student-led sections of the community meeting.”
- Leadership shared how they are creating a positive school environment. Leadership members explained, “Students meet once a week for community meetings in the multipurpose room. Three days of the month are focused on core values and community building and the fourth day is dedicated to acknowledging the student of the month. Families are invited and encouraged to attend community meetings. Teachers also have morning meetings which are student lead.”

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARIES

FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY continued

- Leadership explained their process for utilizing data from assessments to drive instructional and curricular decisions. Leadership shared, “Teachers meet every week to discuss how to use the data to guide our next steps in how to benefit the lessons and skills for the students. We spend a lot of time on the data to assist in guiding tiered interventions to meet the needs of our students.”

Staff:

- Several staff members shared some challenges in providing targeted support to students in efforts to close opportunity gaps. One staff member shared, “It’s very challenging when we have large class sizes and little to no additional adult support in the classroom.” One teacher said she has reached out to administration asking for extra assistance in the classroom but has not received a response. Staff members explained, “Greater communication from the administration regarding assistance would be welcome and appreciated.” Staff reported that they never hear anything about students who have been absent for consecutive days. Staff elaborated, “We don’t know why they are out, how long they are out, or what is going on.”
- Staff shared some areas of opportunity for improvement at Futuro. Several staff members reported they would like smaller class sizes. Staff also reported that there is a strong need for PE class and a field for students to be able to play. Additionally, staff reported they would like to use a curriculum that is more culturally responsive. One staff member shared, “We should use a curriculum that let students read text that represents their voices and their experiences. For example, we are reading Peter Pan and I’m confused about the text selection. Our students don’t understand British words and experiences. We should be reading text that allows our students to make greater connections in efforts to build comprehension skills.” In addition, staff reported they would like to see improvement in the support provided to staff, such as parenting classes for families, teacher assistants, and improved staff access to enter the building. One staff member explained, “Futuro could benefit from implementing a parenting class on best practices for parenting, behavioral and academic expectations, and community resources.” A staff member shared, “We would like teacher assistants in every classroom. Teacher assistants do push-ins and pull-outs, but there are no teacher assistants for each classroom.” Another staff member shared, “I miss having parent volunteers assist in my classroom. I have to request someone to volunteer. We would like to see parent volunteers back in the school.”
- Staff discussed ways they provide targeted support and services to students in efforts to close opportunity gaps. One staff member said, “The reading and writing teacher pull small groups and provides targeted intervention.” Another staff explained, “We have weekly training to review and discuss special education (SPED) and English learner services. We have a SPED team that provides services. We also have staff who are bilingual to provide services and supports.”

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT AND INSTRUCTION OBSERVATION RUBRIC

A total of 20 classrooms were observed for approximately 15 minutes on the day of the evaluation.

Classroom Environment					
	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Classroom Learning Environment is Conducive to Learning	Students create and maintain a learning environment where students feel free to share their ideas and take risks in learning. Students take ownership in explaining, modeling, and reinforcing classroom routines.	The teacher creates and maintains a learning environment where students feel free to share their ideas and take risks in learning. Teachers explain, model, and reinforce classroom routines.	The teacher attempts to create and maintain a learning environment where students feel free to share their ideas and take risks in learning. Teachers attempt to explain, model, and reinforce classroom routines.	The teacher does not create and maintain a learning environment where students feel free to share their ideas and take risks in learning. Teachers do not explain, model, and reinforce classroom routines.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Learning experiences guide students to identify their strengths, interests, and needs; problem-solve; ask for support when appropriate; maximizing learning time.	Learning experiences guide students to identify their strengths, interests, and needs; problem-solve; ask for support when appropriate; maximizing learning time.	Learning experiences make an effort to guide students to identify their strengths, interests, and needs; problem-solve; ask for support when appropriate. Learning time is sometimes maximized.	Learning experiences do not guide students to identify their strengths, interests, and needs; problem-solve; ask for support when appropriate. Learning time is seldom maximized.	
Establishing a Culture for Learning	Total: 7	Total: 7	Total: 5	Total: 1	Total: 0
	Students and teachers respond appropriately when conflicts arise and demonstrate respect for and affirm their own and others' differences related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges.	Teacher responds appropriately when conflicts arise and demonstrate respect for and affirm their own and others' differences related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges.	Teacher attempts to respond appropriately when conflicts arise and demonstrate respect for and affirm their own and others' differences related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges.	Teacher does not attempt to respond appropriately when conflicts arise and does not demonstrate respect for and affirm their own and others' differences related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 7	Total: 8	Total: 4	Total: 1	Total: 0

Classroom Instruction					
	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Purpose and Explanation of Content, Lesson, Unit or Classroom Activity	The purpose of the lesson or unit is clear and connects with student's life experiences. The explanation of content is imaginative, and students contribute to the lesson by participating and/or explaining concepts to their peers.	The purpose for the lesson or learning activity is clear. The teacher's explanation of content is appropriate. and connects with students.	The teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success. The explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	The purpose of the lesson and learning activity is unclear. The teacher's explanation of the content is unclear, confusing, or uses inappropriate language.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 5	Total: 9	Total: 3	Total: 0	Total: 3
Students' Cognitive Awareness of Learning Goals/Targets	Students can explain/demonstrate the goals/targets of the lesson, content, unit, or classroom activity during this instructional timeframe.	Most of the students can explain/demonstrate the goals/targets of the lesson, content, unit, or classroom activity during this instructional timeframe.	Some of the students can explain/demonstrate the goals/targets of the lesson, content, unit, or classroom activity during this instructional timeframe.	Students cannot explain/demonstrate the goals/targets of the lesson, content, unit, or classroom activity during this instructional time frame.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 3	Total: 12	Total: 3	Total: 0	Total: 2
Quality and purpose of questions	Students formulate and ask high-level questions.	Teacher formulates and asks several high-level questions.	Teacher questioning and discussion techniques are uneven with some high-level questions.	Teacher makes poor use of questioning and discussion techniques, with low-level questions, limited student participation, and little true discussion.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 1	Total: 11	Total: 3	Total: 2	Total: 3
Opportunities for student discourse and student use of academic language	Students use academic language while participating in discourse. Students demonstrate mastery through reasoning and higher-order thinking.	Teachers encourage the use of academic language and provide students opportunities for discourse. Students are encouraged to demonstrate knowledge through reasoning and higher-order thinking.	There is some attempt by the teacher to encourage the use of academic language. Students are provided limited opportunities for discourse. There is some attempt by the teacher to encourage students to demonstrate knowledge through reasoning and higher order thinking.	There is little to no opportunity for student discourse. There is little to no opportunity for students to demonstrate knowledge through reasoning and higher-order thinking.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 1	Total: 11	Total: 6	Total: 1	Total: 1

Classroom Instruction (continued)

	Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Intellectual Engagement in Learning	Students are intellectually engaged throughout the lesson. The pacing and structure of the lesson is differentiated and allows high levels of student engagement.	Students appear to be intellectually engaged throughout most of the lesson. The pacing and structure of the lesson is differentiated and adequate.	Students are partially intellectually engaged throughout the lesson. The pacing and structure of the lesson is somewhat differentiated and inconsistent.	Students are not at all intellectually engaged in significant learning. The pacing and structure of the lesson is not differentiated and inadequate.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 1	Total: 10	Total: 8	Total: 1	Total: 0
Using Formative Assessment in Instruction	The teacher purposefully and consistently provides clear, descriptive feedback in regard to student's understanding of the learning goals/targets. The feedback is timely and is in a reasonable amount.	Most of the time, the teacher, provides clear, descriptive feedback regarding student's understanding of the learning goals/targets. The feedback is timely and is in a reasonable amount.	The teacher provides clear, descriptive feedback inconsistently regarding student's understanding of the learning goals/targets. The feedback is seldom timely and is in a reasonable amount.	The teacher does not provide clear, descriptive feedback regarding student's understanding of the learning goals/targets. The feedback is not timely and is not in a reasonable amount.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	Total: 1	Total: 13	Total: 3	Total: 2	Total: 1

Additional information about the classroom observations shared here when applicable

- In one lower elementary classroom, the teacher provided one-on-one targeted interventions. The other students worked in small groups to complete skilled activities. The teacher set up clear routines and expectations for students to follow.
- In one lower elementary classroom, the teacher explained the purpose of the lesson. The teacher discussed the academic vocabulary needed to understand the learning target and make real-world connections to the words.
- In one elementary classroom, students displayed off-task behaviors while working on independent activities. The teacher made attempts to redirect and reinforce expectations.
- Students used textual evidence from a novel to answer questions posed by the teacher. Students raised their hands to respond. The teacher read the novel aloud, and students followed along quietly.
- Students completed a worksheet on the life cycle of a frog in an elementary science classroom. The teacher sat at her desk and guided the students with a projected copy of the worksheet. Students were disengaged and off task. The teacher reminded the students several times to not throw crayons and to "get in star position."

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

The SPCSA uses the Organizational Performance Framework to collect evidence of performance and evaluate schools, at least annually, to monitor schools throughout their charter terms, to report to schools and the public annually, to intervene in schools that do not meet expectations and to make high-stakes decisions, including: renewal, non-renewal, possible revocation, expansion, or replication. Most of this work is done through routine submissions by the school to the SPCSA.

A limited number of measures within the organizational performance framework may be at least partially evaluated during the site evaluation process. Measures are partially evaluated based upon evidence from school focus groups, school observations, documents reviewed, visual inspection and information from the school presentation portion of the evaluation. SPCSA staff will note the evidence provided by the school and also outline any questions or potential concerns.

