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## DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

The following graphs depict basic demographic information based upon sex, race and ethnicity for the 2018-19 school year.


## PERCENT OF STUDENT POPULATION BY RACE

```
HISPANIC CAUCASIAN
    ASIAN NATIVE AMERICAN
    * NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER TWO OR MORE RACES
```



## PERFORMANCE REPORTING

## Proficiency Performance Reported on Nevada Report Card from 2009-2015

| Mathematics Proficiency of $11^{\text {th }}$ Grade Students |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Percentage Proficient | Over the past five years, there <br> has been some progress in <br> mathematics by the $11^{\text {th }}$ grade |
| $2009-$ | $40 \%$ | cadre. The school is still <br> performing below the state and <br> district levels. |
| 2010 |  |  |
| $2010-$ | $44.4 \%$ |  |
| 2011 |  |  |
| $2011-$ | $45.5 \%$ |  |
| 2012 |  |  |
| $2012-$ $45.9 \%$  <br> 2013   <br> $2013-$ $46 \%$  <br> 2014   <br> $2014-$ $44 \%$  <br> 2015   |  |  |


| Reading Proficiency of 11 th Grade Students |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Percentage Proficient | Over the past five years, there <br> has been some progress in <br> reading by the $11^{\text {th }}$ grade cadre. <br> The school is performing <br> slightly better than the state as <br> reflected in the NSPF report. <br> There was a very high |
| $2009-$ | $91.9 \%$ | proficiency in 2009, leading to <br> the largest graduation class in |
| 2010 |  | 2011. |
| 2011 | $80.6 \%$ | $69.7 \%$ |
| $2011-$ |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |
| $2012-$ | $59.5 \%$ |  |
| 2013 |  |  |
| $2013-$ | $74.4 \%$ |  |
| 2014 |  |  |


| Writing Proficiency of 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Grade Students |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Percentage Proficient | Over the past five years, there |
| has been some progress in |  |  |
| writing by the 11th grade cadre. |  |  |
| $2009-$ | $78.4 \%$ | The school has implemented a <br> 2010 |
| $2010-$ | $61.1 \%$ | more rigorous intervention |
| 2011 |  | program with common rubrics <br> for the writing with the goal |
| $2011-$ | $71 \%$ | that common writing <br> 2012 |
| $2012-$ | $63 \%$ |  |
| 2013 |  |  |


| $2013-$ <br> 2014 | $67 \%$ | improve the program. There <br> was a very high proficiency in |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2014-$ | $67.6 \%$ | 2009, leading to the largest <br> graduation class in 2011. |


| Science Proficiency of $11^{\text {th }}$ Grade Students |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Percentage Proficient | Over the past five years, there has been some progress in science by the $11^{\text {th }}$ grade cadre. After the lowest point in 201011, there has been steady growth upward. |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2009- \\ 2010 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 75\% |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2010- \\ & 2011 \end{aligned}$ | 48\% |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2011- \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | 60.6\% |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2012- \\ & 2013 \end{aligned}$ | 50\% |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2013- \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | 61\% |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2014- \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | 61\% |  |

Proficiency Performance Reported on Nevada Report Card: End of Course Exam

| End of Course (EOC): Reading |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Percentage <br> Proficient | The EOC has changed throughout the past three years, <br> from a high stakes assessment that was just being normed <br> to a component of a student's final grade. As such, it has <br> been difficult to use the measure as tool to describe the <br> school's teaching. |
| $2017-$ | $33.3 \%$ | ( |


| End of Course (EOC): Writing |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Percentage <br> Proficient | The EOC has changed throughout the past three years, <br> from a high stakes assessment that was just being normed |
| $2017-$ | $41.1 \%$ | to a component of a student's final grade. As such, it has <br> been difficult to use the measure as tool to describe the <br> school's teaching. |
| 18 |  |  |


| End of Course (EOC): Algebra |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Percentage <br> Proficient | The EOC has changed throughout the past three years, <br> from a high stakes assessment that was just being normed <br> to a component of a student's final grade. As such, it has <br> been difficult to use the measure as tool to describe the <br> school's teaching. |
| $2017-$ | $63.8 \%$ | (18) |


| Year | Percentage <br> Proficient | The EOC has changed throughout the past three years, from <br> a high stakes assessment that was just being normed to a <br> component of a student's final grade. As such, it has been <br> difficult to use the measure as tool to describe the school's |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2017-$ | $12.5 \%$ | teaching. It has been of particular note that students are <br> tending do do better in Algebra as opposed to Geometry, <br> and this has become a cross-curricular focus. |

