## AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. Public Education Commission Meeting Date: June17, 2016
II. Item Title: Vote on Charter School Amendment - Amy Biehl High School to Add School Site
III. Executive Summary and Proposed Motions:

## Request and Rationale

Amy Biehl High School is requesting to amend the school's primary physical location to lease additional classroom and office (3323 ft.) space at the SIMMS building located across the street from the school at 400 Gold Ave. SW Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87102. The school indicates the rationale for its request to add additional space is:

Amy Biehl High School is committed to a mission of Service and Scholarship; this includes offering a variety of required and elective courses for a diverse student population. To meet this commitment the school requires additional classroom and office space. Courses offered in this space will include $12^{\text {th }}$ Grade ELA, Economics, Pre-Calculus and College Counseling.

## School History

Amy Biehl High School was founded in 1999 and was originally chartered through the APS school district. The school was created to intentionally connect students with the surrounding community through civic engagement as well as employ meaningful, relevant student assessment through dual enrollment. The school has always embraced an inclusion model and strove to provide a rigorous and relevant educational experience to all students.

The charter school was approved in 1999 by Albuquerque Public Schools. In 2010 the New Mexico Public Education Commission (PEC) approved Amy Biehl's renewal as a state authorized charter school for 5 years. The School applied for and received a 5 year renewal by the PEC in 2015. The school serves grades $9-12$ and its enrollment cap is 325 . According to the 2016 120th Day STARS report, the school had 296 students enrolled in March, 2016.

Amy Biehl's academic program targets their mission, specifically college readiness and civic mindedness. The school staff works to intentionally cultivate a school culture that is committed to social justice and civic responsibility.

## School Enrollment and Demographics Data

The $120^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment count at Amy Biehl High School was 276 students for the 2015-2016 school year and 295 students for the 20142015 school year. This demonstrates a decrease in total enrollment by 19 students.

An evaluation of the students enrolled at the end of FY 2015 as compared to enrollment count at the end of the first full week of the 2015-2016 school year shows a re-enrollment rate of approximately 88\%.

Student demographics and subgroup enrollment for Amy Biehl High School Academy for the 2015-16 120th day reporting, as compared to statewide data is provided below. The STARS data indicates the school has a somewhat smaller percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students and English Language Learners enrolled than the percentage of such students enrolled in schools across New Mexico. Amy Biehl High School has a slightly higher percent of Students with disabilities as compared to the statewide percentage.



## School Performance

Amy Biehl High School has received the following school grades:
In 2011-12 the school grade was a C
In 2012-13 the school grade was an A
In 2013-14 the school grade was an A
In 2014-15 the school grade was a B
The school currently maintains a three year average of an A.
Amy Biehl is able to demonstrate a strong academic performance on the state report card over the last 3 years. As demonstrated in the graph below, the school has demonstrated a consistent high average number in points over the last three years.

## Amy Biehl High School - School Letter Grade Points



The 2015 state assessment letter grade and performance data demonstrate a decrease in "Current Standing" from an A to a B, a decrease in "Student Growth of Highest Performing Students" from an A to a B, and a decrease in "Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students" from a B to a C, but a slight improvement in the "Opportunity to Learn" from a B to an A. All other measures remain unchanged.
The table below shows a comparison of the school's state assessment proficiency data to the statewide data for the same grade levels and the Albuquerque Public Schools District data for the same grade levels. This comparison for 2014 and for 2015 indicates that the school continued to score above the statewide and Albuquerque Public Schools' proficiency rates in reading. The school's math proficiency rate declined in 2015. However, in both years, Amy Biehl High School has had a higher math proficiency rate than the state's rate.



## Proposed Motions

Move to approve the amendment request presented by Amy Biehl High School to amend the school's primary physical location to include leased additional classroom and office ( 3323 ft .) space at the SIMMS building located across the street from the school at 400 Gold Ave. SW Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87102, with the condition that the school provide evidence of E-Occupancy and compliance with all facilities requirements and final approved governing board minutes.

Move to deny the amendment requests presented by Amy Biehl High School to amend the school's primary physical location to include leased additional classroom and office ( 3323 ft .) space at the SIMMS building located across the street from the school at 400 Gold Ave. SW Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87102. [PEC to provide reasons that the request should be denied].

## STATE CHARTER SCHOOL CHANGE/AMENDMENT REQUEST FORM

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

Please complete and submit this form to: Attorney for the Public Education Commission, New Mexico Attorney General's Office, P.O. Box 1508, Santa Fe, NM 87504 And
Amendment Request, Public Education Department, Charter Schools Division, Room 301, 300 Don Gaspar, Santa Fe, NM 87501, charter.schools@state.nm.us
Name of State-Chartered School: Amy Biehl High School
Date submitted: 6/8/2016 Contact Name: Frank McCulloch E-mail : fmcculloch@abhs.k12.nm.us

| Current Charter Application or Contract Section and Page | Current Charter Statement(s) | Proposed Revision/Amendment Statement(s) | Rationale for Revision/Amendment | Date of Governing <br> Body Approval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 8.01.10 (pg. 21) | The Charter School's Primary Location is $1234^{\text {th }}$ Street SW, Albuquerque, NM 87102. | Amy Biehl High School would like to lease additional classroom and office ( 3323 ft .) space at the SIMMS building located across the street from the school at 400 Gold Ave. SW Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87102 | Amy Biehl High School is committed to a mission of Service and Scholarship; This includes offering a variety of required and elective courses for a diverse student population. To meet this commitment the school requires additional classroom and office space. Courses offered in this space will include $12^{\text {th }}$ Grade ELA, Economics, Pre-Calculus and College Counseling. | 6/14/2016 |

Original Signature of Governing Council President or Designee: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$
Printed Name of Governing Council President or Designee: $\qquad$

Public Education Commission use only

Public Education Commission Chair: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$

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

# State of New Mexico Public School Facilities Authority 

Robert A. Gorrell, Director<br>Santa Fe Office 401 Don Gaspar Ave Santa Fe, NM 87505<br>(505) 988-5989<br>(505) 988-5933 (Fax)


www.nmpsfa.org

Albuquerque Office 1312 Basehart Dr SE, St200 Albuquerque, NM 87106<br>(505) 843-6272<br>(505) 843-9681 (Fax)

March 15, 2016
Frank McCulloch
Executive Director/Principal
Amy Biehl Charter High School
$1234^{\text {th }}$ Street SW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
Dear Director McCulloch,
On February 18, 2016 the Public Schools Facility Authority received correspondence from you requesting to have an assessment of a facility located at 400 Gold Ave SW, Albuquerque, NM in order to determine if this facility meets statewide adequacy standards for charter schools, pursuant to 22-20-1 NMSA 1978. In addition to your current location at $1234^{\text {th }}$ Street SW, the school plans to occupy the north east corner of this facility. The portion the school will occupy is approximately 3,323 GSF. In accordance with this statute, PSFA shall grant approval of the facility if (1) the facility meets applicable provisions of the Statewide Adequacy Standards pursuant to the Public School Capital Outlay Act, or if the building can be brought into compliance with those standards within 18 months;and (2) the subject facility garners a weighted New Mexico Condition Index (wNMCI) score that is at least equal to the average score for all New Mexico public school facilities for the year in which the request is made.

The requested assessment of this facility was conducted on February 23, 2016. A wNMCI score was generated for this facility as a result of this assessment. The resulting score is $17.32 \%$ which is better than the current average of $18.98 \%$ (lower is better).