Indicator	Measure Description	Evidence Collected
Indicator 1: Education Program	Measures 1a and 1b: The school implements the material terms of the education program. Ex: SPCSA site evaluations will confirm that the school is staying true to its approved application and programming, as well as review curricular materials and their alignment to Nevada Academic Content Standards. Measures 1c and 1d: The school protects the rights of students with disabilities and EL students. Ex: For example, classroom observations include examples of students with an IEP or those learning English as a language. Student support is provided within small groups or teachers using interventions and supports to provide students with special needs and EL learners with meaningful access to grade-level content and standards.	Through rigorous academics and personal excellence, Futuro Academy educates all K-5 scholars to excel through middle school into high school, and to the university of their choice. Futuro focuses on CORE Values and character development. All minutes and services provided are reported in the Infinite Campus Service Log section. Goals are tracked by the Special Education Teacher. English learners students are tested to measure their English language proficiency. Their scores are uploaded on My Education Data for staff and families to access.
Indicator 3: Governance and Reporting	Measure 3a: The school complies with governance requirements Ex: Board policies and oversight of Education Service Provider	The Futuro Academy Board of Trustees is compliant and maintains policies that meet requirements that are reviewed annually for potential edits, additions, or improvements. requirements through new laws or regulations.
Indicator 4: Students and Employees	Measure 4a: Student records under lock and key/stored appropriately Measure 4d: Personnel files are under lock and key/stored appropriately	Student and Personnel files were observed to be locked and stored in a secure location.
Indicator 5: School	Measure 5b:	The site evaluation team saw evacuation plans in

Environment	• Evacuation plans for classrooms are posted • The school has fire extinguishers on all floors which are tagged • Active permit for food service (if applicable) • Nurse requirements are met through visual check of health office, disposal of sharps, cot, refrigeration	classrooms and tagged fire extinguishers throughout the building and common areas. The site evaluation team visually checked and located one cot, a refrigerator, and a receptacle for disposing of sharp objects in the nurse's area.
-------------	--	--

Measures of Progress from Previous Site Evaluations

The extent to which the school has been successful in maintaining areas of strength, removing challenges, and acting upon the recommended items made by the SPCSA during the school's previous evaluation.

Summary of recommendations from most recent site evaluation.	1. Continue with strong instructional practices and closely monitor the implementation of new curriculum in both writing and math. Reevaluate the outcomes of using these newer programs. Closely monitor levels of student achievement in response to newer curriculum. Continue the thoughtful use of technology to strengthen classroom learning environments and levels of student engagement. 2. To increase the levels of "learning relevance" with students, consider making a point of communicating the "why" for each learner. Consider allowing time to have students talk about and share the relevance of the learning to their real situations in life. 3. It is recommended that school staff continue to work on a variety of distance learning practices to become more schooled, purposeful, and intentional with this platform.
School Assessment of progress made against recommendations and evidence provided, or reasons school believes additional time may be necessary to fully address past recommendations	1. Curriculum monitoring has taken place. 2. Learning relevance through student ownership has taken place. 3. Futuro has returned to in person learning
SPCSA staff assessment based upon findings during site evaluation	Recommendations from the 2021- 2022 Site Evaluation have been addressed. The board, leadership team, and staff continue to diligently address the academic and social-emotional needs of students using data to inform decisions.

SITE EVALUATION FINDINGS

STRENGTHS

A summary of strengths as observed through academic achievement indicators, classroom observations, focus group feedback and portions of the Organizational Performance Framework are described within the body of the report and summarized here.

- Futuro was observed by SPCSA site evaluators to have a strong school community. At Futuro, the faculty and the student body represent the community in which they serve. Leadership reported that parent engagement is high. One member of leadership explained, “We have a high turnout of families attending school events.” A staff member shared, “Futuro has a high retention with families in the community.” Several family members reported that their kids have been attending Futuro since it opened and have no plans of leaving. Overall, SPCSA staff found the community the school has created to be an asset to the school.
- SPCSA evaluators observed strong academic tiered levels of support to meet the needs of specialized populations. Leadership reported that data is utilized at a high level to inform decisions for the school. Leadership and staff communicated several evidence-based interventions and supports implemented to support academic growth. Additionally, Futuro’s catalog of professional development offerings is observed as a strength by SPCSA evaluators.
- It was observed by SPCSA site evaluators that Futuro’s drop-off and pick-up lines ran smoothly. Several family members responded positively regarding the effectiveness of Futuro's drop-off and pick-up lines. Students also reported that arriving and departing school is a smooth transition.

CHALLENGES

A summary of challenges as observed through academic achievement indicators, classroom observations, focus group feedback and portions of the Organizational Performance Framework Evidence are described within the body of the report and summarized here.

- School leaders, family members, students, and staff reported that the school has undergone significant staff turnover. Family members reported, “Many staff members are new to the teaching profession.” Family members voiced concerns about some staff members being able to meet the needs of their children.
- The math, science, and English language arts (ELA) student proficiency is a challenge for Futuro Academy. According to the 2021 - 22 NSPF, Futuro’s student proficiency is 12.6 in math, 23 percent in ELA, and 1.6 percent in science. As a result, Futuro’s index score is 20 and does not meet the standard as the school would have been rated as a 1-star school had ratings been issued. Without dramatic improvement during the 2022 – 23 school year, this puts the school at an increased risk for SPCSA intervention.
- Chronic absenteeism is a challenge for Futuro Academy. According to the 2021 - 22 NSPF, Futuro’s chronic absenteeism is 51.7 percent. Leadership reported that they are still struggling

SITE EVALUATION FINDINGS

Site Evaluation Findings continued

with the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. Leadership shared several ways they are working to improve chronic absenteeism, such as calling parents and families to explain the importance of bringing their children to school.

- Staff reported very vocally during the staff focus group feelings of being overwhelmed and under-resourced in meeting the needs of specialized student groups. One staff member shared, “We have a large caseload of students in need of services and targeted interventions. It has become extremely overwhelming while trying to provide services and interventions to meet all of our student’s needs.” Given the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, this represents a challenge for Futuro.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended items are provided so charters may increase their school-wide ratings as well as their overall success. Authorizing Team members will follow up on each listed recommendation.

- It is recommended elementary school staff become more purposeful and intentional with in-person instructional best practices and develop a common language for school-wide expectations. SPCSA staff noticed several disengaged students and loss of learning time during instruction. According to the SPCSA's Classroom Observation Rubric on page 12 of this report, eight classrooms were scored as basic in the Intellectual Engagement in Learning category. Members of the leadership team reported behavioral and loss of learning challenges resulting from the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Staff also indicated the return to in-person learning has illustrated student difficulty in self-regulation within the classroom environment. It is recommended that Futuro consider ways in which to encourage student interaction during lessons. Consider ways in which students can direct their own learning, share explanations of content, or connect to students' individual lived experiences.
- SPCSA evaluators recommend Futuro utilizes greater communication channels with faculty and staff regarding student support and resources. For example, students reported they do not have consistent access to clean uniforms and could benefit from receiving additional uniforms as they grow out of their old uniforms. SPCSA staff believes the Futuro community could benefit from implementing a clothes closet for gently worn uniforms. Leadership reported they have a laundry facility and are working on a way to bolster the communication to let parents know they can bring uniforms to wash. One member of leadership explained, "We have the infrastructure in place to provide tier-three services. We have a parent swap for gently used uniforms on Facebook." SPCSA staff can be available to assist with these efforts by connecting the school with other schools that have a closet, or perhaps helping the school find a community partner to provide additional resources.
- It is recommended by SPCSA staff that Futuro finalize a desired amount of board seats to be in place by the 2023 – 2024 school year and ensure that Epicenter always reflects the current amount. Governing board members explained, "Futuro started with 12 board members when we opened. Currently, we only have 9 board members now that we are more established." It is recommended by SPCSA staff that Futuro keeps Epicenter updated and notify the SPCSA when a seat becomes vacant due to board resignation. Additionally, SPCSA staff recommends that Futuro review its current bylaws at least annually to make sure they reflect the desires of the board.
- SPCSA staff recommends that Futuro creates a robust plan to increase student proficiency rates. As mentioned in the challenges section on page 18 of the report, Futuro's ELA, math, and science proficiency rates are far below the standard. As a result, Futuro's NSPF index score has been negatively impacted and does not meet the standard. Futuro earned an index score of 20 for the 2021 – 2022 school year, which is the equivalent of a 1-star rating. SPCSA staff can be available to assist as needed.
- Futuro continues to face challenges with staff retention. Several family member focus group participants raised concerns about the inconsistency in staffing at Futuro. It was also reported in Futuro's School Performance Plan (SPP) that only 67 percent of teaching staff returned from the prior year. It is recommended that Futuro develops a plan to address staffing concerns. The plan may include an analysis of staffing deficits, marketing, recruitment, staffing agencies, and staffing pay adjustments. If support is needed, SPCSA staff can be available to assist.

STRONG RECOMMENDATIONS

There were no strong recommendations identified for Futuro during this site evaluation.

DEFICIENCIES

There were no deficiencies identified for Futuro during this site evaluation.

Appendix D

Futuro Academy's Optional Response

February 14, 2023

Feedback / Comment For Consideration for Inclusion in SPCSA report as a response:

In general, Futuro Academy accepts the majority of the quantitative and qualitative observations, summaries of focus groups, and other instruments and measurements from the Site Visit which occurred on December 8, 2022, and did not find any substantial errors or misrepresentations in the report.

