## ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK

The Academic Performance Framework answers the evaluative question: Is the academic program a success? The framework includes indicators and measures that allow the PEC to evaluate the school's academic performance and was developed pursuant to the New Mexico Charter Schools Act. This section includes indicators, measures and metrics for student academic performance; student academic growth; achievement gaps in both proficiency and growth between student subgroups; and graduation rate and post-secondary readiness measures for high schools. (Section 22-8B-9.1.A. (1-3, 6, 7) NMSA 1978).

The Academic Performance Framework includes three indicators, ten required measures, and allows for the inclusion of additional rigorous, valid and reliable indicators proposed by the school to augment external evaluations of school performance.

Description of Academic Framework Indicators and Measures

## Indicator 1: Components from NM A-F School Grading System

The PEC considers charter school performance on each of the components of the NM PED A-F grading system.

| The PEC considers charter school performance on each of the components of the NM PED A-F grading system. |  | Weight ${ }^{8}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measure | Description | Elem | High |
| 1.1 Current Standing | Current Standing is a two-part measure of the status of a school in the current year. The two parts are composed of: 1) the percentage of students who are proficient on state assessments in math and reading, and 2) a score based on a growth model that accounts for prior scores. The measure of student growth (Value-Added Modeling) looks at school size, student mobility, and prior student performance to predict expected performance based on actual peer performance in the current year. The growth is expressed as the variance from the expected performance. <br> For schools that qualify as SAM schools, an offset (based on the mean deviation of scaled scores for SAM schools) is applied during the calculation of the value added modeling portion of current standing. | 30\% | 25\% |
| 1.2 School Growth (Value-Added) | This value-added modeling measure reports overall school growth (overall weighted mean score variance from predicted overall weighted mean score) based on school size, and prior schoolwide mean performance. This measure is calculated in the same way as the growth measure in current standing, but it calculated at the school level instead of the student level. | 15\% | 5\% |
| 1.3 Growth of Higher-Performing Students (Q3) | These value added modeling measure are calculated in the same way as the growth measure in current standing, but are calculated separately for two student subgroups. The two student subgroups are the lowest-performing 25\% of students and the higher-performing students (top 75\%). | 5\% | 5\% |
| 1.4 Growth of Lowest-Performing Students (Q1) |  | 5\% | 5\% |
| 1.5 Graduation (4,5, | The graduation measure includes 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year | N/A | 10\% |

[^0]| and 6-year rates; value added) | cohort graduation rates and improvement in the 4-year graduation rate. <br> Graduation rates are one-year lagged. That is, the rates that are published in the school grade report are for the cohort that graduated by August 1 of the prior year. Students are expected to graduate in four years, however rates are calculated for 5and 6-year graduates. Calculation of 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year cohort graduation rates uses the Shared Accountability method, which gives each school in which the student was enrolled in high school proportional credit for their timely or lack of timely graduation. <br> Improvement in the 4-year graduation rate is based on the slope of the 4 -year graduation rates for the past three years. For schools that have a 4-year graduation rate that is over $90 \%$, all points are awarded for graduation growth. <br> For schools that qualify as SAM schools, an auxiliary graduation rate is computed using a senior completer method which includes only 12th grade students who are not members of the 4 -year cohort. The denominator is comprised of the count of 12th graders in the first enrollment snapshot (40D). The numerator is derived from the count of all non-cohort students who graduated by the end of the year (EOY snapshot).Using this method, schools receive feedback on their success in graduating returning dropouts and adults whose cohort has long since aged from the system. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.6 Career and College Readiness | College and Career Readiness (CCR) scores are determined by the percentage of the prior year 4-year graduation cohort members (this indicator is also are one-year lagged) who show evidence of participating in college or career preparation, along with the proportion of those students meeting a benchmark. This indicator is also calculated using the shared accountability model. <br> High school students are expected to participate in at least one college or career readiness program: 1) College entrance exams (Accuplacer,ACT, ACT Aspire, Compass, PLAN, PSAT, SAT, or SAT Subject Test) 2) Evidence that the student can pass a college-level course (Advanced Placement, Dual Credit, or IB) 3) Eligibility for an industry-recognized certification (Career Technical Education) Points are given separately for students' participation and for their success in achieving targets. <br> SAM schools are allowed use of additional indicators including ASVAB, WorkKeys, and TABE. | N/A | 10\% |
| 1.7 Opportunity to Learn (Attendance, Survey) | Opportunity to Learn (OTL) represents the learning environment schools provide. It is determined from student attendance and scores on a student or parent survey administered annually. <br> The expected attendance rate is $95 \%$. Schools that have higher | 5\% | 5\% |


|  | than a 95\% attendance rate can earn more than the total <br> number of points available. <br> The survey measures the extent to which classroom teachers <br> demonstrate instructional practices known to facilitate student <br> learning. Students answer survey questions on topics such as <br> classroom teaching and expectations of students. The survey <br> contains 10 questions with answers from 0 (Never) to 5 (Always) <br> for a maximum score of 50. For students in grades KN-2, a <br> parent or family member completes the survey. The expected <br> average score is 45 points, schools that earn more than 45 <br> points can earn more than the total number of available points. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Source: New Mexico PED A-F School Grading Technical Guide |  |  |

