NM Public Education Department

Options for Parents: Charter Schools Division

State Charter Renewal Application *Preliminary* Analysis For the New Mexico Public Education Commission

Red River Valley Charter School	Nov 2015

Head Administrator: Karen Phillips

NM PED Charter School Division - Renewal Snapshot Report

Red River Valley Charter

Contract Type: Charter Start: 7/1/2011 End: 6/30/2016 Term in Years: 5

General Information

Mailing Address: PO Box 742, Red River, NM 87558
Physical Address: 500 East High St, Red River, NM 87558
Phone: (575) 754-6117 Ext: Fax: (575) 754-3258 Website:
Opened: 2001 State Appvd: Dec-10 Renewal: 2016
School District: Questa County: Taos

Karen Phillips, Head Administrator Email: redrivervalleycs@hotmail.com
Katy Pierce, President Email: jakepierce@q.com
Flavio Cisneros, Email: Flaviocisneros71@yahoo.com

Mission:

To provide every student the opportunity to develop academically, socially, and physically through quality learning experiences utilizing the Core Knowledge Curriculum.

Grade Levels Offered/Enrollment/Cap:

Year	Grades	Grades to phase in	CAP	Total (40 day)	Teacher	Teacher/Student Ratio:
2014-15	PreK-8		100	85	7	12.1

Academics

School Report Card	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
1. Final Grade	C	C	C		
2. 3 Year Avg Grade		C	C		
3. Current Standing	D	D	D		
4. School Growth	C	C	B		
5. Highest Performing Students	C	B	A		
6. Lowest Performing Students	C	F	F		
7. Opportunity to Learn	A	A	B		
8. Graduation					
9. Career and College					
10. Reading Proficiency	52.8	44.7	55.3		
11. Math Proficiency	27.8	42.1	48.9		
12. SAMS	N	N	N		
13. SAMS Graduation %					
14. Bonus Points	0	1	0.58		

NM PED Charter School Division - Renewal Snapshot Report

Red River Valley Charter

Contract Type: Charter Start: 7/1/2011 End: 6/30/2016 Term in Years: 5

Enrollment	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
1. Total Enrollment	59	62	65	78	85

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
2. % Male	57.6%	66.1%	52.3%	51.3%	56.5%
3. % Female	42.4%	33.9%	47.7%	48.7%	43.5%
4. % Caucasian	69.5%	58.1%	44.6%	41.0%	48.2%
5. % Hispanic	27.1%	41.9%	49.2%	53.8%	50.6%
6. % African American	3.4%	0.0%	4.6%	2.6%	0.0%
7. % Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8. % Native American	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	2.6%	0.0%
9. % Economically Disadvantaged	28.8%	54.8%	69.2%	67.9%	67.1%
10. % Title 1 TS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
11. % Title 1 T	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12. %Title 1 S	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
13. % K-3 Plus	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
14. % Disabled	15.3%	14.5%	15.4%	19.2%	18.8%
15. % ELL	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

School Overview

- **Charter History/Academic Performance**

Red River Valley Charter School (RRVCS) opened in 2001 and is applying for its third renewal term. RRVCS is one of the early conversion charter schools and occupies the previous site of the Red River Elementary School in the Town of Red River. Questa Independent School District authorized the conversion of its school to charter school status. The site is still owned by the district. In 2011, RRVCS was approved for state-authorization by the Public Education Commission.

The school's current three year average is a C. The school continues to score low in the areas of Current Standing and Q1 Performance. In recent years, the school has shown declines in the points earned for Final Grade, Current Standing, Q1Growth, and Opportunity to Learn.

School Report Data - Red River Valley Charter School				
	2011	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
3 Year Average	N/A	N/A	C 51	C 53.7
Final Grade	D 42.9	C 54.5	C 54.66	C 50.43
Current Standing	F 12.1	D 15.5	D 17.5	D 14.75
School Growth	F 3	C 6	C 5.39	B 6.68
Student Growth of Highest Performing Students	F 2.3	C 8.1	B 13.08	A 15.04
Student Growth of Lowest Performing Students	C 15.7	C 15.6	F 9.38	F 5.03
Opportunity to Learn	A 9.8	A 9.3	A 9.31	B 8.93

Because the school has such a small population, PARCC data was not publicly available for analysis.