Currently this facility has a Business Occupancy Classification (B occupancy) which, under the 2009 New Mexico Building Codes is acceptable for "Educational occupancies for students above the $12^{\text {th }}$ grade". B occupancy classifications, under the New Mexico Building Codes, is not acceptable for housing students below the $12^{\text {th }}$ grade and therefore must be changed to an Educational Occupancy (E occupancy) Classification in order for students below the $12^{\text {th }}$ grade to occupy the proposed space pursuant to 22-8B-4.2 (A). The jurisdiction having authority to issue the Educational Certificate of Occupancy is the City of Albuquerque. Prior to occupancy you must obtain an E Occupancy Certification from the City of Albuquerque.

In addition, the proposed facility and desire to expand into other areas and increase the number of students served must be included in the charter school's charter agreement approved by the New Mexico Public Education Commission.

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please feel free to contact me at any time. I can be reached at 505-468-0274.

[^0]Cc: Norma Ahlskog, PSFA Financial Specialist

Present:
Board Members: Kevin Hoover, Leslie Andrews, Cliff Wintrode, Rachel Berenson, Emily Darnell-Nunez, Gabrielle Uballez
Staff Members: Frank McCulloch, Betty Seeley, Stacey Cotty
Absent: Finnie Coleman, Eduardo Martinez, Miriam Rand
Call to Order and consent of agenda items previously submitted: The meeting was called to order at 5:35 pm.
I. Approval of Previous Minutes: All approved by consensus.
II. Public Comment (2 minutes per speaker. Speakers must sign up prior to the start of meeting. (Limit of 10 minutes total time.) There were no speakers present
III. New Business
a) SIMMS Rental and Vote**: Leslie motioned to approve the Simms Lease, to be signed by Kevin Hoover; Cliff seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.
IV. Old Business
a) Increased Collaboration and Communication between ABHS Governance and Foundation Boards
V. Committee Reports
a) Audit: The FY 14 Audit was distributed and discussed. A policy regarding mileage reimbursement will be developed and presented at a future meeting.
b) Governance/Executive
c) Finance/Finance Director's and Treasurer's report(s)
d) Teacher Compensation committee: 2016 - 2017 Faculty Compensation Scenarios Discussion and Vote**: Leslie motioned to approve the new teacher and ancillary staff salary schedule that was presented by the committee, Cliff seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously.
e) BARS** The following BAR's were presented:
$\$ 6,824.00$ in additional funding for IDEA-B
\$58.00 in funding for IDEA-Risk Pool \$10,103 in additional funding for Title II Professional Development Cliff motioned to approve the BAR's as presented; Emily seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously.
VI. Closed Session 10-15-1(H)(8). It was determined that there was no need to go into closed session.

The Meeting was adjourned at 7:05pm.

Final Grade
A

## Amy Biehl High Charter

District: State Charter Grade Range: 09-12<br>Code: 525001

## This School Statewide C Benchmark

| Current Standing <br> How did students perform in the most recent school year? Students are tested on how well they met targets for their grade level. | $12.5$ | Grade <br> A | School Points $22.92$ | Possible Points 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Growth <br> In the past 3 years did the school increase grade level performance? For example did this year's 10th graders improve over last year's 10th graders? | $5.8$ | C | 5.51 | 10 |
| Student Growth of Highest Performing Students <br> How well did the school help individual students improve? The highest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the top three quarters ( $75 \%$ ) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state | $3.6$ | A | 9.23 | 10 |
| Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students <br> How well did the school help individual students improve? The lowest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the bottom quarter ( $25 \%$ ) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark. | 7.7 | B | 9.18 | 10 |
| Opportunity to Learn <br> Does the school foster an environment that facilitates learning? Are teachers using recognized instructional methods, and do students want to come to school? | $6.0$ | B | 7.15 | 8 |
| Graduation <br> How does the school contribute to on-time graduation? On-time means within 4 years, and to a lesser extent, within 5 and 6 years for students who require longer. | 12.8 | C | 13.24 | 17 |
| College and Career Readiness <br> Are students prepared for what lies ahead after high school? Schools receive credit when students participate in college entrance exams, and coursework leading to dual credit and vocational certification. The school receives additional credit when students meet success goals. | $9.0$ | A | 12.73 | 15 |

## Bonus Points

Does the school show exceptional aptitude for involving students and parents in education, reducing truancy, and promoting extracurricular activities?


## Details of Each Grade Indicator

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

| Knowing how many students are proficient in a given year is a measure of the school's overall success. Single-year performance will vary with differing classes of students. Therefore, Current Standing uses up to 3 years of data to provide a more accurate picture of the school's achievement. <br> Current Standing is augmented with Value Added Modeling (VAM) by capturing the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Manual at: http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Students |  |  | White <br> hite |  | / Eth <br> Hisp | icity <br> Asian | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| Reading <br> Proficient and Advanced (\%) <br> Proficient and Advanced (Pts) <br> Value Added Model (Pts) | 65.9 <br> 7.42 <br> 5.00 | 69.6 | 59.6 | 71.8 | - | 62.5 | - | - | 58.1 | 31.3 | - | 30.8 |
| Math |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient and Advanced (\%) <br> Proficient and Advanced (Pts) <br> Value Added Model (Pts) | $\begin{aligned} & 48.8 \\ & 5.50 \\ & 5.00 \end{aligned}$ | 43.0 | 58.7 | 57.9 | - | 43.8 | - | - | 44.6 | 25.0 | - | <2.0 |



School growth compares the students enrolled in the current year to students from prior years. While these are partly different

## School Growth

 sets of students, the school that is improving will do a better job each year of impacting their achievement. Unlike Current Standing, School Growth accounts for improvement of all students, not just those reaching proficient.School Growth is augmented with Value Added Modeling (VAM) which accounts for the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED"s School Grading Technical Manual at: http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx

|  | Difference from | Reading |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expected Growth (SS Points) | 0.535 | Math |
|  | 0.345 |  |
| Points Earned | 3.45 | 2.06 |
|  |  |  |