Cohort 2018-19 End of Course Exam Performance

|  | ELA 1: Reading | ELA 2: Writing | Algebra | Geometry |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Level 1 | $77 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| Level 2 | $15 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Level 3 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Level 4 | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Cohort 2017-18 End of Course Exam Performance

|  | ELA 1: Reading | ELA 2: Writing | Algebra | Geometry |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Level 1 | $61 \%$ | $39 \%$ | No Data | $95 \%$ |
| Level 2 | $26 \%$ | $39 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |
|  | Level 3 | $9 \%$ | $22 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  | $5 \%$ |  |
| Level 4 | $4 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |


| Average End of Course Exam Scores by Sub Populations |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | EOC Reading | EOC Writing | EOC Algebra | EOC Geometry |
| Overall <br> Population | 385.7272727 | 353.3529412 | 410.2978723 | 311.5 |
| ELL | 362.2857143 | 345.5714286 | 391.4 | 351.8 |
| Hispanic | 396.8333333 | 370.36 | 400.8695652 | 311.4736842 |
| SPED | 375.3333333 | 274 | 414.5384615 | 229 |
| FRL | 375.3333333 | 395.5238095 | 406.8965517 | 308 |
| NO AT RISK | NO DATA | NO DATA | 423.1666667 | NO DATA |

Based upon the EOC performance of enCompass students, it is clear that many struggle with assessment and basic skills. Students struggled most with geometry over all other EOC exams. This performance highlights a cross-curricular issue,
whereby many students struggle to read and answer questions about graphics including diagrams, graphs, or charts. This difficulty was highlighted in the ACT performance, and preliminary performance on the Science EOC. enCompass has developed an advisory system whereby students who require additional support with mathematics or reading will get the support in those classes. Additionally, through the most recent assessment scores for the EOC, it was noted that the special education (SPED) population had significantly lower scores for both writing and geometry. The school has put more emphasis on supporting the students with IEPs by providing more time for the special education case manager to provide support in mathematics classes, in support classes, and in core classes. A new schedule has been implemented for the 2018-19 school year to free the educator up to support more students.

Proficiency Performance Reported on Nevada Report Card: ACT

| ACT Performance |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Average Score | Total <br> Participants | Score Range |  |
| $2015-16$ | 14.6 | 34 | $9-25$ |  |
| $2016-17$ | 13.2 | 28 | $8-22$ |  |
| $2017-18$ | 13.9 | 32 | $11-25$ |  |



The performance on the ACT exam is a major focus for the enCompass school performance plan (SPP) as it pertains to our ultimate goal to improve life outcomes of the students we serve. The scores above reflect the 2017-18 school year performance. Data was pulled and evaluated on $5 / 1 / 18$. Our goals seek to reduce
the gap in performance between sub-populations and the students with no risk factors, and to improve the overall average score and the percentage of collegeready students. The school has adopted curricular measures to support this including: 1) quarterly ACT practice testing of all students in the ACT test format style, 2) embedded ACT question samples and question stems in all core classes, and 3) ACT test support outside the school day for students who require additional support. In addition, all faculty members have taken the assessment in their core subject area. Training occurs regularly for faculty to incorporate ACT structures in the core classes.

It has been noted that across the board, enCompass students are not college-ready. All scores are significantly lower than college readiness scores. The school will incorporate school performance and accreditation goals around improving ACT performance. The following graphs illustrate all current (from 2018-19 as they were enrolled on $2 / 1 / 19$ ) students who have completed the ACT assessment.