- **Site Visit Summary**

  All school stakeholders indicate they are committed to the school. Parents cite the size and related family atmosphere as the main reasons they keep coming back.

  Teachers in the school range from master teachers displaying exemplary practice to beginning teachers struggling with classroom management. Instruction observed during the site visit ranged from students answering teacher directed questions with difficulty, to differentiated learning stations. There was no evidence of sheltered instruction for ELL students. This is a known weakness for the school, evidence was in place that indicates students are now tested for language proficiency but the school has continued work to do regarding instruction in the area of ELL.

  The head administrator has an understanding of the purpose of data informed instruction and is working on systems to implement the practice with fidelity.

  Governing Board members are equally passionate about the school, though at least one is not clear about the role of a GB member regarding accountability, instead stating that his role includes empathizing with teacher and providing an ear.

I. Self-Report—Looking Back

The Charter School Act requires that each school seeking to renew its charter must submit a report on the progress of the charter school in achieving the goals, objectives, student performance outcomes, state minimum educational standards, and other terms of the current charter, including the accountability requirements set forth in the Assessment and Accountability Act.

Material Violations

The Charter School Act provides:

> *A charter may be suspended, revoked, or not renewed by the chartering authority if the chartering authority determines that the charter school…committed a material violation of any of the conditions, standards or procedures set forth in the charter, 22-8B-12F (1) NMSA 1978.*

The school's charter defines the terms under which it proposes to operate and defines the measurable goals the school pledges to meet. The review team has analyzed the evidence provided by both the charter school and the school's current authorizer (the PEC or the school district) with regard to material violations.

Material Terms

Red River Valley Charter School had the following material violations to their charter as indicated in the 2014/2015 annual monitoring site visit. The renewal site visit confirmed the school has tested for ELL eligibility for the 2015/2016 SY. CSD did not confirm STARS reporting at the time of the visit. The 40 day count was not due by the October 8, 2015 renewal site visit.

- STARS Reporting, including IEP's and ancillary services.
- ELL Services
- Missing PDPs for teachers

The school may comment on the results of the preliminary analysis by typing directly in the text box below. Response areas are available for all remaining sections.

School Response

GENERAL COMMENT CONCERNING THIS REPORT. Red River Valley Charter School (RRVCS) understood that it would have the opportunity to respond to a Preliminary Analysis of its Renewal Application. If this is the intent of this analysis, RRVCS objects to the entirety of this report as more specifically articulated below. This analysis is replete with errors, misstatements and incorrect and misleading assumptions. Inaccuracies from the 2014-15 Annual Site Visit Report have been carried over, because the CSD failed to correct mistakes in the information contained in CSD's 2014-15 Annual Site Visit Report as will be explained below. The inaccuracies in the CSD's 2014-15 Annual Site Visit Report clearly influenced the CSD's preliminary analysis of our renewal application.

Also, glaringly missing is a complete assessment of the prior four years of our charter's performance. Nowhere does CSD mention our successes including our sound operational and financial performance. CSD choses to isolate its review of our school in a single year's annual site visit report that was in fact inaccurate.

We reserve the right to raise additional objections to the CSD's analysis at the hearing on our renewal application in December after we have received the Final Analysis.

RESPONSE TO CHARTER ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE-

The CSD has failed to include positive academic information found in the charter renewal application and verified during the site visit on October 8, 2015. This clear evidence is included in the charter renewal application and does not represent a decline or stagnation of student performance.