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

|  | ust like schools, individual student achievement is expected to improve over time. Student growth is shown as the average change in scaled score (SS) points per year, and is averaged for all students in each group for up to 3 years. Student groups are further divided into highest and lowest performing subgroups. <br> cores on the assessment range from 0 to 80 , and a score of 40 indicates that a student is proficient or on grade level. A student's rior test scores are used to estimate how the student should perform today. When growth is positive ( + ) students score better han expected in the current year: <br> - Above 0 means that the group, in general, scored higher than expected. This is an exciting finding, especially when students are below the proficiency line, because they are closing the achievement gap and catching up to their higher-performing classmates. <br> - Near 0 means that the group scored about as expected. While some students may have performed better than anticipated (positive growth), they were equally balanced by students that did poorer (negative growth). <br> - Below 0 means that the group performed below expectations and students are losing ground when compared to their peers. <br> etails of Student Growth and scaled scores are explained in the Technical Guide on the PED website: ttp://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Students | Female | Gender | Male |  | White |  | African American | Hispanic |  | Asian | Am Indian | Econ Disadv | Students Englishwith LanguageDisabilities Learners |  | Redesignated English Proficient |
|  |  | Range |  | Range |  | Range |  | Range | Range |  | Range | Range | Range | Range | Range | Range |
| Reading Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest 75\% (SS/Yr | 0.8 | -2.7 | 1.6 | -2.9 | 1.4 | -2.7 | 1.6 | - - | -2.8 | 1.5 | - - | - - | -2.9 1. | 4 | - - | $\begin{array}{ll}-3.1 & 1.2\end{array}$ |
| Highest 75\% (Pts) | 4.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest 25\% (SS/Yr) | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | - - |  | 2.3 |  | - - | $-2.0 \quad 2.3$ | 3 | - - | - - |
| Lowest 25\% (Pts) | 4.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest 75\% (SS/Yr | 3.0 | -3.3 | . 8 | -3.1 | 1.0 | -3.2 | 1.0 | - - | -3.3 | . 8 | - - | - - | -3.3 | 8 | - - | - - |
| Highest 75\% (Pts) | 5.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest 25\% (SS/Yr) | 1.3 | -3.1 | 1.0 | -3.0 | 1.1 | - | - | - - | -3.1 | 1.0 | - - | - - | -3.1 1.0 | O-3.6 | 5 - - | - - |
| Lowest 25\% (Pts) | 4.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Remaining Gap Between Highest and Lowest Performing Students in 2014 $\begin{array}{rc}\text { Scaled Score Differences } \\ \text { Reading } & 9.0 \\ \text { Math } & 11.0\end{array}$

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

Math $\quad+1.3$ per year Reading +1.7 per year

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

|  | All <br> Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  | Economically Disadvant | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian |  |  |  |  |
| OTL Attendance (Student Average) | 96.0 | 95.9 | 96.1 | 95.9 | 95.8 | 96.1 | - | 95.5 | 96.3 | 95.7 | - | 95.1 |
| OTL Attendance (Points Earned) | 3.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTL Survey (Average Total Score) | 38.5 | 38.6 | 38.2 | 36.9 | - | 38.9 | - | - | 38.8 | 34.0 | - | 41.1 |
| OTL Survey (Points Earned) | 4.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

OTL Survey Questions Reading $\begin{aligned} & \text { The answer to each question ranges from } 0 \text { (Never) to } 5 \text { (Always), with a midpoint score of 2.5. } \\ & \text { Schools that scored higher demonstrated better classroom teaching practices. }\end{aligned}$

| 1. My teacher introduces a new topic by connecting to things I already know. | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | - | 3.9 | - | - | 3.9 | 3.6 | - | 4.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. My teacher explains why what we are learning is important. | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.6 | - | 3.9 | - | - | 3.9 | 3.2 | - | 4.1 |
| 3. My teacher explains how learning a new topic is a foundation for other topics. | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.7 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.1 | - | 3.8 |
| 4. Every student gets a chance to answer questions. | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.1 | - | 4.4 | - | - | 4.3 | 4.1 | - | 4.3 |
| 5. My teacher wants me to explain my answers. | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.3 | - | 4.5 | - | - | 4.4 | 3.9 | - | 4.7 |
| 6. My teacher knows when I understand, and when I do not. | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | - | 3.6 | - | - | 3.7 | 3.2 | - | 3.6 |
| 7. My teacher explains things in different ways so everyone can understand. | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.6 | - | 3.9 | - | - | 3.8 | 3.1 | - | 4.2 |
| 8. My teacher gives me helpful feedback on work I turn in. | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.1 | - | 4.5 | - | - | 4.4 | 4.0 | - | 4.6 |
| 9. My teacher checks our understanding. | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.7 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 4.0 | 3.5 | - | 4.2 |
| 10. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day. | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | - | 3.9 | - | - | 3.9 | 2.2 | - | 3.5 |
| OTL Survey Questions Math |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. My teacher introduces a new topic by connecting to things I already know. | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.6 | 3.4 | - | 3.9 |
| 2. My teacher explains why what we are learning is important. | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 2.8 | - | - | 2.8 | 2.6 | - | 3.1 |
| 3. My teacher explains how learning a new topic is a foundation for other topics. | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.8 | - | 3.6 | - | - | 3.6 | 3.1 | - | 3.8 |
| 4. Every student gets a chance to answer questions. | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 | - | 3.9 | - | - | 3.8 | 3.9 | - | 4.2 |
| 5. My teacher wants me to explain my answers. | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 | - | 4.3 | - | - | 4.2 | 4.3 | - | 4.5 |
| 6. My teacher knows when I understand, and when I do not. | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.2 | - | 3.5 |
| 7. My teacher explains things in different ways so everyone can understand. | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | 4.0 |
| 8. My teacher gives me helpful feedback on work I turn in. | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.6 | - | 3.9 | - | - | 3.7 | 3.9 | - | 3.8 |
| 9. My teacher checks our understanding. | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | - | 3.8 | - | - | 3.7 | 4.0 | - | 4.1 |
| 10. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day. | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.6 | 2.8 | - | 3.8 |
| Color Key: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 or 5, Rated High 2 or 3, Rated Mid 0 or 1, Rated Low |  |


| Graduation <br> Students are exp rates. Similar t time. <br> SAM schools (Su disabilities. The in a given year. | Students are expected to graduate in 4 years. However, some students require longer and are captured in 5-year and 6-year rates. Similar to School Growth, the expectation is that the school increase the percent of successful 4-year graduates over time. <br> SAM schools (Supplemental Accountability Model) are a subset of schools that target returning dropouts or students with disabilities. These schools receive an additional rate that reflects their ability to graduate any student, not just cohort members, in a given year. Details of the federally approved graduation rules are in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All <br> Students | Gen <br> F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | icity <br> Asian | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| Cohort of 2013-4-Year Rate <br> Percent Graduating <br> Points Earned | $\begin{aligned} & 73.1 \\ & 5.85 \end{aligned}$ | 85.5 | 58.5 | 62.9 | - | 73.4 | - | - | 71.2 | 69.0 | - | N/A |
| Cohort of 2012-5-Year Rate <br> Percent Graduating <br> Points Earned | $\begin{aligned} & 73.9 \\ & 2.22 \end{aligned}$ | 82.5 | 62.0 | 75.7 | - | 69.9 | - | - | 67.2 | 77.0 | - | N/A |
| Cohort of 2011-6-Year Rate <br> Percent Graduating <br> Points Earned | $\begin{aligned} & 63.1 \\ & 1.26 \end{aligned}$ | 78.8 | 43.9 | 64.9 | - | 62.5 | - | - | 34.2 | 43.4 | - | N/A |
| Growth in 4-Year Rates <br> Value Added Modeling takes into account the school's prior 3 years. | Growth Index (Increase) 2.1 <br> Points Earned 3.91 |  |  |  |  | SAM Rates <br> SAM Graduation (\%) <br> This school did not qualify to be a SAM school. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| College High school stu <br> one of the follo <br> and 1) College en <br> Career 2) Evidence <br> Readiness 3) Eligibility <br> (CCR) Points are given <br> established ben <br> http://webapp2 <br>  CCR follows the <br>  Technical Manu | 2) Evidence that the student can pass a college level course (Advanced Placement, Dual Credit, or IB) <br> 3) Eligibility for an industry recognized certification (Career Technical Education, SAM School Supplemental) <br> Points are given separately for students' participation and for their success. To be considered successful students must meet established benchmarks. Details are in the School Grading Technical Guide on the PED website at http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square \begin{aligned} & 50 \% \text { or Higher } \\ & 20 \%-50 \% \\ & \text { Below } 20 \% \end{aligned}$ | All Students | F | M | White | Afr Amer | / Et Hisp |  | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English <br> Language <br> Learners | Redesignated <br> English Proficient |
| Participation (\% of Cohort) <br> Participation (Pts) <br> Success (\% of Participants) <br> Success (Pts) | $\begin{gathered} 90.9 \\ 4.5 \\ 81.9 \\ 8.2 \end{gathered}$ | 97.1 95.3 | 83.5 63.8 | 93.9 84.2 | $>98.0$ 73.9 | 87.0 81.2 | $>98.0$ $>98.0$ | $>98.0$ 76.5 | 89.9 83.7 | 94.7 44.9 | 93.7 38.1 | N/A N/A |
| Percent of School's Cohort Participating in Each CCR Opportunity <br> AccuPlacer Advanced Placement <br> Dual Credit <br> International Baccalaureate <br> Career Technical Education <br> Compass <br> SAT Subject Test <br> SAM School Supplemental | $f 2013$ <br> 67.6 <br> 12.5 <br> $<2.0$ <br> 15.2 <br> 5.6 <br> $<2.0$ <br> 61.5 <br> 2.0 <br> 4.2 <br> $<2.0$ <br> $<2.0$ <br> $<2.0$ | 75.7 7.3 2.1 14.2 2.1 $<2.0$ 80.2 $<2.0$ 4.0 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | 58.1 18.6 $<2.0$ 16.4 9.7 $<2.0$ 39.7 $<2.0$ 4.4 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | 68.3 10.8 $<2.0$ 20.6 4.5 $<2.0$ 55.5 $<2.0$ 3.6 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | $>98.0$ $<2.0$ 4.3 30.4 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ 69.6 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | 60.0 13.6 2.0 12.3 6.8 $<2.0$ 62.5 $<2.0$ 5.4 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | $>98.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $>98.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | $>98.0$ 23.5 $<2.0$ 5.9 5.9 $<2.0$ 70.6 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | 58.6 11.9 2.4 17.3 4.1 2.3 60.0 $<2.0$ 2.3 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | 53.1 44.2 2.7 26.5 2.7 $<2.0$ 31.9 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | 75.4 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ 26.2 31.7 15.9 35.7 $<2.0$ 15.9 $<2.0$ $<2.0$ $<2.0$ | <2.0 |