The female average on the ACT is slightly higher across all categories, with the male sub population scoring an average of 2 points less than female sub population overall. The greatest gap for male vs. female is in the ACT writing assessment, where the males scored over 2 points less than females on average. The school has had both ACT preparation courses as well as a female and male class, and the team is considering looking at doing ACT prep separated by sex to provide more targeted support without distraction.




The ACT scores by race indicate that the Caucasian sub population has scored higher in the composite, English, math, and reading. In the science assessment, across the overall, Hispanic, and Caucasian sub populations, all students performed similarly. The two or more races performed better on the writing assessment than other sub populations.



Students who qualify for FRL have performed slightly below the overall average in all sub categories. This is a slight difference from the May of 2018 data pull in that the FRL sub population performed slightly above the overall population for the ACT composite, and was slightly above in there performance in math and science.



Students who have been designated as ELL have made gains specifically in mathematics and writing, but are still performing below the overall average in the composite, English, math, and reading. In science, the ELL sub population performed better than the overall average.



Students who have qualified for special education services have done better than the overall student population in the ACT composite, math, and science. This is different from the data pulled in May of 2018, as the current cohort of students receiving services are doing better on ACT assessments. In addition, the group that was pulled in May of 2018 included a senior class cohort with lower scores.



Students who have been designated as CIT have performed slightly above or below the overall average in the sub tests. Based upon the current data, the CIT sub population has done better on math and science, and is slightly behind the overall average for enCompass students in language arts (English, reading, and writing). Data was not evaluated in May of 2018 to compare, however the CIT population has significantly grown in the 2018-19 school year.

Based upon student performance on the ACT, goals have been developed in accordance with grant funding to support growth in the ACT.

| Student Subgroup | School Long-term Goals |
| :---: | :---: |
| ELA Economically Disadvantaged Students | 1. Improve overall average ACT rate by 2 points (from 13.8 to 15.8 ). <br> 2. Improve writing ACT score by 1 point (from an average of 4.48 to 5.48). <br> 3. Improve reading ACT score by 2 points (from an average of 13.9 to 15.9). <br> 4. Improve English ACT score by 2 points (from an average of 11.7 to 13.7). |
| ELA EL Students | 1. Improve average ACT rate by 2 points (from 12.8 to 14.8). <br> 2. Improve writing ACT score by 1 point (from an average of 3 to 4 ). <br> 3. Improve reading ACT score by 2 points (from an average of 11 to 13 ). <br> 4. Improve English ACT score by 2 points (from an average of 9.4 to 11.4). |
| Math Economically Disadvantaged Students | 1. Improve overall average ACT rate by 2 points (from an average of 13.9 to 15.9$)$. <br> 2. Improve math ACT score by 2 points (from an average of 15.48 to 17.48) |
| Math EL Students | 1. Improve average ACT rate by 2 points (from an average of 12.8 to 14.8). <br> 2. Improve math ACT score by 2 points (from an average of 13.85 to 15.85). |

Students at enCompass have been participating in the ACT formally for the past three years. This participation has led to an awareness of the students' lack of understanding to answer the questions posed on the assessment, and to have the stamina to complete the assessment.

The math and science subtests have demonstrated the difficulty of students to answer questions that are not strictly computational. Specifically, students are not able to evaluate graphs and answer pointed questions. Students also struggle with problems that include more than one step, and have a difficult time determining the appropriate equation to use for the assessment question. Fluency of form, and ability to problem solve and reason independently, has led to low math scores.

Students participating in the English and reading subtests demonstrate difficulty with basic vocabulary and fluency. This is reflected in Accuccess scores as well. Comprehension is impacted by this lack, as is the stamina to read the passages.

Students writing assessments demonstrate a struggle to write a formal expository essay that uses organization to persuade. In looking at the writing prompt for the
assessment, the form of the question has not been embedded in the curriculum of the school. Students have difficulty knowing what to write about, as there are often three different points of view and students are expected to take on the point of view and elaborate. Much of the writing students do for expository essays in their classes is in the form of claim, evidence, reasoning, however they are not translating this form to the ACT form. It is a structure they are comfortable with, however they are not fluid or fluent in the form.