The feedback for inclusion we would like to present is that in isolation, this report may give a limited or inaccurate sense of the current status of similarly positioned schools within the SPCSA portfolio of schools. The original communication below is provided below for inclusion as part of our response if it is deemed appropriate to provide that context. This communication was initially shared with SPCSA staff in anticipation of additional monitoring approved by the SPCSA board on November 18, 2023.

Substance and Concerns with Over-Identification of Title 1 Elementary Schools for Additional Monitoring and Intervention:

1. Statistical over-representation of elementary schools

A. In the SPCSA in 2021-22, there were 131 schools that received ratings, 40% of which are elementary schools (52 campuses). 80% of schools that qualify under the 1-star criteria here are Elementary Schools (double representation approximately). I cannot run the correlation on schools with notices of concern or breach as that is not a field in the Nevada Report Card, but believe it it's critical to be transparent about this obvious pattern when presenting to the board, and to produce the percentage of elementary schools under notices of concern or breach.

B. In the SPCSA in 2021-22, 6 of the 10 schools who qualify under the 1-star criteria are Elementary Schools attached to a network or larger campus with an affiliated or attached Middle School. 5 of those had complete ratings for both ES and MS campuses. When an Elementary School qualified under the 1 star criteria, its corresponding middle school had an average delta of 37 more index points. No attached middle school had less than twice the index points of its elementary school.

2. Statistical over-representation of Title I schools

A. In the SPCSA in 2021-22, there were 131 schools that received ratings, 28% of which are Title 1 schools (37 campuses). 60% of schools that qualify under the 1-star criteria here are Title 1 Schools (double representation approximately). I cannot run the correlation on schools with notices of concern or breach as that is not a field in the Nevada Report Card, but believe it it's critical to be transparent about this obvious pattern when presenting to the board, and to produce the percentage of elementary schools under notices of concern or breach.

B. There is a compounding effect of both variables (elementary school, Title 1 school). 9% of SPCSA schools are Title 1 elementary schools (12 campuses), yet they represent 50% of schools to qualify under 1 star criteria (quintuple representation), and in aggregate 28% of schools receiving less than 50 index points (triple representation). Again, I cannot figure out the notices of concern as that's not a field in the data exported from the NV Report Card.



Nevada State Public Charter School Authority

Futuro Academy

Site Evaluation Report: February 20, 2025

State Public Charter School Authority
775-687-9174
3427 Goni Rd, Suite 103
Carson City, Nevada 89706
702-486-8895
500 E. Warm Springs Rd, Suite 116
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 3

Site Evaluation Findings: Strengths..... 4

Site Evaluation Findings: Challenges 7

Site Evaluation Findings: Recommendations 8

Site Evaluation Findings: Strong Recommendations 9

Site Evaluation Findings: Deficiencies 10

Focus Group Participation Data..... 11

 Focus Group Summary: Governing Board 12

 Focus Group Summary: Family Members, Parents, and Guardians..... 13

 Focus Group Summary: Faculty and Staff..... 14

 Focus Group Summary: School Leadership 15

 Focus Group Summary: Students 16

Classroom Environment and Instruction Observation Rubric 17

Classroom Observations and Additional Comments 20

Measures of Progress from Previous Site Evaluation..... 24

Operational Compliance Checks..... 26

Appendix A 27

Links to Resources:

- [Nevada School Performance Framework \(NSPF\)](#)
- [SPCSA Academic Performance Framework Results](#)
- [SPCSA Organizational Performance Framework Results](#)
- [SPCSA Financial Performance Framework Results](#)
- [Best Practices](#)

Executive Summary

This Site Evaluation Report offers an analysis of evidence collected during the school evaluation. Pursuant to [NRS 388A.223](#), the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) conducts a comprehensive review of evidence related to all charters within the portfolio during the first, third, and fifth years of operation. This comprehensive analysis addresses the school's academic and organizational effectiveness.

An analysis of the school's academic and operational success is undertaken by reviewing the most current versions of the Nevada State Performance Framework (NSPF), the SPCSA Academic Performance Framework, and the SPCSA Organizational Performance Framework.

In addition, the Site Evaluation Team conducts classroom observations to assess both the classroom environment and the instructional techniques on the day of the evaluation. The purpose of these observations is to collect evidence using a rubric based on the [Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching](#). All classroom rating outcomes are displayed within this report. The overall numbers provide information about the general nature of instruction at a given school during the day of the site evaluation.

SPCSA staff conducts focus group interviews by speaking with school leaders, governing board members, family members, those employed as staff, and most importantly, students enrolled at the school. The information gained during these focus groups is summarized and included in this report.

The site evaluation is designed to focus on teaching and learning (e.g. curriculum, instruction, assessment, and services for at-risk students) as well as leadership, organizational capacity, and board oversight. The SPCSA uses the established criteria to provide schools with a consistent set of expectations during each year of their charter. Final Site Evaluation Reports are published to the SPCSA website and used in conjunction with other performance information to determine renewal decisions.

Site Evaluation Findings: Strengths

A summary of strengths as observed through academic achievement indicators, classroom observations, focus group feedback, and portions of the Organizational Performance Framework.

Classroom environment

Futuro classroom observation results indicate that on the day of the site evaluation, there were “Distinguished” ratings within both classroom environment sections on the Classroom Observation and Instructional Learning Rubric (p. 16 of this report). In the first rubric category, “Classroom Environment is Conducive to Learning,” six of the 28 classrooms observed rated in the “Distinguished” category. Classrooms rated in this area indicate students felt free to share their ideas and take risks in learning. Learning experiences guide students to identify their strengths and interests, problem-solve, and ask for support when appropriate. In the second category, “Establishing a Culture for Learning,” six of the 28 classrooms were rated “distinguished.” This rating indicates that students and teachers responded appropriately when conflicts arose and demonstrated respect for their own and others’ differences related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges.

Improvement in the English language proficiency indicator

A strength of Futuro Academy is its recent improvement of its Nevada Report Card in the English Language Proficiency Indicator. On the 2023-24 Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF), the school improved from one of ten points from the previous year to seven of ten points. The school's adequate growth percentiles of students meeting their growth targets are at 49 percent, exceeding the State average of 48 percent.

Intentional instructional model

The leadership team at Futuro Academy dedicated a focus to professionally developing faculty with an intentional teaching model to support students learning English (EL) in reading, listening, and comprehension¹ immediately following COVID. Futuro Academy’s student population is 44 percent EL. Each Futuro faculty member became WIDA² certificated.³ During classroom observations, members of the site evaluation team regularly observed:

- Students participated in turn-and-talk activities for every 10 minutes of classroom instruction.
- Teachers employed sufficient wait time for students to respond to inquiries.
- Students and teachers used accountable talk⁴ with fidelity.
- Students and teachers used academic vocabulary regularly.
- Students were asked higher-order thinking questions beyond factual recall.

¹ The school’s State Performance Plan goal (SPP).

² WIDA is a comprehensive assessment measuring English language proficiency in four categories: identification, placement, progress, and achievement. The WIDA screener is used to determine ELL support services as well as determining when a student has developed proficiency to exit ELL school services.

³ To become WIDA certified, educators in the WIDA Consortium must complete the required training and pass the relevant quizzes for the WIDA assessments or screener they will be administering.

⁴ Accountable talk is a strategy that promotes meaningful and respectful classroom discussions by encouraging students to build upon each other's ideas, explain their thinking, and engage in higher-order thinking using sentence stems and hand gestures.

Leadership's dedicated attention to EL student and faculty needs is a clear strength. The consistent opportunity for students to verbally practice their oral skills in reasoning was evident across all observed classrooms.

Communication with students in the classroom

Students were able to explain what they were learning. Teachers explained content clearly and imaginatively. They used analogies to bring content to the lives of the students and set high expectations for student outcomes. A majority of teachers pointed out possible areas in which students might have misunderstandings. Most teachers invited students to explain content, thoughts, or strategies to classmates. Teachers modeled the use of rich academic language and offered brief vocabulary lessons where appropriate, both for general vocabulary and for the academic language within the content area. Students used academic language both correctly and often.

Positive relationships between personnel and students

Students were consistently engaged in every classroom visited. This emphasizes a culture of active learning and participation throughout the school, creating a vibrant and intellectually stimulating environment. The SPCSA site evaluation team observed teachers and staff personnel saying 'please,' and 'thank you,' to students in the common areas, modeling civil speech. Students responded in kind. The SPCSA site evaluation team observed many classrooms in which relationships between classroom teachers have cultivated trust with their students. Students felt comfortable asking peers and teachers for academic support. Students were engaged and interested in what they were learning and clearly wanted to know the why and how of things. Many positive and useful teacher responses to student questions, learning engagement, and teacher dedication to student learning were observed.

Consistency with governing board membership

The Futuro Academy governing board demonstrates robust board retention and partnership with leadership. The governing board also demonstrates board membership preservation, with three board members serving since the school opened. Both the governing board focus group and the leadership focus group reported an effective rapport between leadership.

Consistency in leadership

Futuro Academy has maintained consistency in leadership since the school's inception. The staff retention rate is stable, with a 100 percent return this academic year, demonstrating stability for the school's students and families. This strong foundation provides the school with a foundational understanding of the student population's needs, allowing leadership to quickly create and initiate effective procedures and initiatives to support student learning.

Solution-oriented leadership

The leadership team at Futuro Academy demonstrates exceptional resilience and adaptability in the face of challenges. The leadership team works collegially and employs a reflective and innovative approach to establishing strong routines, systems, processes, and procedures that are well-attuned to the needs of the faculty, staff, families, and students, as evidenced by the commentary in each of the focus groups.