Examples of positive progress made by students at RRVCS, but not mentioned in the Preliminary Analysis includes:

Analysis of the school's report cards shows that that RRVCS moved from a letter grade of C to a letter grade of B in the area of "School Growth", indicating RRVCS both met and exceeded the department's minimum educational standards in this category. "School Growth" compares the students enrolled in

the current year to students from prior years and accounts for improvement of all students, not just those reaching a proficient level. On the 2014 RRVCS Report Card, students in both the Highest 75% and Lowest 25% categories gained more than 1 year's growth in reading and in math based on Scaled Score Points.

An analysis of Q1 student performance indicates that the lowest 25% achieved more than one year's growth in both Reading and Math, a significant academic success and indication that the lowest 25% of students are on the way to "catching up". Students identified in the Q1 range are by a majority new to RRVCS, with most transitioning from the local school district.

As part of the data analysis for the current charter goals, an additional analysis of the grades 2-8 STAR Reading data demonstrates higher performance of a cohort of students who have attended RRVCS for 3 or more consecutive years in relation to the performance of all students. (Renewal application, page 34.) This analysis showed that the percent of students who have gained one or more years and have attended RRVCS for 3 or more consecutive years tends to be higher than that of "all students" including those who are relatively new to the school.

RRVCS also made substantial progress increasing its letter grade from a C to an A in the "Students Growth of Highest Performing Students (Q3)" which accounts for 75% of students. An analysis of this group indicates that the identified Q3 students have by a majority been enrolled in RRVCS for at least three consecutive years. In 2014, the state-determined target for Reading was 61.0% on the NMSBA. RRVCS Q3 students achieved 77.4%. The state target for Math was 55% on the NMSABA. RRVCS's Q3 students achieved 83.9%. In both Reading and Math, state expectations were significantly exceeded.

SITE VISIT SUMMARY-In general, RRVCS is surprised at the tenor and negativity of this report. On October 8, 2015, the CSD representatives, Mr. Woodd, Mr. Binkley, and Ms. Lucero visited our school. Their response was very positive and complementary. The CSD's comments are in italics, our responses are in regular font following the comment:

- *Teachers in the school range from master teachers displaying exemplary practice to beginning teacher struggling with classroom management.* This statement is inaccurate and appears to be information from another school. RRVCS has no classroom teachers with less than three years' experience. Moreover, our school has successfully implemented the Love & Logic classroom discipline approach.
- *There was no evidence of sheltered instruction for ELL students.* See statement below.
- *Governing Board members are equally passionate about the school, though at least one is not clear about the role of GB member regarding accountability, instead stating that his role includes empathizing with teacher and providing an ear.* This statement indicates a lack of understanding of charter schools and their role in small rural communities in New Mexico. Moreover, having empathy for teachers and listening to their concerns and interests in critical to ensure that the community created by the charter school is cohesive. This is consistent with the stated purpose of the Charter Schools Act.

MATERIAL TERMS- RRVCS denies that it committed a "material violation" as defined in the Renewal Application Kit and the Charter Schools Act. CSD casually uses this term, when the issues identified are merely technical issues, if even accurately reported at all. Moreover these "material term violations" were apparently selected from the 2014-15 Annual Site Visit Report, which was replete with errors. When RRVCS received its 2014-15 Annual Site Visit Report on September 15, 2015, we requested a timeline for a response to correct errors in the report. We were told by the CSD Director that we could

submit a response; however, we were also told by CSD that our responses to this inaccurate report would not be incorporated into the final Annual Site Visit Report. In addition, at the Renewal Site Visit, all documentation to correct erroneous items on the Annual Site Visit Report was presented to the CSD. No comments or statements have been included in this preliminary analysis which reflect these corrections.

In response to the few *valid* technical issues identified in the Preliminary Analysis (which were actually from the 2014-15 Annual Site Visit Report), RRVCS has taken the following corrective actions- and had done so ***before*** submitting the charter renewal application:

The CSD has indicated three items as Material Terms Violations. The items stated here actually fall under the category of "provisions of law" which are addressed as part of the Organizational Performance Section of the renewal application. Red River Valley Charter School did not violate any Material Terms of the Charter.