## Supplemental Information

Similar Schools

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

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

| Ranks High Ranks Mid | School Rank |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ranks Low | $\begin{gathered} E L L \\ 2.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { SWD } \\ 13.2 \end{array}$ | Ethnicity <br> 67.2 | $\begin{gathered} \hline E D \\ 57.3 \end{gathered}$ | Mobility <br> 1.3 | Composite |  |
| Students (\% Tested) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank | Total |
| Current Standing | 11 ( 27 ) | 7 ( 35 ) | 3 ( 35 ) | 6 ( 35 ) | 13 ( 34 ) | 8 | ( 35 ) |
| School Growth | 14 ( 27 ) | 17 ( 35 ) | 19 ( 35 ) | 13 ( 35 ) | 17 ( 34 ) | 20 | ( 35 ) |
| Student Growth, Highest 75\% | 19 ( 27 ) | 22 ( 35 ) | 27 ( 35 ) | 15 ( 35 ) | 15 ( 34 ) | 23 | ( 35 ) |
| Student Growth, Lowest 25\% | 11 ( 27 ) | 8 ( 35 ) | 12 ( 35 ) | 11 ( 35 ) | 10 ( 34 ) | 10 | ( 35 ) |
| Opportunity to Learn | 2 ( 27 ) | 5 ( 34 ) | 3 ( 35 ) | ( 35 ) | 3 ( 34 ) | 6 | ( 35 ) |
| Graduation | 7 ( 27 ) | 7 ( 34 ) | 7 ( 35 ) | 3 ( 35 ) | 8 ( 34 ) | 5 | ( 35 ) |
| College and Career Readiness | 7 ( 27 ) | ( 34 ) | ( 35 ) | ( 35 ) | 15 ( 34 ) | 10 | ( 35 ) |


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


|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Students } \end{gathered}$ | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | F | M | White | Afr <br> Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian |  |  |  |  |
| Reading | Highest 75\% (\%) | 70.1 | 75.4 | 61.9 | 71.4 | - | 67.2 | - | - | 63.3 | - | - | 27.3 |
| Target 61.0\% | Lowest 25\% (\%) | 26.3 | 35.7 | - | - | - | 30.8 | - | - | 28.6 | - | - | - |
| Math | Highest 75\% (\% | 59.6 | 53.7 | 68.6 | 65.5 | - | 53.6 | - | - | 50.9 | - | - | - |
| Target 55.0\% | Lowest 25\% (\%) | 8.3 | 8.0 | 9.1 | - | - | 12.5 | - | - | 9.5 | . 0 | - | - |

Graduation For high schools graduation rates for the Cohort of 2013 are available on page 5.
Target 73.7\%


| Participation | Schools must include all of their enrolled students in the annual statewide assessment. If the percentage of the All Students group is less than $95 \%$, the school's letter grade is reduced by one grade. Supplemental Accountability Schools (SAM) and small schools with fewer than 40 students receive special consideration. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All Students | Gender |  | $\underset{\text { Afr }}{\text { Race / Ethnicity }}$ |  |  |  | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated <br> English <br> Proficient |
|  |  |  | F | M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Reading (\%) | >98.0 | 97.5 | >98.0 | >98.0 | - | >98.0 | - | - | >98.0 | >98.0 | - | - |
|  | Math (\%) | >98.0 | 97.5 | >98.0 | 97.4 | - | >98.0 | - | - | >98.0 | >98.0 | - | - |

## School History

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

|  |  | All Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |
| Reading | 2014 (Avg SS) |  | 42.8 | 43.3 | 41.8 | 44.4 | - | 42.1 | - | - | 41.4 | 35.5 | - | 38.7 |
|  | 2013 (Avg SS) | 43.1 | 44.6 | 41.0 | 46.0 | - | 40.6 | - | - | 42.7 | 34.1 | - | - |
|  | 2012 (Avg SS) | 41.8 | 44.7 | 38.6 | 45.0 | - | 39.8 | - | - | 41.9 | 31.1 | - | - |
| Math | 2014 (Avg SS) | 38.9 | 38.1 | 40.1 | 40.6 | - | 38.1 | - | - | 38.0 | 30.9 | - | 32.5 |
|  | 2013 (Avg SS) | 39.7 | 40.1 | 39.3 | 43.0 | - | 37.3 | - | - | 40.1 | 31.3 | - | - |
|  | 2012 (Avg SS) | 40.3 | 40.9 | 39.5 | 43.6 | - | 37.8 | - | - | 39.9 | 32.6 | - | - |

