School Performance Framework 2010

School: NOEL MIDDLE SCHOOL - 6784

Level: Middle School

District: DENVER COUNTY 1 - 0880 (3 Year***)

Turnaround Plan (Revised)	Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*				
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	Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)				
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.	Acadomic Crowth	Approaching	50.0%	(25 out of 50 points)				
Plan Assignment Framework Points Earned								
Performance at or above 59%	Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	46.7%	(11.7 out of 25 points)				
Improvement at or above 47% - below 59%								
Priority Improvement at or above 37% - below 47%	Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met						
Turnaround below 37%								
Framework points are calculated using the percentage of points earned out of points eligible.			43.0%	(43 out of 100 points)				
For schools with data on all indicators, the total	* Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from both the points earned and							

points possible are: 25 points for Academic the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

** 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?

Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25 for

Academic Achievement

Academic Growth Gaps.

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.

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 Indicato	ors						Level:	Middle Schoo
School: NOEL MIDDL	E SCHOOL - 678	84						(3 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	1940	32.4%	3	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	1931	22.5%	7	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	1937	21.6%	4	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	700	9.9%	3	
Total	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
				a				Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N		Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	1809	47	60	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	1800	41	91	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1804	49	81	No
Total	6	12	50.0%	Approaching				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	1586	47	61	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	1762	47	61	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	222	38	90	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	1124	48	62	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	1228	48	72	No
Mathematics	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	1575	41	91	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	1753	41	91	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	224	38	99	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	1112	43	90	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	1273	41	97	No
Writing	10	20	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	1582	49	81	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	1758	49	81	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	223	45	96	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	1124	50	82	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	1351	51	87	No
Total	28	60	46.7%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.4%			95% Participation R	ate Met	2147	2161	
Mathematics	99.0%			95% Participation R		2140	2161	
Writing	99.2%			95% Participation R		2146	2164	
Science	99.1%			95% Participation R		764	771	

coring Guide							Level	Middle Schoo			
coring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	ework Report									
erformance India	ator Scoring Guide	Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points						
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	ne school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:									
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools. Exceeds 4									
Academic	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools. Meets 3									
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th 	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools. Approaching 2									
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 	below the 15th percentile of all schools. Does Not Meet 1									
	If the school meets the median adequate student grow	wth percentile and its median	student growth percen	tile was:							
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4					
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 				Meets	3					
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 				Approaching	2	12				
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet	1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	lent growth percentile and its	s median student growth	n percentile was:			content area)				
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4					
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3					
	below 55 but at or above 40.										
	• below 40.										
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and	l its student growth perc	centile was:							
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4					
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 				Meets	3					
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 				Approaching	2	60				
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet	1	(5 for each subgroup				
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median ad	equate student growth perce	ntile and its student gro	wth percentile was:			group in 3 content	25			
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	areas)				
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3					
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				Approaching	2					
	• below 40.				Does Not Meet	1					
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for p	lan type assignment							
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	nis Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ol earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.			
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%	6			Performance			
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framewor	k • at or above 47%	% - below 59%			Improvement			
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37%	% - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen			
	• below 37.5%		Turnaround								
chool plan type a											
	Plan description										
erformance Plan		Performance Plan.	school may not implen	nent a Priority Improv	vement and/or	Furnaround F	Plan for longer than a	combined total of			
nprovement Plar			ive consecutive years be	, ,			0				
					•						
urnaround Plan		an The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan. consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the The school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.									

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

	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.