This solutions-oriented lens has provided Futuro Academy with continuous improvement, which includes:

- Purchase of the school building in August 2024.
- Slow growth model, adding grades four and five over the years.
- Increasing the NSPF star rating to a three-star for the 2023-24 year.
- Staff retention has increased over the last two consecutive years, with a 100 percent expected return of faculty for the upcoming 2025-26 school year, as reported by the leadership team.

Site Evaluation Findings: Challenges

A summary of challenges as observed through academic achievement indicators, classroom observations, focus group feedback, and portions of the Organizational Performance Framework.

Chronic absenteeism

School leadership acknowledged that chronic absenteeism is an ongoing challenge. Attendance information from the most recent data indicates chronic absenteeism at 22.3 percent. The leadership team asserted that efforts to improve communication with families about the excessive and impactful negatives of chronic absenteeism have assisted in reducing chronic absenteeism, and ongoing efforts are in place.

Science proficiency

Science proficiency is a challenge for Futuro Academy. According to the 2023-24 NSPF, its science proficiency rate was 7 percent, well below the district average of 21 percent.

Special needs students

As reported by the leadership team, students with special needs have increased approximately 50 percent year over year. The legislative funding lag causes financial and personnel stress. Nationwide shortages in licensed qualified special education teachers combine to make the stretch growth of specials needs populations a challenge.

Site Evaluation Findings: Recommendations

Recommended items are provided so charter schools may increase their school-wide performance and overall success. The Site Evaluation Team will follow up on these recommendations in preparation for the subsequent site evaluation.

Continue to increase overall student proficiency

SPCSA staff recommend Futuro Academy continue to monitor and plan ways in which to increase student proficiency rates. Futuro Academy has a current three-star NSPF index rating with an index score of 52.5 out of a possible 100 points. As mentioned during the leadership team focus group, a school-wide goal includes efforts to close achievement gaps, reduce chronic absenteeism, improve science proficiency and further increase student growth gains.

Increase student science proficiency

SPCSA recommends Futuro Academy continue to increase student proficiency in science at the elementary school level. Currently, student science proficiency at the elementary level is at 7.1 percent.

Continue to monitor the CKLA⁵ “Core Knowledge” curriculum

SPCSA staff recommend teachers and leaders continue to monitor the effectiveness of the ELA CKLA “Core Knowledge” curriculum as they become more familiar with the contents and applicability to their students in upper elementary grades during the 2025-26 academic year.

Lower levels of chronic absenteeism

SPCSA staff recommend Futuro Academy continue strategizing ways in which to address chronic absenteeism. Attendance information from the most recent data indicates chronic absenteeism for elementary grades is 22.3 percent. Absenteeism rate has a direct effect on the NSPF index scores for the school. The Nevada State Point Attribution Table (PAT) for chronic absenteeism rates has been provided below. The school index ratings (displayed on page four of this report) could have been up to eight points higher if absenteeism rates were improved.

Chronic Absenteeism Point Attribution Table

Rate	Points	Rate	Points	Rate	Points
<5	10	≥ 11 and < 12	6.5	≥18 and <19	3
≥ 5 and <6	9.5	≥ 12 and < 13	6	≥ 19 and < 20	2.5
≥ 6 and <7	9	≥ 13 and < 14	5.5	≥ 20 and < 21	2
≥ 7 and <8	8.5	≥ 14 and < 15	5	≥ 21 and < 22	1.5
≥ 8 and <9	8	≥ 15 and < 16	4.5	≥ 22 and < 23	1
≥ 9 and <10	7.5	≥ 16 and < 17	4	≥ 23 and < 24	0.5
≥ 10 and <11	7	≥ 17 and < 18	3.5	≥ 24	

⁵ Core Knowledge Language Arts is a comprehensive language arts curriculum created by Amplify for grades pre-kindergarten through fifth grade that combine a multi-sensory approach to phonics with rich texts carefully sequenced to build content knowledge.

Site Evaluation Findings: Strong Recommendations

Strong recommendations identified during this site evaluation are listed here, if applicable.

There were no strong recommendations for Futuro Academy during this site evaluation.

Site Evaluation Findings: Deficiencies

Deficiencies identified during this site evaluation are listed here, if applicable.

There were no deficiencies identified for Futuro Academy during this site evaluation.

Focus Group Participation Data

Focus groups are conducted on the day of the site evaluation and last for 45 minutes. During an abbreviated site evaluation, focus groups are not conducted.

Name of Focus Group	Number of Participants
Governing Board ⁶	2
Family Members, Parents, and Guardians	5
Faculty and Staff	2
School Leadership	5
Students	11

⁶ Quorum was not met, and Open Meeting Law was not violated.

Focus Group Summary: Governing Board

Two members of the six-member governing board met with members of the site evaluation team. Three members of the governing board are founding members. One member of the board is a non-voting member, a teacher, and is elected by the other members of the board. Board members reported that they meet every other month. The board has the following sub-committees: governance, finance, education and academic, and an ad-hoc construction sub-committee. Sub-committees meet every quarter and as needed. Membership expertise includes people with expertise from the professional fields of law, education, medical administration, marketing, and parenting.

Board members said they are kept abreast of academics through the Executive Director's report provided at every board meeting. One board member explained, "We receive the report ahead of time in order to review the report. It contains thorough data, like the Star report⁷ and discipline reports. We get benchmark projections, and we can see increase in academic gains of students. We can create questions if necessary and there is time in the agenda for board members to talk with the school leader about the report and ask questions." Board members participating in the focus group indicated the board has not created any direct academic school initiatives, but they do track school goals and ask numerous questions. Board members said they also frequently visit the school and attend school events. One board member said he facilitated a social-emotional-lesson with fifth grade students. Board members said they are regularly updated on teacher turnover. One board member shared, "We have discussed recruitment and targets. We have adjusted the academic calendar to make it more competitive. We have adjusted pay to be competitive. We hear feedback from the school and provide guidance."

The board said their current focus is on monitoring the day-to-day fiscal costs of the school. The board is acutely attentive to the maintenance costs of the school and creating a budget for those expenditures now that they fully own the property. "We are financially focused," one board member said. Another board member said, "We are also looking at the changes in the federal government and watching those closely."

The governing board evaluates the school leader yearly, utilizing an adjustable matrix. The board refers to the matrix as adjustable in case they wish to modify the testing mechanism. The board modifies and assesses pieces of the matrix mid-year and at the end of the year. The instrument contains components that both the school leader and members of the governing board complete and evaluate.

⁷ A Star report are projections of student performance based on the NSPF data (Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) Star Ratings.

Focus Group Summary: Family Members, Parents, and Guardians

Parents in the focus group appreciated digitized messages, stating the information flow was consistent from school personnel in general. Several parents said the consistent flow of communication was one of Futuro's greatest strengths. One parent said, "I can check grades, see what is going to happen during the week, check on upcoming activities, and see pictures of what the students have done throughout the week." Parents stated that communication varied from teacher to teacher and grade to grade. A few parents said they would like to see more information regarding student behavior reports, especially those students with an IEP⁸. One parent explained, "I would like to see more messages regarding behavior between my child and his peers and my child and his teachers. When he gets frustrated, he scratches himself. I don't know what happened during the day. I only see scratches when he comes home. I don't know exactly what the school, teachers, or personnel are doing to take care of him behaviorally to help him. I don't hear anything unless he has scratched, and I contact them for a report. I would like to hear from them what happened before I have to reach out."

Parents indicated they felt welcome at the school and comfortable expressing concerns or seeking the assistance of teachers or leadership if needed. Family members said teachers are receptive and open to listening. Several parents said they have not had any negative experiences with school personnel. Concerns were met in a timely manner, either via direct contact or through email. Parents valued the safety and security measures of the school, the inclusion of students with special needs into the complete day-to-day schooling experience, and the extra-curricular opportunities extended to students. Parents indicated they would like to see more events in which families can participate and volunteer their time at the school.

Family members shared that their children looked forward to attending school for the most part and often get upset if they have to miss school, even when they are ill. One parent laughed and said, "I know my child likes coming to school because he doesn't fight the morning routine."

Parents reported seeing increased writing activities during the 2024-25 school year in comparison to prior years her children have attended Futuro. "I can see an improvement in their writing and writing and reading are connected," the parent explained. Other participants in the group said when they review their children's homework they can see their children are receiving an excellent education. One parent stated she was confused as to why the homework differed from the work her children were tested on during class time.

⁸ Individualized Education Program (IEP) is a plan that outlines the specialized instruction and support services a child with a disability will receive in school

Focus Group Summary: Faculty and Staff

Staff participants in the staff and faculty focus group stated they make families aware of each child's understanding of Nevada state standards by sending home monthly Star reports⁹ which shows individual student academic growth patterns. One teacher explained, "There is an explanation of how to read the data by domain, and it includes a vocabulary list for the parents. There are a lot of graphs. The report also has behavioral report, and many parents will ask for clarification." One teacher suggested creating academic goals for each grade, explaining, "It would be nice if students could say 'I can read _____ amount of words or I need to be able to read _____ to go to first grade.' Those kinds of academic goals are more easily understood by students and parents."

Faculty described how they assess students' levels of understanding before, during, and after each lesson. One teacher said he implemented exit tickets and used those to review or pull a small group of students that may need remediation on particular content. A few teachers echoed these practices, stating they implemented similar practices in their classrooms. During classroom instruction, one teacher said he selects specific topic quizzes to see how each student is progressing. The teacher also selects specific questions or problems and will spot-check those in student notebooks or on classroom work. A few teachers said they specifically reach out and call on students who don't always volunteer or get a chance to speak to check for understanding. Several of the teachers relied on the embedded curricular skill checks.