STARS Reporting- RRVCS acknowledges that the SPED service level was under reported for two students in the initial STARS reporting for the 2014-15 school year. These two errors were corrected in the End-of-Year STARS report. In June, 2015, the Special Education Bureau conducted an audit of the program and has verbally indicated that there *were no major findings*. RRVCS has requested a written copy of the report from both the CSD and the Special Education Bureau but to date, no written report has been provided to the school. It is unclear to RRVCS what issues, if any were included in this report and RRVCS cannot respond to an issue of which it has not been notified.

ELL Services-RRVCS acknowledges that responses from the Home Language Surveys were incorrectly interpreted and that some students had not been tested for possible ELL services. This issue was brought to our attention during the 2014-15 Stie Visit and we immediately took steps to correct the concerns. RRVCS is now in full compliance with the requirements. RRVCS is providing needed services for ELL students. The teaching staff has been trained in language acquisition and literacy instruction methods through the Guided Language Acquisition Design (Project GLAD). In addition, two TESOL-endorsed teachers are on staff. In response to the statement, in the Site Visit Summary section above, "There was no evidence of sheltered instruction for ELL students. This is a known weakness for the school", during the Renewal Visit Exit Interview on October 8, 2015, the CSD member who had observed classroom instruction verified that accommodations for ELL students were observed. This statement was made to the School Administrator and classroom teacher, Kimberly Ritterhouse and is in contradiction to the statement above.

Missing PDPs for teachers- In the CSD annual monitoring report for 2014-15, it was stated that no PDPs were submitted and available in the Teachscape Teacher Evaluation System. This is not and was not at the time accurate, however, CSD did not correct the Site Visit Report after being provided the accurate information. All teachers at the Red River Valley Charter School submitted PDPs for the 2014-15 school year in the Teachscape teacher evaluation system as required. There are NO missing PDPs and these documents can be found in the Teachscape system under the 2014-15 school year. During the renewal site visit, the CSD was presented with paper copies of the PDPs from the Teachscape system indicating the records were submitted during the 2014-15 school year. l

Academic Performance/Educational Plan

The Charter School Act provides as follows:
A charter may be suspended, revoked, or not renewed by the chartering authority if the chartering authority determines that the charter school… failed to meet or make substantial progress toward achievement of the department's minimum educational standards or student performance standards identified in the charter contract at Paragraph 2 of Subsection K of 22-8B-12 NMSA 1978.

CSD Analysis - School Grade Report over the Last 3 Years

Red River Valley Charter School was required to provide statements of progress for any specific area of the state report card that did not meet a C level for any of the past 3 years. The school provided statements of progress which are analyzed following the rubric provided to schools during the final renewal training given by CSD.

Red River Valley was required to provide statements of progress for Current Standing and Q1 growth.

1.) The school has not provided evidence of improvement in the areas of Current standing or Q1 performance on the state report card. The same is true for Current and Q1 performance.

2 a.) The school has indicated in the statements of progress the data the school collects and utilizes to understand student performance in the areas of Current standing and Q1 performance. This data includes:

- STAR Early Literacy
- STAR Reading
- DIBELS
- STAR Math

b.) The school has <u>not</u> provided evidence of how it systematically analyzes data to understand the root

causes of areas needing improvement in relation to student performance in Current standing and Q1 performance. It is unclear how this data is used to make decisions regarding curriculum or instruction. CSD confirmed during the site visit the use of the reading interventionist through observation of student pullouts and leveled grouping of students requiring similar interventions.

c). The school has not provided evidence of how it systematically acts in response to data. The school indicates in the application that:

- RTI strategies have been implemented
- Professional development has been adopted
- A Reads to Lead grant was won and,
- A reading interventionist was hired.

It is unclear if these interventions were directly linked to the increase in scores indicated in the statement of progress. The school indicates growth in math and CSD confirmed this data, however the reading scores have remained flat for the past two years.

