District: MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 - 2000

/2 Voor***\

Accredited with Improvement Plan

This is the accreditation category for the district. Districts are designated an accreditation category based on their overall framework score, which is a percentage of the total points they earned out of the total points eligible in each performance indicator. The overall score is then matched to the scoring guide below to determine the accreditation category.

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned
Accredited with Distinction	at or above 80%
Accredited	at or above 64% - below 80%
Accredited with Improvement	at or above 52% - below 64%
Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	at or above 42% - below 52%
Accredited with Turnaround Plan	below 42%

Framework points are calculated using the percentage of points earned out of points eligible. For districts with data on all indicators, the total points possible are: 15 points for Academic Achievement, 35 for Academic Growth, 15 for Academic Growth Gaps, and 35 for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Meets	62.5%	(9.4 out of 15 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	69.4%	(24.3 out of 35 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	53.9%	(8.1 out of 15 points)	
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Approaching	58.3%	(20.4 out of 35 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		62.2%	(62.2 out of 100 points)	m both the points earned and the points eligible, so scores are not negatively

^{*} Districts may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient counts of students. In these cases, the points are removed from both the points earned and the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

^{**} Districts do not receive points for test participation. However, districts are assigned one accreditation category lower than their points indicate if they do not (1) meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one subject (reading, writing, math, science, and COACT), or (2) for districts serving multiple grade levels, meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one subject when individual subject rates are rolled up across grade levels AND the district makes AYP participation (in reading and math) for each grade level overall (not including disaggregated groups).

Finance	Meets requirements
Safety	Meets requirements
Districts do not rosoivo noi	into far figures and enfatures wanges. However, districts that do not make requirements in at least one area default to Assemble Drivetty Improvement Dian for remain Assembled with

Districts do not receive points for finance and safety assurances. However, districts that do not meet requirements in at least one area default to Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan (or remain Accredited with Turnaround Plan) until they meet requirements.

What do the performance indicators measure?

Academic Achievement

The Achievement Indicator reflects how a district's students are doing at meeting the state's proficiency goal: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This Indicator includes results from CSAP and CSAPA (Reading, Writing, Math and Science), and Lectura and Escritura.

Academic Growth

The Growth Indicator measures academic progress using the Colorado Growth Model. This Indicator reflects 1) median growth: how the academic progress of the students in this district compared to that of other students statewide with a similar CSAP score history in that subject area, and 2) adequate growth: whether this level of growth was sufficient for the typical (median) student in this district to reach an achievement level of proficient or advanced on the CSAP within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first.

Academic Growth Gaps

The Gaps Indicator measures the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student subgroups and students needing to catch up. It disaggregates the Growth Indicator into student subgroups, and reflects their median and adequate growth. The subgroups include students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities (IEP status), English Language Learners, and students needing to catch up.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator measures the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This Indicator reflects student graduation rates, dropout rates, and average Colorado ACT composite scores.





District: MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 - 2000

3 Year

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	14195	67.0%	31	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	14169	61.8%	25	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	14191	46.0%	25	
Science	2	4		Approaching	4700	41.7%	33	
Total	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	8753	49	34	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	8860	44	52	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	8782	47	44	Yes
Total	8	12	66.7%	Meets				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	12	20	60%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	4237	49	43	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	2173	49	45	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	1017	42	66	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	509	54	63	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2856	54	63	No
Mathematics	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	4324	44	60	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	2244	44	62	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	1027	38	74	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	581	49	72	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	3144	48	75	No
Writing	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	4255	44	54	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	2181	47	55	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	1023	37	75	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	514	50	70	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	5000	51	62	No
Total	30	60	50%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.7%			95% Participation Rat	te Met	14709	14755	
Mathematics	99.8%			95% Participation Rat	te Met	14724	14749	
Writing	99.8%			95% Participation Rat	te Met	14724	14753	
Science	99.8%			95% Participation Rat	te Met	4881	4892	

2

Level: Middle School

District: MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 - 2000

3 Year

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	15292	69.5%	51	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	15321	49.5%	51	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	15295	54.5%	41	
Science	3	4		Meets	4617	49.1%	57	
Total	11	16	68.8%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	14338	53	29	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	14374	55	70	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	14346	53	51	Yes
Total	9	12	75%	Meets				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	12	20	60%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	6077	50	41	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	3319	51	41	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	1482	45	73	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	832	53	63	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	4392	52	65	No
Mathematics	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	6103	53	79	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	3341	55	80	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	1482	47	97	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	843	56	91	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	6803	56	92	No
Writing	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	6082	51	67	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	3325	53	65	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	1483	40	89	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	835	54	80	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	6532	53	79	No
Total	35	60	58.3%	Approaching				
Test Participation %	6 of Students Tester	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.6%			95% Participation R	ate Met	15795	15861	
Mathematics	99.7%			95% Participation R	ate Met	15819	15862	
Writing	99.6%			95% Participation R	ate Met	15800	15868	
Science	99.5%			95% Participation R		4766	4788	