Faculty and staff described the school environment as strong and collegial. One faculty member said, "Everyone seems to get along. We work well together. We have a lot of support from administration. Staff, like anywhere, gravitate toward the person we need. If we need something quickly, we know who to go to."

School-wide expectations are taught from the time families arrive at the school, according to staff. Group participants explained all adult personnel model appropriate behavior to students. Orientation days allow those new students and families who have not been enrolled at Futuro since kindergarten to familiarize themselves with the daily routine and behavioral expectations of the school. Parents also have their own designated orientation day to learn the car loop procedure.

⁹ Star assessments are an online assessment program developed by Renaissance Learning for students typically in grades k-12.

Focus Group Summary: School Leadership

Members of the leadership team explained how Futuro Academy has addressed chronic absenteeism which was at 22.3 percent for the 2023-24 academic school year. The school retooled the way in which it processes student absences by providing a direct URL link where parents and/or guardians can now upload doctor's notes directly to the school. School-wide daily attendance information is routinely included in school communication. Monthly messages alert families to the total absences of their child. MyEducationData¹⁰ contains each child's individual attendance record for family members to see. Teachers include each student's attendance record in their communication with families, and absenteeism is discussed during parent/teacher conferences. The Principal of Futuro Academy said the leadership team trends indicated kindergarten students and those who attended school virtually during COVID were the most frequently absent.

Members of the leadership spoke about targeted interventions provided to meet the learning needs of struggling students. The school has adopted i-Ready¹¹ and the accompanying toolkit for math. Leadership explained, "The toolkit takes current student data and provides information on which pre-requisite skills the teacher needs to be teaching so students can be ready when the students get to that component." Trainers from i-Ready came to the school and conducted professional development (PD). For literacy, there are plans to move toward CKLA Core Knowledge¹². The principal said, "The strength in the program is really great training and execution. It has two strands that are strong in phonics and fluency. The program is designed for catch-up and has been very successful in lower grades; for students who need help and may be below grade level. It has a very structured set of lesson plans called Guided Reader that goes to fifth grade that has an accompanying reader." Members of the leadership team said they have not made any decisions related to science yet. They continue to look at curricular materials as well as hiring a single subject teacher to teach science content, but no specific decisions have been made.

Character education is a strong facet of Futuro Academy. The leadership was asked to describe how character education was woven throughout the curriculum with fidelity. One member of the leadership said, "We have a culture management plan called CORE that stands for curiosity, optimism, responsibility, excellence. CORE gets embedded daily from the cleaning crew through to our after-school personnel. All personnel adopt the language of CORE." Staff are trained on CORE prior to the start of school for two and one-half weeks. Training includes the school's mission and values. Staff participate in CORE simulations with adult scenarios and perspectives as well as student scenarios and perspectives. Social-emotional learning activities occur three times a month, and morning meetings happen every morning in kindergarten through fifth classrooms while students eat breakfast. Any substitute at Futuro Academy must watch a video before substituting for a class, and a binder is provided for them to reference while on campus about CORE and the school's values and culture.

¹⁰ MyEducationData is an online software platform that provides parents with easy access to their child's academic information, offering a comprehensive overview of their child's performance, attendance, and other key details, all in one secure and user-friendly location.

¹¹ *i-Ready Learning* is a digital instructional resource assessing students with grade-level materials in reading and math.

¹² CKLA - Core Knowledge Language Arts is a comprehensive language arts curriculum created by Amplify for grades pre-kindergarten through fifth grade that combine a multi-sensory approach to phonics with rich texts carefully sequenced to build content knowledge.

Focus Group Summary: Students

Students explained that the teachers at Futuro Academy often ask the students for feedback about their teaching in class. Students said teachers often ask if they need to explain the directions differently or provide more examples. Some students in the focus group said they did not always feel comfortable asking to have the directions re-explained.

Students provided several examples of classroom activities in which they work with other students, explaining their thinking to a peer, summarizing events from a chapter, defining a word in their own terms, restating something they understood differently, and showing how they solved a problem differently to other class members. Several students shared that older grade students often served as role models for younger grade students and will assist them in academic work. One student said, “Decimals are hard. So, some of us fifth graders helped the younger grade students understand decimals when they were learning them. Sometimes it’s just easier to pick things up when it comes from another kid.”

Students said they enjoy being at Futuro Academy to meet new people, make friends, play outside, get fresh air, learn art, and math. Several students said math was their favorite thing to learn, although it was the most challenging. When asked what students had most recently learned that surprised the students about themselves, many students were proud to speak about mathematical concepts. One student said, “I struggled so much with fractions, and then I got it, and I was so happy with myself.” Another student said, “I learned how to do long division with three numbers, and I never thought I could do it.” A third student replied she enjoyed learning how to write an ITC¹³ paragraph.

¹³ ITC stands for Introduction, Topic, Conclusion. In an ITC paragraph, students write an introductory sentence, three topic sentences and then a concluding sentence.

Classroom Environment and Instruction

Observation Rubric

A total of 28 elementary school classrooms were observed for approximately 15 minutes on the day of the site evaluation.

Classroom Environment					
	Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Classroom Learning Environment is Conducive to Learning	The teacher demonstrates knowledge and caring about individual students' lives beyond the class and school. When necessary, students respectfully correct one another. Students participate without fear of put-downs or ridicule from either the teacher or other students. The teacher respects and encourages students' efforts.	Talk between the teacher and students and among students is uniformly respectful. The teacher successfully responds to disrespectful behavior among students. Students participate willingly but may be somewhat hesitant to offer their ideas in front of classmates. The teacher makes general connections with individual students.	The quality of interactions between teachers and students, or among students, is uneven, with occasional disrespect or insensitivity. The teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior among students with uneven results. The teacher attempts to make connections with individual students, but student reactions indicate that these attempts are not entirely successful.	The teacher is disrespectful toward or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Students' body language indicates feelings of hurt, discomfort, or insecurity. The teacher displays no familiarity with, or care about, individual students.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	TOTAL: 6	TOTAL: 22	TOTAL: 0	TOTAL: 0	TOTAL: 0
Establishing a Culture for Learning	The teacher communicates passion for the subject. Students indicate through their questions and comments a desire to understand content. Students assist their classmates in understanding the content.	The teacher communicates the importance of the content and the conviction that with hard work all students can master the material. The teacher conveys an expectation of high levels of student effort. Students expend good effort to complete work of high quality.	The teachers' energy for the work is neutral. The teacher conveys high expectations for only some students. Students exhibit a limited commitment to completing the work on their own. The teacher's primary concern appears to be to complete the task at hand.	The teacher conveys that there is little or no purpose for the work, or that the reasons for doing it are due to external factors. The teacher conveys to at least some students that the work is too challenging for them. Students exhibit little or no pride in their work.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	TOTAL: 6	TOTAL: 20	TOTAL: 2	TOTAL: 0	TOTAL: 0

Classroom Environment and Instruction

Observation Rubric

A total of 28 elementary school classrooms were observed for approximately 15 minutes on the day of the site evaluation.

Classroom Instruction					
	Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Communicating with Students	If asked, students can explain what they are learning and where it fits into the larger curriculum context.	The teacher states clearly, at some point during the lesson, what the students will be learning.	The teacher provides little elaboration or explanation about what students will be learning.	At no time during the lesson does the teacher convey to students what they will be learning.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	The teacher explains content clearly and imaginatively.	The teacher's explanation of content is clear and invites student participation and thinking.	The teacher's explanation of the content consists of a monologue, with minimal participation or intellectual engagement by students.	Students indicate through body language or questions that they don't understand the content being presented.	
	The teacher invites students to explain the content to their classmates.	The teacher makes no content errors.	The teacher may make minor content errors.	Students indicate through their questions that they are confused about the learning task.	
	Students use academic language correctly.	Students engage with the learning task, indicating that they understand what they are to do.	The teacher must clarify the learning task.		
	TOTAL: 6	TOTAL: 21	TOTAL: 1	TOTAL: 0	TOTAL: 0
Using Questioning and Discussion Strategies	Students initiate higher-order questions.	The teacher uses open-ended questions, inviting students to think and/or offer multiple possible answers.	The teacher frames some questions designed to promote student thinking, but many have a single correct answer.	Questions are rapid-fire and convergent with a single correct answer.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	The teacher builds on and uses student responses to questions to deepen student understanding.	Discussions enable students to talk to one another without ongoing mediation by the teacher.	The teacher invites students to respond directly to one another's ideas, but few students respond.	The teacher does not ask students to explain their thinking.	
	Students extend the discussion, enriching it.	Many students actively engage in the discussion.	The teacher calls on many students, but only a small number participate.	Only a few students dominate the discussion.	
	Virtually all students are engaged.				
	TOTAL: 3	TOTAL: 20	TOTAL: 3	TOTAL: 0	TOTAL: 2

Classroom Environment and Instruction

Observation Rubric

A total of 28 elementary school classrooms were observed for approximately 15 minutes on the day of the site evaluation.