CSD was unable to confirm the specific and systematic student-level actions the school takes in response to data during the site visit. Though a reading interventionist is working with students there does not appear to be a plan to target and measure specific skills for growth.

3.) The school has demonstrated improving performance in the areas of Current Standing and Q1 performance as demonstrated by internal school data in the most recent year.

CSD was able to confirm an increase in student math scores over the past three years based on internal short cycle assessment data. The school was unable to show the same increase in reading scores, despite the confirmed interventions related to the Reads to Lead Grant.

Due to three out of five areas of the analysis not meeting standards, the school received a “Does Not Meet” rating in this area of the application. In order for the school to obtain a “Meets” rating in this area the school must provide the following:

- Evidence the school uses data to understand the root causes of areas needing improvement.
- Systematic actions based on analysis of this data, and evidence of analysis of the outcomes of systematic actions taken.

School Response

1. Evidence of Improvement for Current Standing and Q1 Growth:

Evidence of improvement for Current Standing based on NMSBA data is provided on pages 21-22 of the charter renewal application. Math growth is presented in a chart and a written narrative explains that RRVCS demonstrated growth in proficiency with increases from 28% in 2012 to 42% in 2013 to 49% in 2014. An overall 21% increase in proficiency (improvement) in Math was achieved over the three year period.

Evidence of improvement for Current Standing based on NMSBA data is provided on pages 22-23 of the charter renewal application. Reading growth is presented in a chart and a written narrative explains that RRVCS demonstrated a 10% increase in proficiency from 45% in 2013 to 55% in 2014.

Overall, improvement for Q1 Growth for Reading and Math based on the NMSBA Scaled Score Points is not evident as a year to year upward trend in proficiency; however, Q1 students have consistently achieved more than one year's growth in 2012, 2013, and 2014.

This data was presented to the CSD during the renewal site visit on October 8, 2015.

Please note: The CSD statement 1 and Statement 3 are in conflict with each other. In statement 1, CSD indicates that the school has NOT provided evidence of improvement in the areas of Current Standing or Q1. In statement 3, CSD indicates that the school has demonstrated improving performance in the areas of Current Standing and Q1.

It should also be noted that the rubric used to rate the school's responses to three years of School Report Card data and four years of data provided for achievement of the charter goals was introduced for the first time at CSD's September 8, 2015 Renewal Workshop, 23 days prior to the submission deadline of October 1, 2015. The rubric imposes requirements for a specific data analysis process to have been used during the charter term on a retroactive basis. The rubric judges the data analysis process by the school's description of its systematic analysis of data and systematic actions in response to the data. This is not identified as a requirement in the application and the recently introduced rubric is not clear about the necessary components required to receive a "MEETS" rating, The data analysis process used by the school is not a specific requirement of the four areas specified under 22-8B-12(K) for possible denial of a charter renewal.

2. Data Analysis Process:

The data analysis process currently in place at RRVCS is conducted at scheduled monthly teacher-administrator supervisory meetings (pages 23-24 in the charter renewal application). During these meetings, both the classroom teacher and administrator review current data information on each student in the classroom. The data analysis review examines current performance and growth indicators. A variety of data sources are used in the data analysis, including quarterly and progress monitoring from STAR Reading and Math Assessments, (or STAR Early Literacy Assessment for Kindergarten students) along with classroom artifacts and observations of student performance. Since receiving the NM Reads To Lead grant, DIBELS scores for students in grades Kindergarten through 3rd grade are also included in the data review. During this monthly data analysis, identification of root causes for deficits are discussed. For purposes of the data analysis at RRVCS, the root cause is defined

as the most basic reason that the deficit is occurring. In the data analysis meetings, both the teacher and administrator utilize the data to inform instruction for every student and if needed, remediation of the possible root causes for students demonstrating deficit performance. At the monthly meetings, data is utilized to track the progress of students receiving intervention. If students are not demonstrating adequate progress, then further or different interventions are implemented, attempting to address the root causes for the deficit and provide more effective intervention.