While there is a lot of data looking at different sub populations, the overall size of the school and the number of at-risk students means that we develop school-wide initiatives.

The school has targeted several levers to help improve ACT performance:

1. Embed ACT questioning strategies into class content: warm-ups, assessments, classwork.
2. Ensure that all instructors complete the ACT in their content area, and evaluate their own performance.
3. Break down the types of questions prevalent in the ACT, and determine how this impacts instructional focus (i.e. percentage of algebraic questions versus geometric questions).
4. Provide four practice ACT test sessions in the style of the official ACT test to help build stamina for students, and help them to be comfortable with the assessment.
5. Score those assessments, and provide students with updated information on their performance. Show students how to analyze their performance, and what they could do to improve their scores. Incentivize the participation.
6. Instruct students as to the components of the ACT, what scores mean, and how they can impact future opportunity at colleges and universities.

The ACT is a gatekeeper to future opportunities. As such, we wish to support students to improve so they have the most options upon graduation.

| Average Accuccess Benchmark Scores by Year |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Mathematics | Reading |
| $2015-16$ | 555 | 652 |
| $2016-17$ | 574 | 761 |
| $2017-18$ | 585 | 749 |
| $2018-19$ | 555 | 802 |

Students often enroll at enCompass skill or credit deficient, or both. The school has seen a steady improvement in basic skills over the past three years, however the school is still below grade level on average. The skill deficits impact the average ACT and EOC average scores, and necessitate a plan for interventions to be provided to students. Reading skills have been steadily improving, but math performance has been stagnant. The school provides two highly qualified math instructors, as well as math intervention twice per week. In addition, the school has implemented an honors Calculus class for students to work toward.



Overall, the female sub population has done better than male sub population across all categories with the exception of the math assessment from August of 2018. It is important to note the dip in performance that occurs in the Winter benchmark. This has been typical over the years. While assessment scores are used in conjunction with other factors to determine placements for interventions, many returning students do not take the winter assessment as seriously as they do the fall assessment.



The average performance score of the Hispanic sub population was less than the overall and Caucasian sub populations for both reading and mathematics in August, however the group saw improvement in mathematics, and less of a dip in reading as compared to the Caucasian sub population.



The overall average of performance mirrors the performance of the students qualifying for FRL. enCompass has had the highest average of FRL students (64\% as of the data pull in October of 2018), so this makes sense.



The average performance score of the ELL sub population was less than the overall and overall performance for mathematics in August, however it mirrored the overall population for reading. The group saw improvement in mathematics between the two assessment deliveries, and less of a dip in reading as compared to the overall population.



The average performance score of the students who qualify for special education services sub population was less than the overall average performance for each delivery of the assessment. This is makes sense, as the majority of students who qualify for services do so as a result of reading or mathematics at enCompass.



The average performance score of the CIT sub population was less than the overall average for both reading and mathematics for every assessment, however the group saw a decrease in the gap of performance between the overall average and CIT average for reading in the January assessment.

## Achievement Gap and Special Population Performance

The term "achievement gap" is often defined as the difference between the test scores of minority and/or low income students and the test scores of their Caucasian peers. Data was evaluated for this portion using this model. It is noted that at various educational phases, achievement gaps may occur between other groups as well. Differences between scores of students with different backgrounds (ethnic, racial, gender, disability, and income) will be evaluated with specific attention paid to students at-risk as compared to students who are on track.

The overall population of enCompass is $97 \%$ at-risk. Comparing the performance of enCompass students to the performance of the Washoe County School District and the State of Nevada as a whole will provide greater insight into the challenge of supporting enCompass students, while reducing achievement gaps. On average, students start at enCompass with an overall average for reading and mathematics that is several grade levels behind for mathematics, and one or more behind for reading. These skill deficits impact performance on the EOC and ACT assessments, and also impact the students sense of themselves as students.