Classroom Instruction					
	Distinguished	Highly Proficient	Approaching Proficient	Unsatisfactory	Not Observed
Engaging Students in Learning	Virtually all students are engaged in the lesson. Lesson activities require high-level student thinking and explanations of their thinking. Students have an opportunity for reflection and closure on the lesson to consolidate their understanding.	Most students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. Most learning tasks have multiple correct responses or approaches and/or encourage higher-order thinking. Students are invited to explain their thinking as part of completing tasks. The pacing of the lesson provides students with the time needed to be intellectually engaged.	Some students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. Learning tasks are a mix of those requiring thinking and those requiring recall. Student engagement with the content is largely passive. The pacing of the lesson is uneven—suitable in parts but rushed or dragging in others.	Few students are intellectually engaged in the lesson. Learning tasks, activities, and materials require only recall or have a single correct response. The lesson drags on or is rushed.	This criterion was not observed or rated.
	TOTAL: 7	TOTAL: 20	TOTAL: 1	TOTAL: 0	TOTAL: 0
Using Assessment in Instruction	Students indicate they clearly understand the characteristics of high-quality work. The teacher uses multiple strategies to monitor student understanding. Students monitor their own understanding. Feedback comes from many sources.	The teacher makes the standards of high-quality work clear to students. The teacher elicits evidence of student understanding. Students are invited to assess their own work and make improvements. Feedback includes specific and timely guidance.	There is little evidence that the students understand how the work is evaluated. The teacher monitors understanding through a single method, without eliciting evidence of understanding from students. Feedback to students is vague.	The teacher does not indicate what quality work looks like. The teacher makes no effort to determine whether students understand the lesson. Students receive no feedback, or feedback is global or directed to one student.	
	TOTAL: 3	TOTAL: 23	TOTAL: 1	TOTAL: 0	TOTAL: 1

Classroom Observations and Additional Comments

Students ate breakfast while they completed morning work. Students were engaged, speaking with their peers and the teacher about the academic work they were completing. Some completed a Black History presentation on a person on their laptops. They were going to present these orally later in the day. Other students completed writing essays to complement the culmination of their research on their selected Black History person. Students were reminded to complete a class vote on their personal style and computer application so the class could tally this for comparative purposes.

Students engaged in a class-wide discussion on decorating their doors based on a book. The teacher facilitated the discussion by asking students to share their thoughts about colors, character names, and spelling. Students engaged in table talks, voting, explaining their thinking, and consensus. The teacher did not insert her opinion or bias; she only asked for clarification. The teacher recorded students' choices on the whiteboard. The prompts for the discussion were also projected on the whiteboard. Students were engaged and excited to participate in the discussion.

In a secondary elementary classroom, the teacher displayed on the screen, 'I can plan for an opinion/argumentative essay using an IRC outline¹⁴.' The students were provided with a review of an opinion and argumentative essay, followed by a turn-and-talk activity to discuss the steps for planning an opinion and argumentative essay. The students actively engaged in the discussion while the teacher monitored their responses during the short turn-and-talk activity. The activity was followed by a review of keywords or phrases and how they relate to the type of essay they will write. The students were engaged, and the teacher maintained a well-structured learning environment with clearly defined procedures and expectations.

In a primary music specials classroom, the teacher led an activity in which the students sang along with notes as several students rang bells at the beginning of the notes. The activity involved: color the music notes, count the distance from one note to another and put the number write if it is melodic or harmonic, find the music notes on the piano keys on the worksheets. The students were very engaged, as evidenced by their enthusiasm for singing the notes, and the teacher offered a supportive learning environment.

In one math lesson, students completed a task independently after the teacher walked them through the prompt. Students encouraged each other with accountable talk and hand gestures such as the fireworks handclap and rollercoaster. Students complimented each other on besting their individual scores from their previous scores, with the teacher encouraging them to 'try their best' and 'give their best effort.'

Students read to each other in pairs in one early grades classroom. Students transitioned quickly to answer questions about the text with a partner from a teacher prompt. Students were engaged and eager to share their factual recall about the text. Students participated in active listening, and respectful talk.

¹⁴ An IRC outline (Introduction, Reasons, Conclusion) is a structured essay planning method that helps students organize their thoughts into preparing and structuring an essay by outlining the introduction, body paragraphs (each with reasons), and a conclusion.

In a lower-grade classroom, there were two adults. One worked on sight word recognition with a teacher using flashcards. This teacher had high expectations for learning and provided students with feedback, repetition, and feedback such as "thank you for pronouncing all the sounds." The other teacher worked with a small group of three on sounds, and the students were practicing the letters and the sounds. There were high levels of learning.

In a primary elementary classroom, the teacher led a morning whole-brain activity on the carpet in the front of the room. The teacher displayed the rules on the screen, reviewed them, and asked, "How are you feeling today?" The choices included being worried, upset, surprised, or annoyed, and the teacher displayed a visual representation of the emotion on the screen. The students were provided with time to think and then shared their responses with the group. A breathing exercise followed the activity. The teacher offered explicit directions, the students were highly engaged, and the procedures for the activity operated efficiently.

Students were asked to sign on to electronic devices. Very young students followed directions quickly and were able to sign on and begin online learning within two minutes or less. One of the teachers worked with a small group of four, practicing phonics and reading, including decoding. The students received high levels of positive specific feedback. A second adult within the classroom monitored the activity of students in the classroom on the computers. One student was upset, and the teacher spoke with him privately to calm him. He re-entered the classroom, signed on to his electronic device, and began the activity. Students within the small group were at ease participating and taking risks to continue learning the alphabet and its sounds.

In a secondary elementary classroom, students learned science terms (evaporate, vapor, atmosphere, filtered, pollution) displayed on the screen. The teacher led the lesson by reviewing the word's definition, having the students refer to their sketches of the term on their worksheet, and sharing their definitions. The teacher led the lesson during the session by prompting students to use their bodies to model the science vocabulary. The lesson was well-paced, with frequent checks for student understanding. The students were engaged; however, several opportunities for extended student-to-student discourse were missing, and that potentially could have increased student understanding.

Students engaged in discussions with their peers and then shared class-specific questions with the instructor, which were related to a story the class had read. Questions centered around factual details, inferences, theme, evidence, claims, and summary. Students agreed or disagreed with their classmates using their own reasoning and explaining their thinking from what they read. The teacher facilitated the discussion, using academic vocabulary and asking students to clarify their meaning by explaining further.

The instructor asked the whole class questions and students supported the speaker by using accountable hand signals to support the speaker. Hand signals were also used to indicate agreement, respectful disagreement, or when a student wanted to build upon what a speaker stated. Students were focused, engaged, and eager to participate. The class discussed expository text-based writing and the inclusion of

references.

In one upper elementary class, students completed mathematical word problems by writing their responses in prose. They completed the first problem with the teacher as a whole class, then completed the second one independently, and then checked their work for accuracy with the instructor as a class.

Primary English language arts students took a multiple-choice quiz in their workbooks. The teacher prompted students to use their textbooks to help them answer the questions. Two additional adults assisted students as the teacher read each quiz question while the students selected their answers. The quiz contained ten questions.

Lower elementary students transitioned to i-Ready Work Time and Toolbox. The students independently transitioned to their workstations as two adults monitored the classroom procedure. The teacher led a small group math activity on a kidney-shaped table in the back of the classroom while the rest of the students used their devices to engage in the activity. The students displayed a high level of focus and independence during the observation.

A middle-grade math class of 24 students uses whiteboards as they follow along with the teacher. The teacher asks students to try to solve the problems independently. She said, "Even if you get it wrong, you should try; no whiteboard should be blank." When they finished, students spoke up and explained their thinking using academic language.

Students in a special education self-contained classroom worked in centers. Some worked independently, and some worked one-to-one with an adult. The classroom was well organized, specifically with well-defined learning areas that provided flexible groupings conducive to individualized learning. The teacher offered transitional cues before cleaning up and transitioning to a whole group activity.

Students completed procedural tasks in one special class as the teacher walked around the room, assisting as needed. Students helped each other and encouraged each other verbally as they completed the tasks that included multiple steps. Students were engaged and on-task.

In a secondary elementary classroom, students worked on Rocket Math¹⁵ activities using their devices. The teacher actively monitored the students, who were self-directed and consistently engaged in the math activity involving single-digit multiplication problems.

Students were engaged during the entirety of the observational time. The teacher utilized several best practices, including movement through singing and dancing; repeating the date of yesterday, today, and tomorrow in English and Spanish; using students first names; turn and talk to neighbor; asking high

¹⁵ Rocket Math is a supplemental learning program that teaches students addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, and fractions. Specifically, the program teaches math facts—the basic building blocks of all math.

level open-ended questions; re-stating what students said; using please and thank you; and having students track the speaker.

Measures of Progress from Previous Site Evaluation

The extent to which the school has been successful in maintaining areas of strength, removing challenges, and acting upon the recommended items made by the SPCSA Site Evaluation Team during the school's previous site evaluation.