## Student Promotion

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

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

## End Notes

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

District: State Charters<br>Grade Range: 09-12<br>Code: 525001

This School
Statewide C Benchmark


| Current Standing <br> How did students perform in the most recent school year? Students are tested on how well they met targets for their grade level. | $12.5$ | Grade <br> B | School Points 15.95 | Possible Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Growth <br> In the past 3 years, did the school as a whole increase performance? For example, did a schoolwide reading program advance reading scores over the prior years? | $5.8$ | C | 5.65 | 10 |
| Student Growth of Highest Performing Students <br> How well did the school help individual students improve? The highest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the top three quarters (75\%) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark. | $3.6$ | B | 5.57 | 10 |
| Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students <br> How well did the school help individual students improve? The lowest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the bottom quarter ( $25 \%$ ) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark. | 7.7 | C | 8.14 | 10 |
| Opportunity to Learn <br> Does the school foster an environment that facilitates learning? Are teachers using recognized instructional methods, and do students want to come to school? | 6.0 | A | 7.39 | 8 |
| Graduation <br> How does the school contribute to on-time graduation? On-time means within 4 years, and, to a lesser extent, within 5 and 6 years for students who require longer. | 12.8 | C | 12.57 | 17 |
| College and Career Readiness <br> Are students prepared for what lies ahead after high school? Schools receive credit when students participate in college entrance exams and coursework leading to dual credit and vocational certification. The school receives additional credit when students meet success goals. | $9.0$ | A | 13.43 | 15 |
| Bonus Points <br> Does the school show exceptional aptitude for involving students and parents in education, reducing truancy, and promoting extracurricular activities? |  |  | 4.88 | 5 |


|  |  |  |  | 3-Year <br> Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 78.8 |
|  | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | $A$ |


| Final School Grade | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75.0 to $<100.0$ | A | Points |
| 65.0 to $<75.0$ | B | $\mathbf{7 3 . 5 8}$ |
| 50.0 to $<65.0$ | C |  |
| 35.0 to $<50.0$ | D |  |
| 0.0 to $<35.0$ | F |  |

## Details of Each Grade Indicator

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

## Current Standing

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

|  | All Students |  | White | Race / Ethnicity |  |  | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English <br> Language <br> Learners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian |  |  |  |  |
| Reading |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient and Advanced (\%) | 50.6 | 56.542 .9 | 58.2 | 28.6 | 44.6 | >98.0 | 50.0 | 41.8 | 13.3 | <2.0 |
| Proficient and Advanced (Pts) | 2.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Value Added Model (Pts) | 8.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient and Advanced (\%) | 13.7 | 15.211 .7 | 22.0 | <2.0 | 7.3 |  | <2.0 | 8.9 | 3.3 | <2.0 |
| Proficient and Advanced (Pts) | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Value Added Model (Pts) | 4.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| School Growth | Growth in proficiency is calculated with Value Added Modeling (VAM), which accounts for the school's size, student mobility, and prior student performance. Details of VAM can be found in the PED's School Grading Technical Guide at http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value Added Score <br> Points Earned | Reading <br> 1.010 <br> 4.22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ -0.562 \\ 1.44 \end{gathered}$ | School growth is expressed as a score that can be both negative and positive. When it is positive the school performed better than was expected relative to its peers with the same size, mobility, and prior student performance. |

## Student Growth

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

- Above 0 means that the group, in general, scored higher than expected. This is an exciting finding when students are below the proficiency line, because they are closing the achievement gap and catching up to their higher-performing classmates.
- Near 0 means that the group scored about as expected compared to their academic peers. While some students may have performed better than anticipated (positive growth), they were equally balanced by students that did poorer (negative growth).
- Below 0 means that the group performed below expectations and students are losing ground when compared to their peers.
Details of student growth and value added scores are explained in PED's School Grading Technical Guide at http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx. Note that separate analytic techniques are used for the school overall and for the subgroups.

|  | School Overall | Subgroup Analysis English |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female | Male | White | African American | Hispanic | Asian | Am Indian | Econ Disadv | with Disabilities | Language Learners |
| Reading Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest 75\% (VAS) | 0.77 | 0.48 | 0.69 | 0.61 | 0.23 | 0.54 | 0.69 | 0.68 | 0.55 | 0.83 | -0.81 |
| Highest 75\% (Pts) | 3.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest 25\% (VAS) | 1.21 | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.29 | -0.03 | 0.45 | - | - | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.29 |
| Lowest 25\% (Pts) | 4.43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest 75\% (VAS) | -0.42 | 0.28 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 1.11 | 0.25 | - | 0.70 | 0.16 | -0.09 | 0.12 |
| Highest 75\% (Pts) | 1.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest 25\% (VAS) | 0.65 | 0.33 | -0.18 | -0.04 | 0.26 | 0.12 | - | - | -0.04 | 0.04 | -0.19 |
| Lowest 25\% (Pts) | 3.71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Opportunity

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

## Learn (OTL)

|  | AllStudents | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English <br> Language <br> Learners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian |  |  |  |
| Attendance (Average) | 96.1 | 96.0 | 96.2 | 95.9 | - | 96.2 | - | - | 95.8 | 95.2 | 97.3 |
| Attendance (Points) | 3.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Survey (Average) | 39.2 | Surveys consisted of ten questions with answers from 0 (Never) to 5 (Always), <br> sielding a maximum score of 50. A typical question includes "My teacher introduces a | Reading | 39.7 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Survey (Points) | 4.4 | Math <br> new lesson by reminding us of things we already know." Schools that scored higher <br> demonstrated better classroom teaching practices. | General | NA |

## Graduation

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

|  |  | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All <br> Students | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp |  | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |
| Cohort of 2014-4-Year Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Graduation (\%) | 78.1 | 89.0 | 62.8 | 79.5 |  | 76.3 | - | - | 70.5 | 60.6 | - |
| Non-Cohort Graduation (\%) | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SAM Adjustment (Weighted \%) |  |  |  |  | This | chool | d not | qualify | a SAM scho |  |  |
| Points Earned | 6.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort of 2013-5-Year Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation (\%) | 73.1 | 85.5 | 58.5 | 62.9 | - | 73.4 | - | - | 71.2 | 69.0 | - |
| Points Earned | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort of 2012-6-Year Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation (\%) | 73.9 | 82.5 | 62.0 | 75.7 | - | 69.9 | - | - | 67.2 | 77.0 | - |
| Points Earned | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Growth in 4-Year Rates

Growth takes into account three years of graduation rates.

Growth Index
.27
Points Earned 2.65

| College | High school students are expected to participate in at least one college or career readiness program. These activities include one of the following: |
| :---: | :---: |
| and | 1) College entrance assessments (SAT, SAT Subject Test, PSAT, ACT, PLAN, Compass, or Accuplacer) |
| Career | 2) Evidence that the student can pass a college-level course (Advanced Placement, Dual Credit, or IB) |
| Readiness | 3) Eligibility for an industry recognized certification (Career Technical Education, SAM School Supplemental) |
| (CCR) | Points are given separately for students' participation and for their success. To be considered successful, students must meet established benchmarks. Details are in the School Grading Technical Guide on the PED website at http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx. |