The composite ACT score that reflects college and career readiness is 22. enCompass is well below that average, with a current average of 15.9. It is noted, however, that enCompass saw the greatest improvement on average as compared to both Washoe County School District and the state of Nevada as demonstrated below.


## At- Risk Population

## PERCENTAGE OF AT-RISK STUDENTS




The at-risk indicators in this report take into account the following: race/ethnicity, credit attainment, attendance, FRL, ELL, SPED, and CIT. Other factors that have been assessed include retention, transiency, and suspensions. In addition to these factors, a student's performance on assessment is also taken into account. Under this system, a total of $97 \%$ of students would be considered at-risk.

## Average Daily Attendance

Attendance has been an ongoing concern. Several attendance incentives have been implemented, and there has been improvement in the school culture because of it. The impact of students traveling from all over the school district has an impact on attendance, the impact of relying on individuals to find transportation impacts attendance, and the individual behaviors of students impact attendance. The academy does not have access to truancy officers or programs, and works to develop its own in house. In the past year, the Washoe County School District has supported the school with a Family Advocate. Attendance is screened daily, and phone calls are sent home on a daily basis. Students meet with the Dean if they have an unverified absence on a daily basis. These practices have helped more students focus and attend, but there students who miss on a habitual basis. enCompass Academy will work to improve this attendance pattern by freeing up time for administrative staff and teachers to reach out to families on a more regular basis through phone calls, meetings, and home visits. The academy is also setting up individual learning plans, with parents, to address specific concerns.

| Year | Rainshadow ADA | WCSD | State |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2003-04$ | $88.8 \%$ | $95.3 \%$ | $94.1 \%$ |
| $2004-05$ | $92.1 \%$ | $95.3 \%$ | $94.5 \%$ |
| $2005-06$ | $90.6 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ | $93.7 \%$ |
| $2006-07$ | $84.6 \%$ | $94.8 \%$ | $93.9 \%$ |
| $2007-08$ | $78.6 \%$ | $94.8 \%$ | $94.3 \%$ |
| $2008-09$ | $76.4 \%$ | $95.1 \%$ | $94.7 \%$ |
| $2009-10$ | $87.3 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ | $94.6 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ | $78.4 \%$ | $94.7 \%$ | $94.6 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ | $77.3 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | $81.5 \%$ | $94.5 \%$ | $94.4 \%$ |
| $2013-14$ | $78.2 \%$ | $94.8 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ | $78.9 \%$ | $94.5 \%$ | $94.6 \%$ |
| $2015-16$ | $78.1 \%$ | $94.5 \%$ | $95 \%$ |


| Year | enCompass ADA | WCSD | State |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2016-17$ | $76.1 \%$ | $94.2 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| $2017-18$ | $83.9 \%$ | $94.5 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ |
| $2018-19$ | $94 \%$ through December 20, <br> 2018. |  |  |

*Data gathered from the Nevada Report Card website.
The academy has had an ADA that is less than both the WCSD and the state of Nevada throughout its existence. Annual SPP goals are established to aid in improving attendance, and goals are also present in the accreditation report. (See Appendix K for ADA data from Infinite Campus, and Appendix G).

Of additional concern is the chronic absenteeism rate for the school, which was evaluated in the 2017-18 school year, and was 67\%. Chronic absenteeism rates reflect the percentage of students whose average daily attendance is below $90 \%$. With the implementation of the new attendance policies, and the ability of students to make up assignments, in combination with a stabilization of the student population, enCompass has reduced its chronic absenteeism rate from $67 \%$ to $17 \%$ in the first semester of the 2018-19 school year.

Graduation Rate

| Year | Cohort Graduation Rate |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2013-2014$ | $27 \%$ |
| $2014-2015$ | $33.33 \%$ |
| $2015-2016$ | $28 \%$ |
| $2016-2017$ | $28 \%$ |
| $2017-2018$ | $42 \%$ |

enCompass has a goal in the School Performance Plan to specifically address the graduation rate issue. The objective is to improve the graduation rate by at least $3 \%$, and will continue to focus on a growth of at least $3-5 \%$ in each subsequent school year. The graduation rate for SY 17-18 was $42 \%$. It is predicted that the graduation rate for SY 18-19 will be $43 \%$. This is the last group of students prior to the change to enCompass Academy. Of this group, 16 students are currently on track for graduation. There are seven students who are still off track for graduation at this time. Several of these students will return for a fifth school year. In the "vanished student" report, there are 14 students listed from the current cohort. Of that group, two students attended Rise, and two attended the Northern Nevada Center for Literacy to receive a HiSet.

