# School Performance Framework 2010

# School: CENTENNIAL K-8 SCHOOL - 1400

Level: All Levels

District: DENVER COUNTY 1 - 0880 (1 Year\*\*

Priority	Improvement Plan	
----------	------------------	--

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement. Schools are assigned a plan 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 plan type.

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned				
Performance	at or above 59%				
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%				
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%				
Turnaround	below 37%				
Framework points are percentage of points e eligible. For schools with the total points possibl Academic Achievement Growth, and 25 for Acade	earned out of points data on all indicators, le are: 25 points for , 50 for Academic				

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	34.4%	( 8.6 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Approaching	50.0%	( 25 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	52.8%	( 13.2 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		46.8%	( 46.8 out of 100 points )	
the points eligible, so scores are no	t negatively impacted.		of students. In these cases, the points are re	

\*\* Schools do not receive points for test participation. However, schools that do not meet the 95% participation rate in two or more subject areas are assigned a plan type one category lower than their points indicate.

# What do the performance indicators measure?

#### Academic Achievement

The Achievement Indicator reflects how a school'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) normative growth: how the academic progress of the students in this school 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 school to reach an achievement level of proficient or advanced on the CSAP within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first.

#### COE Improving Academic Achievement

#### **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 normative 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.

Performance Indicat	ors						Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: CENTENNIAI	L K-8 SCHOOL							(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	•
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	184	44.6%	11	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	184	47.3%	13	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	184	32.6%	15	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	58	15.5%	11	
Total	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N		Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	114	39	44	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	114	41	59	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	114	42	60	No
Total	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	6	16	37.5%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	93	37	44	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	98	38	45	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	27	42	45	No
Students needing to catch up	<b>b</b> 2	4		Approaching	58	41	59	No
Mathematics	6	16	37.5%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	93	38	59	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	98	41	65	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	38	64	No
Students needing to catch up	<b>b</b> 2	4		Approaching	55	47	80	No
Writing	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	93	41	60	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	98	42	64	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	27	42	60	No
Students needing to catch up	<b>)</b> 2	4		Approaching	80	43	70	No
Total	20	48	41.7%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Parti	cipation Rate Met		188	188	
Mathematics	100.0%		95% Parti	cipation Rate Met		188	188	
Writing	100.0%		95% Parti	cipation Rate Met		188	188	
Science	100.0%		95% Parti	cipation Rate Met		58	58	

Performance Indicate	ors						Level	: Middle Schoo
School: CENTENNIAI	. K-8 SCHOOL							(1 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	148	50.7%	15	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	148	27.0%	11	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	148	33.1%	12	
Science	2	4		Approaching	41	36.6%	30	
Total	6	16	37.5%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	147	46	41	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	147	47	83	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	147	47	66	No
Total	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				
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	60.0%	Approaching				Growth.
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	00.070	Meets	116	47	45	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	110	47	47	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	29	46	88	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	28	58	42	Yes
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	71	50	72	No
Mathematics	14	20	70.0%	Meets	/1	50		
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	70.078	Meets	116	55	86	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	110	46	83	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	29	40	99	No
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	29	73	83	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	96	57	95	No
Writing	11	20	55.0%	Approaching	50	57	55	NO
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	55.0%	Approaching	116	46	68	Νο
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	116	40	67	NO
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	29	44 49	96	NO
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	29	55		NO
Students needing to catch up	-	4		Approaching	85	50	86	No
Total	37	60	61.7%	Approaching	85			NO
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	4		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.3%	4		cipation Rate Met	,	150	151	
Mathematics	99.3%			•		150	151	
	99.3%			cipation Rate Met		150	151	
Writing	100.0%		95% Partic	cipation Rate Met		42	42	

Scoring Guide							L	evel: All Levels
Scoring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report						
Performance India	cator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points
-	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	or advanced was:						
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.	16						
Academic	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50t	h percentile of all schools.			Meets	3	(4 for each	25
Achievement	<ul> <li>below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15t</li> </ul>	h percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)	
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools.</li> </ul>				Does Not Meet	t 1		
	If the school meets the median adequate student grov	wth percentile and its median stu	udent growth percentil	e was:				
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4		
	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>				Meets	3		
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>				Approaching	2	12	
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet	t 1	(4 for each	50
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	lent growth percentile and its me	edian student growth p	percentile was:			content area)	
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4		
	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>				Meets	3		
	<ul> <li>below 55 but at or above 40.</li> </ul>				Approaching	2		
	• below 40.				Does Not Meet	t 1		
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and its	s student growth perce	ntile was:	-	-		
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4		
	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>				Meets	3		
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>				Approaching	2	60	
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet	t 1	(5 for each subgroup	
Growth Gaps		equate student growth percentil	e and its student grow	th percentile was:			group in 3 content	25
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	areas)	
	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>				Meets	3		
	<ul> <li>below 55 but at or above 40.</li> </ul>				Approaching	2		
	• below 40.				Does Not Meet	t 1		
Cut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for pla	an type assignment				
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	iis Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ool earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%	%			Performance
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or above 47%	% - below 59%			Improvement
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%		Pr	iority Improvemen				
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround
School plan type a	assignments							
	Plan description							
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan. A sc	chool may not impleme	ent a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	Furnaround P	lan for longer than a	combined total of
Improvement Plai	n The school is required to adopt and implement ar		consecutive years bef					
	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a		•					
Furnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a		ool is notified that it is		•		, ,	

#### **Comparison Data**

#### Academic Achievement

# Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2010) Reading Math Writing Elem Middle High High 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	49.2	50.4	54.9	48.6	29.7	16.0	32.5	35.0	31.0	19.7	23.8	27.5
50th percentile	71.6	71.4	73.3	70.9	52.5	33.5	53.5	57.8	50.0	47.5	48.0	50.0
90th percentile	89.1	88.2	87.2	89.3	75.0	54.8	76.8	79.7	72.2	76.0	75.1	72.4

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

		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	50.0	50.6	53.3	48.7	29.7	13.5	32.6	36.8	30.0	20.5	25.0	27.9
50th percentile	72.0	71.4	72.2	70.1	51.6	30.5	54.8	58.3	49.6	45.4	48.7	50.0
90th percentile	88.2	87.4	86.2	87.5	74.4	52.2	76.5	79.2	71.0	72.6	71.3	71.5

### Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

Decision tree to determine which scoring guide to use for Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps



# Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

State Average (Mean) Dropout Rate

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

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

Science

# 1-year vs. 3-year report

Schools receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated School Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more schools to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small schools 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 plan type assignment for the school: the one under which the school 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. The years of data included in a report are indicated on page 1.