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

| $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \text { or Higher } \\ & 20 \%-50 \% \\ & \text { Below } 20 \% \end{aligned}$ | All <br> Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students with Disabilities | English <br> Language Learners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Amer | Hisp | Asian | Indian | Disadvantaged |  |  |
| Participation (\% of Cohort) | 88 | 92 | 82 | 87 | 100 | 89 | - | 74 | 80 | 77 | 85 |
| Participation (Pts) | 4.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Success (\% of Participants) | 90 | 89 | 92 | 89 | 92 | 90 | - | 100 | 81 | 89 | 0 |
| Success (Pts) | 9.04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of School's Cohort of 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participating ACT | 52.4 | 65.3 | 34.3 | 48.9 | 92.3 | 49.4 | - | 74.2 | 48.6 | 20.8 | 31.9 |
| in Each <br> PLAN | 6.5 | 4.1 | 9.9 | 2.7 | <2.0 | 10.6 | - | <2.0 | 3.3 | 20.8 | <2.0 |
| CCR Opportunity SAT | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 |
| PSAT | 73.6 | 81.2 | 62.9 | 70.9 | >98.0 | 73.3 | - | 74.2 | 64.0 | 54.9 | 23.9 |
| AccuPlacer | 4.1 | <2.0 | 7.4 | <2.0 | <2.0 | 7.3 | - | <2.0 | 5.6 | 7.6 | <2.0 |
| Advanced Placement | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | 31.9 |
| Dual Credit | 76.4 | 88.2 | 59.7 | 76.6 | 92.3 | 75.1 | - | 74.2 | 69.4 | 56.8 | 29.4 |
| International Baccalaureate | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 |
| Career Technical Education | <2.0 | 2.5 | <2.0 | 3.6 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | 5.7 | <2.0 |
| Compass | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 |  | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 |
| SAT Subject Test | <2.0 | <2.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 |
| SAM School Supplemental | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 |

## Bonus Points

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

Student Engagement

Parental Engagement

Extracurricular Activities

Truancy Improvement

Other

## Participation

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

Reading (\%) 100
Math (\%) 98

## Supplemental Information

## Similar

 Schools While statewide comparisons are helpful, schools may want to see how they rank next to their peers that have similar students and settings. The figures below show how this school contrasts with other schools in the state that are most like it in student characteristics.Schools are grouped into categories that have similar proportions of English language learners (ELL), students with disabilities (SWD), ethnicities, economically disadvantaged (ED), and mobile students. Different schools are in each category set. A composite score incorporates all categories into a general measure of atrisk students.

| Ranks High Ranks Mid | School Rank |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ranks Low | ELL | SWD | Ethnicity | $E D$ | Mobility | Composite |
| Students (\% Tested) | 3.3 | 12.6 | 55.9 | 56.1 | 1.0 |  |
|  | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total |
| Current Standing | 14 ( 36 ) | 11 ( 36 ) | 18 ( 36 ) | 9 ( 36 ) | 17 ( 35 ) | 15 ( 35 ) |
| School Growth | 16 ( 36 ) | 16 ( 36 ) | 19 ( 36 ) | 12 ( 36 ) | 15 ( 35 ) | 18 ( 35 ) |
| Student Growth, Highest 75\% | 15 ( 36 ) | 15 ( 36 ) | 19 ( 36 ) | 17 ( 36 ) | 17 ( 35 ) | 16 ( 35 ) |
| Student Growth, Lowest 25\% | 5 ( 36 ) | 4 ( 36 ) | 11 ( 36 ) | 2 ( 36 ) | 8 ( 35 ) | 6 ( 35 ) |
| Opportunity to Learn | 6 ( 36 ) | 7 ( 36 ) | 6 ( 36 ) | 5 ( 36 ) | 10 ( 35 ) | 8 ( 36 ) |
| Graduation | 21 ( 36 ) | 20 ( 36 ) | 23 ( 36 ) | 16 ( 36 ) | 21 ( 35 ) | 25 ( 36 ) |
| College and Career Readiness | 9 ( 36 ) | 8 ( 36 ) | 9 ( 36 ) | 8 ( 36 ) | 15 ( 35 ) | 7 ( 36 ) |

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

## Targets

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

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

|  |  | All Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian |  |  |  |
| Reading Proficiency | 2015 (\%) |  | 50.6 | 56.5 | 42.9 | 58.2 | 28.6 | 44.6 | >98.0 | 50.0 | 41.8 | 13.3 | <2.0 |
|  | 2014 (\%) | 65.9 | 69.6 | 59.6 | 71.8 |  | 62.5 |  |  | 58.1 | 31.3 |  |
|  | 2013 (\%) | 71.4 | 73.4 | 68.5 | 81.5 |  | 62.0 |  |  | 68.3 | 27.8 |  |
| Math Proficiency | 2015 (\%) | 13.7 | 15.2 | 11.7 | 22.0 | <2.0 | 7.3 |  | <2.0 | 8.9 | 3.3 | <2.0 |
|  | 2014 (\%) | 48.8 | 43.0 | 58.7 | 57.9 |  | 43.8 |  |  | 44.6 | 25.0 |  |
|  | 2013 (\%) | 52.2 | 50.6 | 54.5 | 72.7 |  | 38.0 |  |  | 54.7 | 15.8 |  |

## Student

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

| Percent of students scoring Beginning Step (lowest) in the prior year advancing to the next grade . |  | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Students | F | M | White | $\begin{gathered} \text { Afr } \\ \text { Amer } \end{gathered}$ | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian |  |  |  |
| Grade 9 to Grade 10 (\%) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Grade 10 to Grade 11 (\%) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Grade 11 to Grade 12 (\%) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## End Notes

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

Certified

## Amy Biehl High Charter

District: State Charters<br>Grade Range: 09-12<br>Code: 525001

## This School Statewide C Benchmark

| Current Standing <br> How did students perform in the most recent school year? Students are tested on how well they met targets for their grade level. | 12.5 | Grade A | School Points 22.04 | Possible Points 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Growth <br> In the past 3 years did the school increase grade level performance? <br> For example did this year's 10th graders improve over last year's 10th graders? | 5.8 | C | 5.73 | 10 |
| Student Growth of Highest Performing Students <br> How well did the school help individual students improve? The highest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the top three quarters ( $75 \%$ ) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark. | $3.6$ | A | 10.00 | 10 |
| Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students <br> How well did the school help individual students improve? The lowest performing students are those whose prior scores placed them in the bottom quarter ( $25 \%$ ) of their school. Individual student growth over the past 3 years is compared to the state benchmark. | 7.7 | B | 9.13 | 10 |
| Opportunity to Learn <br> Does the school foster an environment that facilitates learning? Are teachers using recognized instructional methods, and do students want to come to school? | 6.0 | A | 7.25 | 8 |
| Graduation <br> How does the school contribute to on-time graduation? On-time means within 4 years, and to a lesser extent, within 5 and 6 years for students who require longer. | $12.8$ | D | 11.14 | 17 |
| College and Career Readiness <br> Are students prepared for what lies ahead after high school? Schools receive credit when students participate in college entrance exams, and coursework leading to dual credit and vocational certification. The school receives additional credit when students meet success goals. | 9.0 | A | 12.98 | 15 |

## Bonus Points

Does the school show exceptional aptitude for involving students and parents in education, reducing truancy, and promoting extracurricular activities?