Seven current seniors are not on track to graduate this school year. Of that group, all started at the school two semesters or more behind in credits. 16 seniors are currently on track credit-wise to graduate.

The 16 that are on track are the only students who count positively to the graduation rate. The others will not count, including those who are fifth year seniors who will graduate. There are currently three fifth-year seniors on track, and there are two juniors on track to graduate early. The total graduates will be 21 for SY 18-19. If only the sixteen that are on track complete the required obligations, in combination with the vanished student report and the fifth year seniors, the school's graduation rate for the 2018-19 school year will be 43\%. This is not where the school wishes to be, but it is a reality of the population that the school currently serves, in combination with the enrollment practices outlined in NRS 386.580. To address the concerns, the school has begun implementing additional credit recovery programming as well as intervention programming. This would allow the school to stay true to its School Performance Plan goal to increase by 3-5\% each school year.

Of active students, defined as current students who have been with the school for more than a year, the goal is to reach a 48\% graduation rate. For the 2019-20 school year, the projected graduation rate is $61 \%$, with five fifth-year seniors, and the potential for additional graduates who are currently off track provided they complete extended day programming. The school has seen a steady increase in credit attainment rate, which was $78 \%$ in SY 17-18 and $88 \%$ in the first semester of SY 18-19. enCompass Academy will continue to focus on graduation rate with a more balanced approach to monitoring of student progress, as outlined in both the Personal Pathways description on page 64 and the Social/Emotional description on page 78 of this document.

Goals for graduation rate are outlined below:

| School Year and Goal | Interim Measurable Objective |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2018-19 Graduation Rate Goal: | 1. Increase graduation rate by 4\% or better for <br> SY 2018-19. |
| 2. Increase average daily attendance rate by 5\%, |  |
| working toward an ADA of 90\% or better. |  |$|$| 1. Increase graduation rate by 4\% or better for |
| :--- |
| SY 2019-20. |
| 2. Increase average daily attendance rate by 5\%, |
| working toward an ADA of 90\% or better. |

## Credit Attainment

Approximately $75 \%$ of students enter the school credit deficiency in their 10-12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ grade school year. The school has been working to improve credit attainment for all students. This deficiency negatively impacts the overall graduation rate for the school. Central to the issue are two things: attendance and starting at the school after not having had success.
enCompass saw an increase in credit attainment rates to $88 \%$ for the first semester of the 2018-19 school year. This is an increase from the overall attainment rate improvement of 78\% for the 2017-18 school year. Improvements to these rates have occurred due to the stabilization of the school population, the ability for students to complete assignments after an absence to change attendance to a temporary education placement, which does not count against average daily attendance or chronic absenteeism, and the credit earning of some students who attend extended day classes. With a program that has high attendance concerns, and low parent involvement, the ability of some students to make up assignments
effectively excusing their absences with school work has supported the population of enCompass. The school has been monitoring credit attainment heavily since 2015, and has seen steady progress.

It has been difficult to evaluate credit attainment of students prior to attending the school without looking at each individual student. Administration is creating a data template to evaluate all students moving forward.