3

Level: High School

District: MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 - 2000

3 Year

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	7986	71.1%	49	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	8082	31.5%	53	
Writing	3	4		Meets	7981	50.8%	53	
Science	3	4		Meets	4664	54.9%	62	
Гotal	11	16	68.8%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	7375	53	15	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	7487	54	93	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	7379	52	50	Yes
Total Total	8	12	66.7%	Meets				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	12	20	60%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	2684	50	36	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	1691	52	35	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	676	41	91	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	471	54	75	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2106	51	79	No
Mathematics	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	2746	52	99	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	1718	51	99	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	691	48	99	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	479	51	99	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	4385	54	99	No
Vriting	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	2684	49	78	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	1692	50	74	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	677	42	99	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	471	49	93	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	3397	53	91	No
otal	32	60	53.3%	Approaching				
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Rate/Score	Minimum State Expectation	
Graduation Rate: 4yr/5yr/6yr/7yr	2	4		Approaching	6,975/ 5,258 / 3,508/1,742	71.0/ 72.9 /72.0/70.7%	80%	
Dropout Rate	3	4		Meets	33860	3.7%	At/below state average	
Colorado ACT Composite	2	4		Approaching	4324	19.3	Above state average	
[otal	7	12	58.3%	Approaching Approaching				
est Participation %	of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	97.6%			95% Participation R	ate Met	8255	8457	
Mathematics	98.7%			95% Participation R	ate Met	8351	8460	
Writing	97.5%			95% Participation R	ate Met	8249	8463	
Science	98.4%			95% Participation R	ate Met	4820	4899	
Colorado ACT	97.4%			95% Participation R	ato Mot	4324	4438	

Scoring Guide 2011 Level: All Levels coring Guide for Performance Indicators on the District Performance Framework Report Performance Indicator Scoring Guide Point Value Total Possible Rating Framework Points The district's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was: • at or above the 90th percentile of all districts using 2010 (1-year DPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF). Exceeds 4 16 Academic • below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all districts using 2010 (1-year DPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF) Meets 3 (4 for each 15 Achievement • below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all districts using 2010 (1-year DPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF). Approachin 2 content area) • below the 15th percentile of all districts using 2010 (1-year DPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF). Does Not Mee 1 If the districtmeets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was: • at or above 60. Exceeds 4 • below 60 but at or above 45. Meets 3 • below 45 but at or above 30. Approachin 2 12 Academic below 30. Does Not Mee 1 (4 for each 35 Growth lf the district does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was: content area) 4 • at or above 70. Exceeds below 70 but at or above 55. Meets 3 • below 55 but at or above 40. Approaching 2 • below 40. Does Not Mee 1 If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was: at or above 60. Exceeds 4 below 60 but at or above 45. Meets 3 2 below 45 but at or above 30. 60 Approaching Academic • below 30. Does Not Mee 1 (5 for each subgroup **Growth Gaps** If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was: group in 3 content 15 • at or above 70. **Exceeds** 4 areas) • below 70 but at or above 55. 3 Meets below 55 but at or above 40. 2 below 40. Does Not Mee 1 Graduation Rate: The district's graduation rate was: • at or above 90%. Exceeds 4 3 above 80% but below 90%. Meets at or above 65% but below 80%. Approaching 2 below 65%. Does Not Mee 1 Dropout Rate: The district's dropout rate was: • at or below 1%. 4 (4 for each sub-Postsecondary and Exceeds 35 Workforce Readiness at or below the state average but above 1% using 2009 (1-year DPF) or 2007-09 baseline (3-year DPF). Meets 3 indicator) 2 • at or below 10% but above the state average using 2009 (1-year DPF) or 2007-09 baseline (3-year DPF). **Approaching** • at or above 10%. Does Not Mee 1 Average Colorado ACT Composite: The district's average Colorado ACT composite score was: • at or above 22. **Exceeds** 4 • at or above the state average but below 22 using 2010 (1-year DPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF). 3 Meets • at or above 17 but below the state average using 2010 (1-year DPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF). Approaching 2 • at or below 17. Does Not Mee Cut-Points for each performance indicator: The district earned ... of the points eligible on this indicator. Cut-Points for accreditation category: The district earned ... of the total framework points eligible. • at or above 87.5% • at or above 80% Achievement; • at or above 62.5% - below 87.5% Meets Accredited Growth; Gaps; **Total Framework** • at or above 64% - below 80% Improvement **Postsecondary** at or above 37.5% - below 62.5% Approaching **Points** at or above 52% - below 64% • at or above 42% - below 52% • below 37.5% **Does Not Meet Priority Improvement** • below 42% District accreditation categories Accred. w/ Distinction The district is Accredited with Distinction. A district may not be accredited with a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer Accredited The district is Accredited. than a combined total of five consecutive years before the State Board of Education is required

5

The district is Accredited with an Improvement Plan.