### 2.14 <br> 5




| Final School Grade |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75.0 to 100.0 | A | Points |
| 65.0 to 74.9 | B | $\mathbf{8 0 . 4 1}$ |
| 50.0 to 64.9 | C |  |
| 35.0 to 49.9 | D |  |
| 0.0 to 34.9 | F |  |

## Details of Each Grade Indicator

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

## Current

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

|  | All Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  | Economically Disadvantaged | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Amer | Hisp | Asian | Indian |  |  |  |  |
| Reading <br> Proficient and Advanced (\%) | 71.4 | 73.4 | 68.5 | 81.5 | - | 62.0 | - | - | 68.3 | 27.8 | - | - |
| Proficient and Advanced (Pts) | 7.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Value Added Model (Pts) | 5.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proficient and Advanced (\%) | 52.2 | 50.6 | 54.5 | 72.7 | - | 38.0 | - | - | 54.7 | 15.8 | - | - |
| Proficient and Advanced (Pts) | 5.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Value Added Model (Pts) | 3.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



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

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

|  | Difference from | Reading |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expected Growth (SS Points) | 2.058 | Math |
|  | 0.564 |  |
| Points Earned | 1.97 | 3.76 |
|  |  |  |

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

|  | Just like schools, individual student achievement is expected to improve over time. Student growth is shown as the average change in scaled score (SS) points per year, and is averaged for all students in each group for up to 3 years. Student groups are further divided into highest and lowest performing subgroups. <br> Scores on the assessment range from 0 to 80 , and a score of 40 indicates that a student is proficient or on grade level. A student's prior test scores are used to estimate how the student should perform today. When growth is positive (+) students score better than expected in the current year: <br> - Above 0 means that the group, in general, scored higher than expected. This is an exciting finding, especially when students are below the proficiency line, because they are closing the achievement gap and catching up to their higher-performing classmates. <br> - Near 0 means that the group scored about as expected. While some students may have performed better than anticipated (positive growth), they were equally balanced by students that did poorer (negative growth). <br> - Below 0 means that the group performed below expectations and students are losing ground when compared to their peers. <br> Details of Student Growth and scaled scores are explained in the Technical Guide on the PED website: http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Students | Female |  | Male |  | White |  | African American |  | Hispanic |  | Asian | Am Indian | Econ <br> Disadv | Students with | English Language | Redesignated English |
|  |  | From To |  | From To |  | From To |  | From To |  | From To |  | From To | From To | From To | From To | From To | From To |
| Reading Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest 75\% (SS/Yr) | 5.6 | 0.6 | 5.2 | -0.1 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 5.2 | 3.8 | 8.4 | -0.1 | 4.5 | - - | 3.17 .5 | $0.5 \quad 5.0$ | -2.1 2.8 | $\begin{array}{ll}-2.0 & 2.9\end{array}$ | 9 |
| Highest 75\% (Pts) | 5.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest 25\% (SS/Yr) | 2.7 | 2.8 | 7.3 | 3.3 | 7.9 | 3.8 | 8.4 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.7 |  | -1.8 3.1 | 1.96 .5 | $3.0 \quad 7.6$ | 4.99 .0 | - - |
| Lowest 25\% (Pts) | 4.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Math Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest 75\% (SS/Yr) | 4.1 | -0.7 | 3.9 | -0.8 | 3.8 | -0.6 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 5.6 | -1.2 | 3.4 | - - | 1.56 .0 | -0.9 3.7 | -1.5 3.2 | $-2.0 \quad 2.5$ | - - |
| Highest 75\% (Pts) | 5.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest 25\% (SS/Yr) | 1.0 |  | 5.9 | 0.2 | 4.9 |  | 5.9 |  |  |  |  | - - | -1.2 3.5 | 0.85 .5 | $0.5 \quad 5.1$ |  | - - |
| Lowest 25\% (Pts) | 4.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Remaining Gap Between Highest and Lowest Performing Students in 2013 Scaled Score Differences Reading 15.5 Math 15.1

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

Math +1.3 per year Reading +1.7 per year

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

|  | All Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  | Economically Disadvant | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian |  |  |  |  |
| OTL Attendance (Student Average) | 98.5 | 98.4 | 98.6 | 98.4 | 97.6 | 98.6 | - | - | 98.4 | 98.5 | 99.0 | - |
| OTL Attendance (Points Earned) | 3.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTL Survey (Average Total Score) | 38.6 | 38.5 | 38.8 | 39.3 | 35.8 | 38.2 | - | 40.0 | 38.6 | 37.8 | 41.0 | - |
| OTL Survey (Points Earned) | 4.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

| 1. My teacher introduces a new topic by connecting to things I already know. | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.7 | - | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.5 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. My teacher explains why what we are learning is important. | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 4.0 | - | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | - |
| 3. My teacher explains how learning a new topic is a foundation for other topics. | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 4.0 | - |
| 4. Every student gets a chance to answer questions. | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.4 | - | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 5.0 | - |
| 5. My teacher wants me to explain my answers. | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.5 | - | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 5.0 | - |
| 6. My teacher knows when I understand, and when I do not. | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.0 | - |
| 7. My teacher explains things in different ways so everyone can understand. | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.8 | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.5 | - |
| 8. My teacher gives me helpful feedback on work I turn in. | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.3 | - | 5.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 5.0 | - |
| 9. My teacher checks our understanding. | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 4.0 | - | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.5 | - |
| 10. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day. | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | - | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 4.0 | - |
| OTL Survey Questions Math |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. My teacher introduces a new topic by connecting to things I already know. | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 3.6 | - | 4.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 | - |
| 2. My teacher explains why what we are learning is important. | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.0 | - |
| 3. My teacher explains how learning a new topic is a foundation for other topics. | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 3.3 | - | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 4.0 | - |
| 4. Every student gets a chance to answer questions. | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 4.0 | - | 4.8 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 3.0 | - |
| 5. My teacher wants me to explain my answers. | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 4.3 | - | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 3.0 | - |
| 6. My teacher knows when I understand, and when I do not. | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.4 | - | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 2.5 | - |
| 7. My teacher explains things in different ways so everyone can understand. | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.6 | - | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | - |
| 8. My teacher gives me helpful feedback on work I turn in. | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.7 | - | 4.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.0 | - |
| 9. My teacher checks our understanding. | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 4.1 | - | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.5 | - |
| 10. My teacher takes the time to summarize what we learn each day. | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.9 | - | 4.3 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | - |
| Color Key: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 or 5, Rated High <br> 2 or 3, Rated Mid <br> 0 or 1, Rated Low |  |  |


| Graduation <br> Students are expected to graduate in 4 years. However, some students require longer and are captured in 5 -year and 6 -year rates. Similar to School Growth, the expectation is that the school increase the percent of successful 4 -year graduates over time. <br> SAM schools (Supplemental Accountability Model) are a subset of schools that target returning dropouts or students with disabilities. These schools receive an additional rate that reflects their ability to graduate any student, not just cohort members, in a given year. Details of the federally approved graduation rules are in the Graduation Technical Manual on the PED website |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Students |  | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students with Disabilities | English <br> Language <br> Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
|  |  |  | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |
| Cohort of 2012-4-Year Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Graduating | 63.5 | 72.9 | 49.8 | 58.6 | - | 64.6 | - | - | 59.6 | 53.6 | - | N/A |
| Points Earned | 5.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort of 2011-5-Year Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Graduating | 60.2 | 78.8 | 37.5 | 60.6 | - | 60.1 | - | - | 34.2 | 43.4 | - | N/A |
| Points Earned | 1.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort of 2010-6-Year Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Graduating | 76.7 | 86.6 | 67.3 | 70.1 | - | 79.4 | - | - | 75.0 | 81.2 | - | N/A |
| Points Earned | 1.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Growth in 4-Year Rates Value Added Modeling takes into account the school's prior 3 years. | Growth Index (Increase) |  |  | 3.7 |  | SAM Rates |  | SAM Graduation (\%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Points Earned |  |  | 2.73 |  | This school did not qualify to be a SAM school. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| College | High school students are expected to participate in at least one college or career readiness program. These activities include <br> one of the following: |
| :--- | :--- |
| and | 1) College entrance assessments (SAT, SAT Subject Test, PSAT, ACT, PLAN, Compass, or Accuplacer) |
| Career | 2) Evidence that the student can pass a college level course (Advanced Placement, Dual Credit, or IB) |
| Readiness | 3) Eligibility for an industry recognized certification (Career Technical Education, SAM School Supplemental) <br> (CCR) |
|  | Points are given separately for students' participation and for their success. To be considered successful students must meet <br> established benchmarks. Details are in the School Grading Technical Guide on the PED website at <br> http://webapp2.ped.state.nm.us/SchoolData/SchoolGrading.aspx. |
|  | CCR follows the Shared Accountability model used for cohort graduation rates. Cohorts are fully described in the Graduation |