It should be noted that both teachers and administrators may also meet more frequently than the monthly meeting to review recent data on individual students that indicates additional intervention is needed or which sheds further light on the root cause of a student's deficit performance. For instance, a teacher may notice that a student does not understand a particular math concept despite differentiation and Tier I interventions. The teacher and administrator may be able to identify that the root cause of the deficit is because the student has not had instruction on a sequential math skill that is needed to understand the concept. The teacher and administrator will then immediately develop a strategy to remediate the deficit. This may include additional instruction, tutoring from the Title I program assistant, and more individualized practice.

Based on the data analysis of student performance, students needing additional intervention are identified and intervention strategies are developed to address any noted deficient. All students, including Q1 students are reviewed monthly utilizing current data information. (Please note that analysis of enrollment and academic growth data indicates that students identified in the Q1 range were by a majority new to RRVCS, transitioning from the local school district.) Intervention strategies are targeted for students based on individual needs and progress monitoring. Intervention strategies may include referral to SAT, referral to the afterschool tutoring program, additional classroom Tier I interventions, referral to the reading intervention program, referral to the math intervention program (Title 1 program), and other Tier II interventions (See Appendix .

This school year (2015-16) the faculty of RRVCS is in the process of developing an additional school-wide data analysis review system. This system will utilize a school-wide tracking system of data and provide opportunity for all faculty to analyze school-wide data. Several faculty members have attended professional development training on creating such a system and are conducting additional research on various systems for school wide data analysis. The plan for 2015-16 is to develop and implement the system, with review at the end of the school year providing a comprehensive system ready for full implementation in SY 2016-17 that meets the needs of our school and instructional philosophy of addressing the learning needs of every student.

In response to the statement, "Though a reading interventionist is working with students there does not appear to be a plan to target and measure specific skills for growth", it should be explained that the reading interventionist does examine quarterly and progress monitoring of student performance on the STAR reading and DIBELS assessments in order to provide targeted intervention and track student progress. Once a student is receiving reading intervention, the reading interventionist provides targeted intervention based upon individual student deficits as evidenced from the STAR Reading, Early Literacy, and DIBELS assessments. The reading interventionist is trained in several research-based reading remedial programs that enable her to target a variety of reading deficits and address root causes.

Based upon monitoring of student performance, data analysis of students participating in the Reading Intervention program for 2014-15 school year had an average gain of 1.2 years. Additionally, math proficiency has continued to significantly increase each year, by 14% in 2013 and an additional 7% in

2014. Although reading proficiency dropped by 8% in 2013, it increased by 10% in 2014. On the 2014 School Report Card, student in both the highest 75% (Q3) and lowest 25% (Q1) categories gained more than 1 year's growth in reading and in math based on Scaled Score Points. The increase in performance is directly linked to the measures implemented to increase and sustain growth.

CSD Analysis - Previous Charter Goals

Statements of progress were required by CSD for any goal stated in the school's previous charter that was not met. Red River Valley Charter had 2 organizational and 5 student achievement goals as part of their previous charter. CSD confirmed evidence of the school meeting its two organizational goals. The school has indicated it has not met the five student achievement goals listed in the previous charter over the course the past three years. Red River Valley provided statements of progress and CSD evaluated those in accordance with the rubric provided to all renewing schools at the final training conducted by CSD. The following analysis will follow the format of the rubric.

Two of the goals could not be evaluated as written as they rely on NMSBA data rather than the PARCC scores the state now uses. As for the 3 remaining goals the school indicates three main data points were used to evaluate its achievement.

1. STAR reading
2. STAR Early Literacy
3. DIBELS reading

All data presented in the application indicated stagnant growth with the exception of STAR Early Literacy. CSD confirmed the data for STAR reading, STAR Early Literacy, and DIBLES reading.

The school has not indicated how it systematically analyzed data to arrive at the interventions indicated in this area of the application. CSD confirmed the following during the site visit as related to the statement of progress in the renewal application:

- What role the reading interventionist plays
- How RTI and SAT processes work
- How professional development was targeted to the issues in reading and math as identified

- How the addition of DIBELS reading assessment will increase proficiency or growth.