Prior Recommendation by Site Evaluation Team	School Assessment of Progress	SPCSA Staff Assessment of Progress
Elementary school staff become more purposeful and intentional with in-person instructional best practices and develop a common language for school-wide expectations.	Ongoing training on instructional techniques, for example, a clinic entitled "Engaging All Learners," occurred on 1/6/25 as part of a multi-skill sequence with observations and feedback.	The SPCSA acknowledges the school's effort to address the previous recommendation. Leadership continues to monitor and adjust professional development as needed through routine evaluations and surveys of school stakeholders.
Utilize greater communication channels with faculty and staff regarding student support and resources.	Futuro has created an annual uniform exchange and a free uniform pickup system in the summer. It is also the pilot charter school for Communities in Schools of Southern Nevada, which will provide greater access to necessities in school year 2024-25.	The SPCSA acknowledges the school's effort to address the previous recommendation and appreciates the school's initiatives. Futuro Academy, in partnership with its governing board, continues to strategize ways to support the school's families through direct support and community resources.
Finalize the desired amount of board seats to be in place by the 2023– 24 school year and ensure that Epicenter always reflects the current amount of board membership.	Futuro has intentionally decreased the number of board members to five to manage training and transitions more easily, according to leadership.	SPCSA staff agree with school leadership that this recommendation has been met.
Create a robust plan to increase student proficiency rates.	According to leadership, Futuro has increased proficiency and growth to be, on average, the second-highest performing public school per the NSPF within a large radius encompassing more than 10 neighboring schools over the past two years.	The SPCSA acknowledges the school's effort to address the previous recommendation and appreciates its ongoing efforts, through routine monitoring, to increase student proficiency and close learning gaps.
Develop a plan to address staffing concerns.	According to leadership team members, Futuro has greatly improved retention year over year, with attrition for licensed	The SPCSA acknowledges leadership's efforts to address staffing challenges as they continue to increase educators'

	instructional staff at 12.5perccent for the school year 2024-25. Overall, the experience level and proficiency of instructors have increased notably in the prior three years.	proficiency in the student population the school serves.
--	--	--

Operational Compliance Checks

Fire Extinguisher	☒ YES	☐ NO	
Nurse's Station	☒ YES	☐ NO	
Evacuation Plan in Classrooms	☒ YES	☐ NO	
Food Permit	☒ YES	☐ NO	☐ N/A
Elevator Permit	☐ YES	☐ NO	☒ N/A

Appendix A

The school may choose to submit a response to the SPCSA Site Evaluation Team's findings. This response will be included with the report in the public domain. The final report is submitted to the school's leadership and governing board, the SPCSA board, and into the public record via the SPCSA's website.

Appendix D: SPCSA Financial Performance Framework Results for
2020–21, 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24



2020-21 Fiscal Year: Financial Performance Framework

The Financial Performance Framework provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the [Technical Guide](#) for Details.

Futuro Academy

Address: 920 N. Lamb Boulevard, Las Vegas, NV 89110
Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>
Enrollment: 435
Grades Served: K-4

2020-21

Meets the Standard

2019-20

Meets the Standard

1. CURRENT RATIO Meets Standard Is the school's Current Ratio at least 1.1?	2. UNRESTRICTED DAYS CASH ON HAND Does Not Meet Standard Is the school's UDCOH at least 60 days or 30 days with a positive	3. ENROLLMENT VARIANCE - Is the school's Enrollment Variance 95% or greater?	4. DEBT DEFAULT Meets Standard Is the school in default of loan covenant(s) or delinquent with debt service payments?
5. TOTAL MARGIN AND AGGREGATE THREE YEAR TOTAL Meets Standard Is the school's current year and three year aggregate Total Margin positive?	6. DEBT TO ASSET RATIO Meets Standard Is the school's Debt to Asset Ratio less than 0.90?	7. CASH FLOW Meets Standard Is the school's most recent year and three year aggregate cash flow positive?	8. DEBT OR LEASE SERVICE COVERAGE RATIO Meets Standard Is the school's Debt/Lease Service Coverage Ratio at least 1.10?

* Enrollment Variance ratings were not reported for the 2020-21 school year.

School

- ☐ Alpine Academy
- ☐ Amplus
- ☐ Beacon Academy
- ☐ Civica Academy
- ☐ Coral Academy of Science
- ☐ Democracy Prep
- ☐ Discovery Charter School
- ☐ Doral Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Doral Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Elko Institute for Academic Achievement
- ☐ Equipo Academy
- ☐ Explore Academy
- ☐ Founders Academy
- ☐ Freedom Classical Academy
- ☒ Futuro Academy
- ☐ Girls Empowerment Middle School
- ☐ Honors Academy of Literature
- ☐ Imagine School at Mountain View
- ☐ Leadership Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Learning Bridge Charter School
- ☐ Legacy Traditional School
- ☐ Mater Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Mater Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Nevada Connections Academy
- ☐ Nevada Prep
- ☐ Nevada Rise
- ☐ Nevada State High School
- ☐ Nevada State High School - Meadowood
- ☐ Nevada Virtual Academy
- ☐ Oasis Academy
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Quest Academy
- ☐ Signature Preparatory
- ☐ Silver Sands Montessori School
- ☐ Somerset Academy of Las Vegas



Futuro Academy

Address: 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV 89110
Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>
Enrollment: 476
Grades Served: K-5

2021-22 Fiscal Year: Financial Performance Framework

The Financial Performance Framework for charter schools provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the [Technical Guide](#) for details.

2021-22

2020-21

Meets the Standard

Meets the Standard

1. CURRENT RATIO

Meets Standard

Is the school's Current Ratio at least 1.1?

2. UNRESTRICTED DAYS CASH ON HAND

Meets Standard

Is the school's UDCOH at least 60 days or 30 days with a positive trend?

3. ENROLLMENT FORECAST ACCURACY

Not Rated

Is the school's Enrollment Variance 95% or greater?

4. DEBT DEFAULT

Meets Standard

Is the school in default of loan covenants or delinquent with debt service payments?

5. TOTAL MARGIN AND AGGREGATE THREE YEAR TOTAL MARGIN

Meets Standard

Is the school's current year and three year aggregate Total Margin positive?

6. DEBT TO ASSET RATIO

Meets Standard

Is the school's Debt to Asset Ratio less than 0.90?

7. CASH FLOW

Meets Standard

Is the school's most recent year and three year aggregate cash flow positive?

8. DEBT OR LEASE SERVICE COVERAGE RATIO

Meets Standard

Is the school's Debt/Lease Service Coverage Ratio at least 1.10?

* Enrollment Forecast Accuracy ratings were not reported for the 2021-22 school year.

School

- ☐ Alpine Academy
- ☐ Amplus
- ☐ Battle Born Academy
- ☐ Beacon Academy
- ☐ Civica Academy
- ☐ Coral Academy of Science
- ☐ Democracy Prep
- ☐ Discovery Charter School
- ☐ Doral Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Doral Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Eagle Schools of Nevada
- ☐ Elko Institute for Academic Achievement
- ☐ Equipo Academy
- ☐ Explore Academy
- ☐ Founders Academy
- ☐ Freedom Classical Academy
- ☒ Futuro Academy
- ☐ Girls Empowerment Middle School
- ☐ Honors Academy of Literature
- ☐ Imagine School at Mountain View
- ☐ Leadership Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Learning Bridge Charter School
- ☐ Legacy Traditional School
- ☐ Mater Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Mater Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Nevada Connections Academy
- ☐ Nevada Prep
- ☐ Nevada Rise
- ☐ Nevada State High School
- ☐ Nevada State High School - Meadowood
- ☐ Nevada Virtual Charter School
- ☐ Oasis Academy
- ☐ pilotED Cactus Park
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Quest Academy
- ☐ Sage Collegiate

 Nevada State Public Charter School Authority The Financial Performance Framework for charter schools provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the Technical Guide for details.		2022-23 Fiscal Year: Financial Performance Framework	
Futuro Academy Address: 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV 89110 Website: http://futuroacademylv.org/ Enrollment: 456 Grades Served: K-5		2022-23	2021-22
		Meets the Standard	Meets the Standard
1. CURRENT RATIO Meets Standard Is the school's Current Ratio at least 1.1?	2. UNRESTRICTED DAYS CASH ON HAND Meets Standard Is the school's UDCOH at least 60 days or 30 days with a positive trend?	3. ENROLLMENT FORECAST ACCURACY Meets Standard Is the school's Enrollment Variance 95% or greater?	4. DEBT DEFAULT Meets Standard Is the school in default of loan covenants or delinquent with debt service payments?
5. TOTAL MARGIN AND AGGREGATE THREE YEAR TOTAL MARGIN Does Not Meet Standard Is the school's current year and three year aggregate Total Margin positive?	6. DEBT TO ASSET RATIO Meets Standard Is the school's Debt to Asset Ratio less than 0.90?	7. CASH FLOW Meets Standard Is the school's most recent year and three year aggregate cash flow positive?	8. DEBT OR LEASE SERVICE COVERAGE RATIO Meets Standard Is the school's Debt/Lease Service Coverage Ratio at least 1.10?

Name

- ☐ (Blank)
- ☐ Alpine Academy
- ☐ Amplus
- ☐ Battle Born Academy
- ☐ Beacon Academy of Nevada
- ☐ CIVICA Nevada Career & Collegiate Acade..
- ☐ Coral Academy of Science
- ☐ Democracy Prep
- ☐ Discovery Charter School
- ☐ Doral Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Doral Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Elko Institute for Academic Achievement
- ☐ Equipo Academy
- ☐ Explore Academy
- ☐ Founders Classical Academy of Las Vegas
- ☐ Freedom Classical Academy
- ☒ Futuro Academy
- ☐ Honors Academy of Literature
- ☐ Imagine Schools at Mountain View
- ☐ Leadership Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Learning Bridge Charter School
- ☐ Legacy Traditional School
- ☐ Mater Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Mater Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Nevada Connections Academy
- ☐ Nevada Prep
- ☐ Nevada Rise
- ☐ Nevada State High School
- ☐ Nevada State High School - Meadowood
- ☐ Nevada Virtual Charter School
- ☐ Oasis Academy
- ☐ pilotED Schools - Cactus Park Elementary
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of Northern Nevada
- ☐ Quest Academy
- ☐ Sage Collegiate Public Charter School



The Financial Performance Framework for charter schools provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the [Technical Guide](#) for details.

2023-24 Fiscal Year: Financial Performance Framework

Futuro Academy

Address: 920 N. Lamb Boulevard, Las Vegas, NV 89110
Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>
Enrollment: 473
Grades Served: KG - 05

2023-24

2022-23

Meets the Standard

Meets the Standard

1. CURRENT RATIO

Meets Standard

Is the school's Current Ratio at least 1.1?