| $50 \%$ or Higher$20 \%-50 \%$Below $20 \%$ | All Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |
| Participation (\% of Cohort) | 85.4 | 82.5 | 89.7 | 90.1 | >98.0 | 78.4 | - | >98.0 | 84.8 | 94.5 | 29.6 | - |
| Participation (Pts) | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Success (\% of Participants) | 87.1 | 92.2 | 80.2 | 82.9 | >98.0 | 89.1 | - | >98.0 | 82.1 | 66.0 | 14.7 | - |
| Success (Pts) | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of School's Cohort of 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participating | 65.9 | 74.5 | 53.5 | 63.1 | 82.2 | 65.0 | - | >98.0 | 67.5 | 61.3 | 4.3 | - |
| PLAN | 17.7 | 8.9 | 30.6 | 22.9 | 17.8 | 13.7 | - | <2.0 | 18.6 | 32.1 | <2.0 | - |
| CCR Opportunity SAT | <2.0 | 2.5 | <2.0 | 2.4 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - |
| PSAT | 2.8 | 3.9 | <2.0 | 3.0 | <2.0 | 3.2 | - | <2.0 | 4.0 | <2.0 | 25.2 | - |
| AccuPlacer | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - |
| Advanced Placement | <2.0 | 2.1 | <2.0 | 2.4 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | 3.4 | <2.0 | <2.0 | 4.3 | - |
| Dual Credit | 61.0 | 68.4 | 50.2 | 57.4 | 60.6 | 62.5 | - | 96.6 | 55.3 | 52.5 | <2.0 | - |
| International Baccalaureate | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - |
| Career Technical Education | 7.8 | 11.1 | 3.1 | 5.0 | 17.8 | 10.0 | - | <2.0 | 10.4 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - |
| Compass | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - |
| SAT Subject Test | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - |
| SAM School Supplemental | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | - | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 | <2.0 |


#### Abstract

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


## Supplemental Information

## Similar

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

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

| Ranks High Ranks Mid | School Rank |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ranks Low | ELL | SWD | Ethnicity | $E D$ | Mobility | Composite |
| Students (\% Tested) | 1.5 | 13.9 | 59.2 | 47.1 | 2.7 |  |
|  | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total | Rank Total |
| Current Standing | 11 ( 29 ) | 4 ( 35 ) | 14 ( 35 ) | 8 ( 35 ) | 9 ( 34 ) | 10 ( 35 ) |
| School Growth | 12 ( 29 ) | 10 ( 35 ) | 14 ( 35 ) | 11 ( 35 ) | 14 ( 34 ) | 12 ( 35 ) |
| Student Growth, Highest 75\% | 12 ( 29 ) | 18 ( 35 ) | 10 ( 35 ) | 12 ( 35 ) | 12 ( 34 ) | 18 ( 35 ) |
| Student Growth, Lowest 25\% | 9 ( 29 ) | 18 ( 35 ) | 14 ( 35 ) | 13 ( 35 ) | 20 ( 34 ) | 17 ( 35 ) |
| Opportunity to Learn | 4 ( 29 ) | 4 ( 35 ) | 3 ( 35 ) | 6 ( 35 ) | 4 ( 34 ) | 5 ( 35 ) |
| Graduation | 20 ( 29 ) | 24 ( 35 ) | 21 ( 35 ) | 22 ( 35 ) | 25 ( 34 ) | 24 ( 35 ) |
| College and Career Readiness | 6 ( 29 ) | 12 ( 35 ) | 9 ( 35 ) | 10 ( 35 ) | 16 ( 34 ) | 11 ( 35 ) |


#### Abstract

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


|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Students } \end{gathered}$ | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |
| Reading | Highest 75\% (\%) | 84.4 | 82.5 | 87.9 | 88.6 | - | 78.7 | - | - | 79.2 | - | . 0 | - |
| Target 56.7\% | Lowest 25\% (\%) | 33.3 | 30.8 | 35.0 | - | 100.0 | 29.2 | - | . 0 | 30.8 | 26.7 | - | - |
| Math | Highest 75\% (\% | 64.4 | 59.0 | 72.5 | 81.8 | - | 51.0 | - | - | 70.2 | - | . 0 | - |
| Target 50.0\% | Lowest 25\% (\%) | 3.6 | 6.7 | . 0 | 16.7 | - | . 0 | - | - | 7.1 | . 0 | - | - |

Graduation For high schools graduation rates for the Cohort of 2012 are available on page 5.
Target 71.8\%


| Participation | Schools must include all of their enrolled students in the annual statewide assessment. If the percentage of the All Students group is less than $95 \%$, the school's letter grade is reduced by one grade. Supplemental Accountability Schools (SAM) and small schools with fewer than 40 students receive special consideration. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | All Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students | English | Redesignated |
|  |  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer |  | Asian | $\begin{gathered} \text { Am } \\ \text { Indian } \end{gathered}$ | Economically Disadvantaged | with Disabilities | Language Learners | English Proficient |
|  | Reading (\%) | 95.7 | 95.2 | 96.4 | 91.5 | - | 100.0 |  | - | 100.0 | - | - |  |
|  | Math (\%) | 96.4 | 95.2 | 98.2 | 93.2 | - | 100.0 |  | - | 100.0 | - | - |  |

## School History

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

|  |  | All Students | Gender |  | Race / Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  | Students with Disabilities | English Language Learners | Redesignated English Proficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | F | M | White | Afr Amer | Hisp | Asian | Am Indian | Economically Disadvantaged |  |  |  |
| Reading | 2013 (Avg SS) |  | 43.1 | 44.6 | 41.0 | 46.0 | - | 40.6 | - | - | 42.7 | 34.1 | - | - |
|  | 2012 (Avg SS) | 41.8 | 44.7 | 38.6 | 45.0 | - | 39.8 | - | - | 41.9 | 31.1 | - | - |
|  | 2011 (Avg SS) | 42.2 | 43.3 | 40.5 | 42.0 | - | 43.1 | - | - | 39.8 | - | - | - |
| Math | 2013 (Avg SS) | 39.7 | 40.1 | 39.3 | 43.0 | - | 37.3 | - | - | 40.1 | 31.3 | - | - |
|  | 2012 (Avg SS) | 40.3 | 40.9 | 39.5 | 43.6 | - | 37.8 | - | - | 39.9 | 32.6 | - | - |
|  | 2011 (Avg SS) | 38.8 | 38.4 | 39.4 | 39.6 | - | 39.3 | - | - | 36.6 | - | - | - |

## Student Promotion

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

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

## End Notes

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