During the course of the site visit CSD was able to confirm the role of the reading interventionist. CSD observed pull-out intervention, utilizing word-level and phonemic awareness work with two students. It was not clear how this intervention was chosen. CSD was able to confirm the use of both the RTI and SAT processes. Documentation of the use of these two processes was provided to the site visit team.

There was little clarity around the tier II interventions in math. Reading interventions were confirmed as previously stated. CSD was unable to confirm the use of Professional Development targeted to areas of increasing student performance in math or reading.

The school has not indicated how it systematically analyzed data to arrive at the interventions indicated in this area of the application. CSD was unable to confirm the systematic analysis of data and the targeted interventions in math.

School Response

The CSD analysis states "The school has indicated it has not met the five student achievement goals listed in the previous charter over the course of the past three years." This is an inaccurate statement. The current charter has four academic achievement goals and it is over the course of four years of the charter term. The fifth student performance goal, identified on page 42 of the renewal application as "Other Student Performance Stand/Goal #1" is focused on curriculum-based service learning goal . This was MET in each of the previous four years of the charter term.

The CSD analysis states, "Two of the goals could not be evaluated as written as they rely on NMSBA data rather than the PARCC scores the state now uses." It is unclear why these goals are identified as "Not Met" if they are cannot be evaluated. The two goals referred to have been evaluated using NMSBA School Report Card data and statements of progress were provided in both the School Report Card section and in the specific charter goals section of the charter application.

The CSD analysis states, "As for the 3 remaining goals the school indicates three main data points were used to evaluate its achievement. 1) STAR reading; 2) STAR Early Literacy; and 3) DIBELS reading. " This statement is inaccurate. Two of the remaining goals used STAR Reading Assessment, STAR Early Literacy, and STAR Math Assessment as the main data points to evaluate achievement. DIBELS reading data was not used as an achievement indicator for any of the current charter goals,. However, DIBELS data will be used as achievement indicator going forward in the new proposed performance indicators

identified in Part C of the renewal application. The third goal was focused on student achievement in Service Learning and used service learning records and assessments as the data points to evaluate achievement. The third goal was MET.

The CSD analysis states, "All data presented in the application indicated stagnant growth with the exception of STAR Early Literacy. CSD confirmed the data for STAR reading, STAR Early Literacy Assessment, and DIBLES (sic.)" . This is an inaccurate statement. The CSD could not have confirmed DIBELS data; DIBELS data was not part of the goal statements and was therefore not provided to the CSD visiting team.

In response to the stated lack of clarity on how reading intervention is chosen, as stated in the renewal application (page 22) and explained in the response to the above section, CSD Analysis- School Grade Report over the Last 3 Years, targeted interventions are provided to students as informed by data analysis conducted on a monthly basis and within the SAT process. The reading interventionist targets phonemic and comprehension skills as informed by individual student performance deficits on the STAR Reading, STAR Early Literacy, and DIBELS assessments.

Although reading proficiency dropped by 8% in 2013, it increased by 10% in 2014. On the 2014 School Report Card, student in both the highest 75% (Q3) and lowest 25% (Q1) categories gained more than 1 year's growth in reading and in math based on Scaled Score Points. This would not be considered stagnate growth.

CSD Analysis - Proposed Charter Goals

Red River Valley Charter has included four mission specific/academic indicators in their renewal application. Each of the included goals are written in SMART format and include the appropriate metrics ranging from exceeds to falls far below. The school has included two more goals than required, these goals relate to social emotional well-being and physical fitness. CSD understands that these two areas are important aspects of the school's mission and would encourage the school to make a clear plan for tracking the information needed to determine whether or not they have met these two goals.

School Response

The tracking of the social emotional goal will be tracked through the use of the informal teacher survey administered at the beginning of the year and end of year by classroom teachers and will be analyzed as

a component of the school wide data analysis system. The information will inform school-wide and classroom character development programs and emphases. (See pages 75-76 in the charter renewal application).