2. UNRESTRICTED DAYS CASH ON HAND

Meets Standard

Is the school's UDCOH at least 60 days or 30 days with a positive trend?

3. ENROLLMENT FORECAST ACCURACY

Meets Standard

Is the school's Enrollment Variance 95% or greater?

4. DEBT DEFAULT

Meets Standard

Is the school in default of loan covenants or delinquent with debt service payments?

5. TOTAL MARGIN AND AGGREGATE THREE YEAR TOTAL MARGIN

Meets Standard

Is the school's current year and three year aggregate Total Margin positive?

6. DEBT TO ASSET RATIO

Meets Standard

Is the school's Debt to Asset Ratio less than 0.90?

7. CASH FLOW

Meets Standard

Is the school's most recent year and three year aggregate cash flow positive?

8. DEBT OR LEASE SERVICE COVERAGE RATIO

Meets Standard

Is the school's Debt/Lease Service Coverage Ratio at least 1.10?

Appendix E: SPCSA Organizational Performance Framework Results
for 2020–21, 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24



Nevada State Public
Charter School
Authority

2020-21 School Year: Organizational Performance Framework

The Organization Performance Framework for charter schools provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the [Technical Guide](#) for details.

Futuro Academy

Address: 920 N. Lamb Boulevard, Las Vegas, NV 89110

Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>

Enrollment: 435

Grades Served: K-4

2020-21

100.00
Meets Standard

2019-20

Meets Standard

SCORING TABLE

≥80
MEETS
STANDARD

<80
BELOW
STANDARD

1. EDUCATION PROGRAM

20 out of 20

The Education Program section assesses the school's adherence to the material terms of its proposed education program.

2. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

20 out of 20

While the Financial Framework is used to analyze the school's financial performance, the SPCSA will use this section of the Organizational Framework to set expectations for the school's management and oversight of its finances, without regard to financial performance.

3. GOVERNANCE & REPORTING

20 out of 20

In this section the SPCSA sets forth expectations of the charter board's compliance with governance-related laws as well as the board's own bylaws and policies.

4. STUDENTS & EMPLOYEES

20 out of 20

In this section, the SPCSA measures charter school compliance with a variety of laws related to students and employees.

5. SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

20 out of 20

This section addresses the school's facility, transportation, food service, and health services, among other things.



2021-22 School Year: Organizational Performance Framework

The Organization Performance Framework for charter schools provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the [Technical Guide](#) for details.

- ☐ Alpine Academy
- ☐ Amplus
- ☐ Beacon Academy of Nevada
- ☐ CIVICA Career & Collegiate ..
- ☐ Coral Academy of Science
- ☐ Democracy Prep
- ☐ Discovery Charter School
- ☐ Doral Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Doral Academy of Northern ..
- ☐ Elko Institute for Academic ..
- ☐ Equipo Academy
- ☐ Explore Academy
- ☐ Founders Classical Academy
- ☐ Freedom Classical Academy
- ☒ Futuro Academy
- ☐ Girls Empowerment Middle ..
- ☐ Honors Academy of Literatur
- ☐ Imagine School at Mountain ..
- ☐ Leadership Academy of Nev..
- ☐ Learning Bridge Charter Sch..
- ☐ Legacy Traditional School
- ☐ Mater Academy
- ☐ Mater Academy of Northern ..
- ☐ Nevada Connections Academ
- ☐ Nevada Prep
- ☐ Nevada Rise
- ☐ Nevada State High School
- ☐ Nevada State High School - ..
- ☐ Nevada Virtual Academy
- ☐ Oasis Academy
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of Nevad
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of North..
- ☐ Quest Academy
- ☐ Signature Preparatory
- ☐ Silver Sands Montessori

Futuro Academy

Address: 920 N. Lamb Boulevard, Las Vegas, NV 89110
 Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>
 Enrollment: 476
 Grades Served: K-4

2021-22

98.00
 Meets Standards

2020-21

Meets
 Standard

SCORING TABLE

≥80 MEETS STANDARD	<80 BELOW STANDARD
--------------------------	--------------------------

EDUCATION PROGRAM

20 out of 20

This section addresses the school's adherence to the material terms of its proposed education program.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

20 out of 20

This section addresses the expectations set for the school's management and oversight of its finances, without regard to the school's financial performance as measured by the Financial Performance Framework.

GOVERNANCE & REPORTING

18 out of 20

This section addresses the charter board's compliance with governance-related laws as well as the board's own bylaws and policies.

STUDENTS & EMPLOYEES

20 out of 20

This section addresses the school's compliance with a variety of laws related to students and employees.

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

20 out of 20

This section addresses, but is not limited to: the school's facilities, transportation, food service, and health services.



2022-23 School Year: Organizational Performance Framework

The Organization Performance Framework for charter schools provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the [Technical Guide](#) for details.

- ☐ Alpine Academy
- ☐ Amplus Academy
- ☐ Battle Born Academy
- ☐ Beacon Academy of Nevada
- ☐ CIVICA Nevada Career and C...
- ☐ Coral Academy of Science-L...
- ☐ Democracy Prep
- ☐ Discovery Charter School
- ☐ Doral Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Doral Academy of Northern ...
- ☐ Elko Institute for Academic ...
- ☐ Equipo Academy
- ☐ Explore Academy
- ☐ Founders Classical Academy
- ☐ Freedom Classical Academy
- ☒ Futuro Academy
- ☐ Honors Academy of Literatur...
- ☐ Imagine School at Mountain ...
- ☐ Leadership Academy of Nev...
- ☐ Learning Bridge Charter Sch...
- ☐ Legacy Traditional School
- ☐ Mater Academy
- ☐ Mater Academy of Northern ...
- ☐ Nevada Connections Academ...
- ☐ Nevada Prep Charter School
- ☐ Nevada Rise Academy
- ☐ Nevada State High School
- ☐ Nevada State High School-M...
- ☐ Nevada Virtual Charter Scho...
- ☐ Oasis Academy
- ☐ pilotED Schools-Cactus Park ...
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of North...
- ☐ Quest Academy
- ☐ Sage Collegiate Public Chart...

Futuro Academy

Address: 920 N. Lamb Boulevard, Las Vegas, NV 89110

Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>

Enrollment: 456

Grades Served: K-4

2022-23

2021-22

Meets Standards

100.00

Meets
Standard

SCORING TABLE

≥80
MEETS
STANDARD

<80
BELOW
STANDARD

EDUCATION PROGRAM

20 out of 20

This section addresses the school's adherence to the material terms of its proposed education program.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

20 out of 20

This section addresses the expectations set for the school's management and oversight of its finances, without regard to the school's financial performance as measured by the Financial Performance Framework.

GOVERNANCE & REPORTING

20 out of 20

This section addresses the charter board's compliance with governance-related laws as well as the board's own bylaws and policies.

STUDENTS & EMPLOYEES

20 out of 20

This section addresses the school's compliance with a variety of laws related to students and employees.

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

20 out of 20

This section addresses, but is not limited to: the school's facilities, transportation, food service, and health services.



2023-24 School Year: Organizational Performance Framework

The Organization Performance Framework for charter schools provides a framework within which a charter school authorizer may carry out its oversight roles. See the [Technical Guide](#) for details.

- ☐ (Blank)
- ☐ Alpine Academy
- ☐ Amplus Academy
- ☐ Battle Born Academy
- ☐ Beacon Academy of Nevada
- ☐ CIVICA Nevada Career and Coll...
- ☐ Coral Academy of Science-Las V...
- ☐ Democracy Prep Nevada
- ☐ Discovery Charter School
- ☐ Doral Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Doral Academy of Northern Ne...
- ☐ Eagle Charter School
- ☐ Elko Institute for Academic Ach...
- ☐ Equipo Academy
- ☐ Explore Academy
- ☐ Founders Classical Academy
- ☐ Freedom Classical Academy
- ☒ Futuro Academy
- ☐ Honors Academy of Literature
- ☐ Imagine Schools at Mountain V...
- ☐ Leadership Academy of Nevada
- ☐ Learning Bridge Charter School
- ☐ Legacy Traditional Schools
- ☐ Mater Academy
- ☐ Mater Academy of Northern N...
- ☐ Nevada Connections Academy
- ☐ Nevada Prep Charter School
- ☐ Nevada Rise Academy
- ☐ Nevada State High School
- ☐ Nevada State High School-Mea...
- ☐ Nevada Virtual Charter School
- ☐ Oasis Academy
- ☐ pilotED Schools-Cactus Park Ele...
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy
- ☐ Pinecrest Academy of Northern...

Futuro Academy

Address: 920 N Lamb Blvd, Las Vegas, NV 89110

Website: <http://futuroacademylv.org/>

Enrollment: 456

Grades Served: K-5

2023-24

2022-23

Meets Standard

Meets Standards

SCORING TABLE

≥80
MEETS
STANDARD

<80
BELOW
STANDARD

91.00

EDUCATION PROGRAM

19 out of 20

This section addresses the school's adherence to the material terms of its proposed education program.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

15 out of 20

This section addresses the expectations set for the school's management and oversight of its finances, without regard to the school's financial performance as measured by the Financial Performance Framework.

GOVERNANCE & REPORTING

17 out of 20

This section addresses the charter board's compliance with governance-related laws as well as the board's own bylaws and policies.

STUDENTS & EMPLOYEES

20 out of 20

This section addresses the school's compliance with a variety of laws related to students and employees.

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

20 out of 20

This section addresses, but is not limited to: the school's facilities, transportation, food service, and health services.