The district is Accredited with a Turnaround Plan.

The district is Accredited with a Priority Improvement Plan.

Accred. w/ Impr. Plan

Accred. w/ Priority Impr. Plan

Accred. w/ Turnaround Plan

to restructure or close the district. The five consecutive years commence on July 1 during the

a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.

summer immediately following the fall in which the district is notified that it is Accredited with

Comparison Data

Academic Achievement

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 2010 baseline (1-year DPF)

		Reading		Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1008	479	327	1007	480	327	1007	480	327	912	407	286
15th percentile	59.3	58.9	57.1	58.0	34.5	18.3	38.5	42.4	32.9	29.5	28.6	30.3
50th percentile	71.5	70.5	71.5	70.5	50.0	32.2	54.7	56.4	48.6	48.0	45.6	48.9
90th percentile	84.4	83.6	84.8	84.6	68.8	52.1	69.7	72.3	67.6	69.7	69.1	70.4

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF)

		Reading		Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1032	507	362	1032	507	361	1032	507	362	972	469	347
15th percentile	60.4	56.6	57.6	56.8	36.4	17.8	41.4	41.8	33.8	32.9	30.0	31.4
50th percentile	72.2	69.2	71.3	70.4	49.1	30.5	55.8	56.8	49.7	47.5	46.8	49.2
90th percentile	85.2	81.5	83.8	83.4	65.3	48.0	71.0	70.9	67.7	66.5	65.9	67.3

All achievement data is compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released (2009-10 for 1-year reports and 2008-10 for 3-year reports).

Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps Did my school meet adequate growth? YES, met adequate growth NO, did not meet adequate growth Exceeds 60-99 Exceeds 70-99 Meets 45-59 Meets 55-69 Approaching 30-44 Approaching 40-54 Does not meet 1-29 Does not meet 1-39

For Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps, the median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth. Schools that met adequate growth use the rubric on the left; schools that did not meet adequate growth use the rubric on the right.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

This District's Graduation Rate (1-year DPF)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	2007	67.7	69.6	70.2	70.7
Anticipated Year	2008	70.6	73.2	73.9	
of Graduation	2009	71.8	75.8		
	2010	74.0			

This District's Graduation Rate (aggregated for 3-year DPF)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	2007	67.7	69.6	70.2	70.7
Anticipated	2008	70.6	73.2	73.9	
Year of	2009	71.8	75.8		
Graduation	2010	74.0			
	Aggregated	71.0	72.9	72.0	70.7

State Average Dropout Rate-2009 (1-year DPF) or 2007-09 baseline (3-year DPF)

	N of Students	Average Dropout Rate
1-year (2009)	416,953	3.6
3-year (2007-09)	1,238,096	3.9

State Average Colorado ACT Composite Score 2010 (1-year DPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year DPF)

	N of Students	Average Score
1-year (2010)	51,438	20.0
3-year (2008-10)	151,439	20.1

All averages are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released (2010 for 1-year reports and 2008-10 for 3-year reports).

Colorado calculates "on-time" graduation as the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. A student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade, and the graduating class is assigned by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. The formula anticipates, for example, that a student entering ninth grade in fall 2006 will graduate with the Class of 2010.

For the 1-year DPF, districts earn points based on the highest value among the following: 2010 4-year graduation rate, 2009 5-year rate, 2008 6-year rate, and 2007 7-year rate (the shaded cells in the first table above). For the 3-year DPF, districts earn points based on the highest value among the following: aggregated 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 4-year graduation rate, aggregated 2007, 2008 and 2009 5-year rate, aggregated 2007, 2008 and 2009 5-year rate, or 2007 7-year rate (the shaded cells in the second table above). For each of these rates, the aggregation is the result of adding the graduation totals for all available years and dividing by the sum of the graduation bases across all available years. For both 1-year and 3-year DPFs, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized on the Performance Indicators detail page.

1-year vs. 3-year report

Districts receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated District Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more districts to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small districts may not have public data on the basis of a single year because of small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count.

Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) is the one that will be the official accreditation category for the district: the one under which the district has ratings on a higher number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it received a higher total number of points. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available. This is indicated on page 1.

6

DPF 2011 2000 - 3 Year