The tracking of the physical goals will occur with the use of the grade appropriate Physical Education (PE) Skill Checklist for grades K-4 and the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP) FITNESSGRAM Assessment for grades 5-8. These assessments will be administered at the beginning of the year and end of year and utilized by the PE teacher . The data will be a component in the school-wide data analysis system (See pages 75-78 in the charter renewal application

CSD Analysis – Final Site Visit Report 2014/2015

Red River Valley Charter had 12 items rated "Does Not Meet" for the 2014/2015 SY PEC Authorized Charter School Annual Monitoring. Items of continued concern following the renewal site visit include:

- STARS Reporting, including IEP's and ancillary services.
- ELL Services
- Missing PDPs for teachers
- Missing policies which should be included in Employee's handbook *(see 2014/2015 site visit report for specific findings)*

School Response

It is clear from the CSD's statement above that CSD admits that of the "12 items rated "Does Not Meet" for 2014-2015", that all but eight have been resolved and were resolved promptly after the Annual Site Visit and before submission of the charter renewal application. Of the remaining four issues, the School offers the following rebuttal.

The Final Site Visit Report 2014-15 contained several inaccuracies that were not corrected by the CSD in spite of evidence submitted to the CSD Liaison. Four items are listed as items of continued concern following the renewal site visit.

STARS Reporting- RRVCS acknowledges that the SPED service level was under reported for two students in the initial STARS reporting for the 2014-15 school year. These two errors were corrected in the End-of-Year STARS report. In June, 2015, the Special Education Bureau conducted an audit of the program

and has verbally indicated that there were no major findings. RRVCS has requested a written copy of the report from both the CSD and the Special Education Bureau but to date, no written report has been provided to the school. It is unclear to RRVCS what issues, if any were included in this report.

ELL Services-RRVCS acknowledges that responses from the Home Language Surveys were incorrectly interpreted and that some students had not been tested for possible ELL services. This issue was immediately corrected and RRVCS is now in full compliance with the requirements. RRVCS is providing needed services for ELL students. The teaching staff has been trained in language acquisition and literacy instruction methods through the Guided Language Acquisition Design (Project GLAD). In addition, two TESOL-endorsed teachers are on staff. In response to the statement, in the Site Visit Summary section above "There was no evidence of sheltered instruction for ELL students. This is a known weakness for the school, during the Renewal Visit Exit Interview on October 8, 2015, the CSD member who had observed classroom instruction verified that accommodations for ELL students were observed. This statement was made to the School Administrator and classroom teacher, Kimberly Ritterhouse and is in contradiction to the statement above.

Missing PDPs for teachers- In the CSD annual monitoring report for 2014-15, it was stated that no PDPs were submitted and available in the Teachscape Teacher Evaluation System. This is not accurate. All teachers at the Red River Valley Charter School submitted PDPs for the 2014-15 school year in the Teachscape teacher evaluation system as required. There are NO missing PDPs and these documents can be found in the Teachscape system under the 2014-15 school year. During the renewal site visit, the CSD was presented with paper copies of the PDPs from the Teachscape system indicating the records were submitted during the 2014-15 school year. I

Missing policies which should be included in Employee's handbook- The two missing policies were 1) Promotion/Retention and 2) Employee Rights. The Promotion/Retention policy was approved by the Governance Council on June 15, 2015. Evidence presented to the CSD at the renewal site visit included the policy and minutes from the Governance Council meeting indicating approval of the policy by the Council on June 15, 2015. The school was in-compliance with this item at the time of the visit.

During the renewal site visit exit meeting, the Administrator and a teacher queried the CSD on the policy regarding citation of the School Personnel Act within the Employee Handbook, which was what was communicated by the CSD as a missing employee policy. No one on the CSD visiting team could give guidance on how this policy was to be written and included in the handbook. It is not possible to develop this policy due to lack of understanding and guidance on the implementation.