The current system for tracking credit attainment has been developed by evaluating credits based upon a tiered system. Overall attainment data was pulled at the start of the second semester of the 2018-19 school year. As such, credit attainment is determined as a students overall attainment, including attainment at other schools. It is more of a depiction of at-risk indicators, especially as the credit attainment rate for enCompass has been steadily improving.

|  | START OF YEAR |  |  |  | START OF TERM 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRADE | $\text { TIER } 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIER } 2 \\ & \text { YELLOW } \end{aligned}$ | TIER 3 ORANGE | TIER 4 RED | GRADE | $\begin{gathered} \text { TIER } 1 \\ \text { ON-TRACK } \end{gathered}$ | TIER 2 YELLOW | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIER } 3 \\ & \text { ORANGE } \end{aligned}$ | TIER 4 <br> RED |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | 9.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 2 | <2 |
| 10 | 6+ | 5 | 4 | <4 | 10.5 | 9.5 | 7.5 | 6 | <6 |
| 11 | 12+ | 10 | 8 | <8 | 11.5 | 15.5 | 12.5 | 10 | $<10$ |
| 12 | 18+ | 16 | 14 | $<14$ | 12.5 | 21.5 | 18.5 | 16 | $<16$ |
| 13 | Pending enCompa ability to meet you | cademy's demic needs. | Students beginnin with $<13$ credits return for a $5^{\text {th }}$ ye plan to apply to b | senior year expect to dents should year student. | 13.5 | Pending enCompas ability to meet your | Academy's cademic needs. | Students midway year of high scho 18 credits will be for academic plac | $h$ their fifth do not have under review alternatives. |



## 12TH GRADE CREDIT ATTAINMENT



ON-TRACK TIER 2 TIER 3 - TIER 4

12TH GRADE CREDIT ATTAINMENT


The school counselor has been meeting with all students regarding their credits, and the administration has been having meetings with parents regarding attendance. In most cases, attendance is the single-most issue to credit retrieval. It also negatively impacts the school culture. This is an area that the school has worked on since its inception.

Current credit attainment goals:
\(\left.\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \text { School Year and Goal } & \text { Interim Measurable Objective } \\
\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { 2018-19 Credit } \\
\text { Attainment Rate Goal: }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { 1. Improve overall credit attainment for all students } \\
\text { by 3\% (from 74\% to 77\%) }\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}\text { 2. Improve credit attainment rate for first period by } \\
3 \% \text { from 73\% to 76\%) }\end{array} \\
\text { 3. Increase credit attainment options for students by } \\
\text { incorporating an extended day program for any } \\
\text { students who are deficient; provide two additional } \\
\text { hours of programming on ground per day in addition } \\
\text { to online credit recovery options. }\end{array}
$$\right\} \begin{array}{l}4. Increase credit attainment during the extended day <br>

program by 5\%.\end{array}\right\}\)| 1. Improve overall credit attainment for all students |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| by 3\%. |  |
| Attainment Rate Goal: | 2. Improve credit attainment rate for first period by |


|  | $3 \%$ (from 76\% to 79\%) <br> 3. Increase credit attainment options for students by <br> incorporating an extended day program for any <br> students who are deficient; provide two additional <br> hours of programming on ground per day in addition <br> to online credit recovery options. <br> 4. Increase credit attainment during the extended day <br> program by 5\%. |
| :--- | :--- |

## Reenrollment Data

| Rainshadow Reenrollment Data |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Years | Total Remaining | Total Re-enrolled | Percentage |
| $2011-12$ <br> to <br> $2012-13$ | 78 | 57 | $73 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ <br> to <br> $2014-15$ | 80 | 62 | $77.5 \%$ |
| $2013-14$ <br> to <br> $2014-15$ | 97 | 72 | $74 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ <br> to <br> $2015-16$ | 76 | 67 | $88 \%$ |


| enCompass Reenrollment Data |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Years | Total Remaining | Total Returning | Percentage |
| $2015-16$ <br> to | 69 | 45 | $65 \%$ |
| $2016-17$ |  |  |  |
| $2016-17$ <br> to <br> $2017-18$ | 65 | 44 | $68 \%$ |
| $2017-18$ <br> to | 77 | 58 | $75 \%$ |
| $2018-19$ |  |  |  |

The past three years have been transitional, especially the 2015-16 school year to the relocation in the Boys and Girls Club facility in 2016-17. The school has steadily
been increasing its re-enrollment, and the consistency of students from year to year has improved with much fewer "vanished" students.