Indicator 2: Subgroup Performance
Subgroup measures are based on the school's relative performance (statewide percentile rank) compared to all NM public schools serving the same grades. Points assigned for each subgroup are averaged to calculate overall points for measures
2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

| Measure | Description | Elem | High |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 2.1 Subgroup <br> Growth of Higher- <br> Performing <br> Students (Q3) | Schools are compared to all schools statewide serving the <br> same grade levels, based on the A-F Student Growth <br> results calculated by NM PED for Q3 students. | $10 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| 2.2 Subgroup <br> Growth of Lowest- <br> Performing <br> Students (Q1) | Schools are compared to all schools statewide serving the <br> same grade levels, based on the A-F Student Growth <br> results calculated by NM PED for Q1 students. | $10 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| Schools are compared to all schools statewide serving the <br> same grade levels, based on subgroup proficiency rates for <br> all eligible subgroups. | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |

Indicator 3: School-Specific Goals
The performance framework allows for the inclusion of additional rigorous, valid and reliable indicators (as determined by the chartering authority) proposed by a charter school to augment external evaluations of its performance. (Section C of 22-8B-9.1(C) NMSA 1978)

| Measure | Description | Elem | High |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TBD $=$ School <br> identified | Charter schools may propose mission-specific goals that <br> are specific, measurable and rigorous, School-proposed <br> goals are subject to approval by the PEC and are <br> incorporated into charter contracts. | PEC guidance for setting school goals: <br> 1. Use a SMART goal format (specific, measureable, <br> attainable, rigorous, and time-bound) | $10 \%$ |$\quad 10 \%$

[^1]2. Include metrics and measures using the following criteria: "Exceeds standards," "Meets standards," "Does not meet standards," and "Falls far below standards."
3. Set goals that augment external evaluations of school performance and do not duplicate existing framework measures.
4. Goals must be able to be documented and supported using objective, verifiable evidence of results.
5. If using additional assessments:
a. Proficiency and growth targets may not be combined.
b. Only utilize assessments that have been evaluated for rigor and have a reporting format that can be verified for accuracy; the appropriate PED bureaus and divisions should be consulted for information on rigor and accuracy.
c. Additional assessments must be aligned to school mission.
d. Do not propose duplicative reading and math goals, which are already assessed using state assesssments and incorporated into Indicators 1 and 2.

## Additional Weight for Indicator 3: School-Specific Goals

If a school proposes to use an assessment or other measure that is an externally, national- or state-normed metric (e.g. ACT, SAT, ACCESS for ELLs, Spanish IPT), it shall be eligible to have 5 points of weight equally removed from all other indicators and applied to the school specific indicators.

If a school proposes ambitious but realistic targets that have been established using a valid benchmark (e.g. comparison to national/state average, improvement from school historic performance), it shall be eligible to have 5 points of weight equally removed from all other indicators and applied to the school specific indicators.
Summary of Indicator Rating System and Assigned Points
The average weighted points across the framework are used to

| Indicators | Description | Rating Scale | Assigned Points | Total Weight? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Elem | High |
| Indicator 1: Components from NM A-F School Grading System | The PEC considers charter school performance on each of the components of the NM PED A-F grading system | A - F grade for each component of the NM grading system | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}=100 \mathrm{pts} \\ & \mathrm{~B}=75 \mathrm{pts} \\ & \mathrm{C}=50 \mathrm{pts} \\ & \mathrm{D}=25 \mathrm{pts} \\ & \mathrm{~F}=0 \mathrm{pts} \end{aligned}$ | 60\% | 65\% |
| Indicator 2: <br> Subgroup Performance | Subgroup measures are based on the school's relative performance (statewide percentile rank) compared to all NM public schools serving the same grades. Points assigned for each subgroup are averaged to calculate overall points for measures 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 | State Percentile Rank (1-100\%) | Equal to State Percentile Rank (1-100 pts) | 30\% | 25\% |
| Indicator $3^{10}$ : School-Specific Goals | Charter schools may propose mission-specific goals and/or supplemental academic goals that are specific, measurable and rigorous. | Four rating categories: <br> 1) Exceeds standard <br> 2) Meets standard <br> 3) Does not meet standard <br> 4) Falls far below standard | Exceeds $=100$ pts Meets $=75$ pts Does not meet $=25$ pts Falls far below $=0$ pts <br> Or by alternative point assignment agreed to by charter school and PEC | 10\% | 10\% |

Schools receive up to 100 points for each academic measure.
assign the overall rating (tier).

## Indicators Description

PEC Academic Performance Framework, Approved 4.13.18

Based on performance across the academic indicators and measures, schools receive an overall academic tier rating that is used by the PEC in annual monitoring and renewal decisions.



[^0]:    ${ }^{8}$ For any school that is eligible to have additional weighting allocated to Indicator 3: School-Specific Goals, the weight of all other indicators will be decreased by an equal amount.

[^1]:    ${ }^{9}$ A school shall be eligible to have additional weighting allocated to Indicator 3: School-Specific Goals, if the proposed indicator is Reliable (additional 5 points of weight) and Rigorous (additional 5 points of weight).

