Academic Growth Gaps.

Level: Elementary School

School: EXPLORE ELEMENTARY - 0506 District: MAPLETON 1 - 0010 (3 Year***)

Performance Plan	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.	Acadamia Craudh	Approaching	50.0%	(25 out of 50 points)	
Plan Assignment Framework Points Earned				(
Performance at or above 59%	Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	53.3%	(13.3 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.			44.6%	(44.6 out of 100 points)	

^{*} 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.

What do the performance indicators measure?

For schools with data on all indicators, the total

Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25 for

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.

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.





^{**} 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.

Level: Elementary School (3 Year***) **Performance Indicators**

School:	EXPLORE ELEMENTARY	- 0506
---------	--------------------	--------

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	511	47.0%	11	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	508	43.7%	9	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	509	30.3%	12	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	128	8.6%	3	
Total	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				

								Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	353	52	53	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	351	49	71	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	352	50	68	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	11	20	55.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	_	Approaching	212	51	56	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	186	52	57	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	36	43	82	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	79	55	58	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	214	53	69	No
Mathematics	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	_	Approaching	213	48	74	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	184	47	78	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	37	29	91	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	77	46	80	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	214	51	86	No
Writing	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	211	50	71	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	185	55	73	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	36	44	89	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	78	58	73	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	272	53	75	No
Total	32	60	53.3%	Approaching				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.6%	95% Participation Rate Met	545	547	
Mathematics	99.6%	95% Participation Rate Met	544	546	
Writing	99.6%	95% Participation Rate Met	545	547	
Science	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	138	138	

coring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
oring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Fra	mework Report						
erformance India	cator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Point
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficie	ent or advanced was:						
	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.				Exceeds	4	16	
Academic	 below the 90th percentile but at or above the 5 	50th percentile of all schools.			Meets	3	(4 for each	25
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 3 	15th percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)	
	below the 15th percentile of all schools.				Does Not Meet	t 1		
	If the school meets the median adequate student g	rowth percentile and its medic	an student growth percei	ntile 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 st	tudent growth percentile and i	its median student growt	th 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.				Approaching	2	1	
	• below 40.			[Does Not Meet	1		
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequat	e student growth percentile ai	nd its student growth per	rcentile was:		•		
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4	1	
	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	р
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median	adequate student growth perc	centile and its student gro	owth percentile was:		•	group in 3 content	i
·	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	areas)	
	below 70 but at or above 55.				Meets	3	1	
	below 55 but at or above 40.				Approaching	2		
	• below 40.				Does Not Meet	1		
t-Points for eac	th performance indicator		Cut-Points for plan	n type assignment				
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point: The school	earned of th	ne total Fran	nework points eligib	le.
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%			рошоство	Performance
rowth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework		below 59%			Improvement
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% -			Pr	iority Improvemen
	• helow 37 5%	Does Not Meet		• helow 37%				Turnaround

Cut-Points for ea	ch performance indicator				
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.			
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds			
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets			
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching			
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet			

Cut-Points for plan	Cut-Points for plan type assignment									
	Cut Point: The school earned of the total Framework points eli	gible.								
	• at or above 59%	Performance								
Total Framework	• at or above 47% - below 59%	Improvement								
Points	• at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement								
	• below 37%	Turnaround								

School plan type assignme	nts
	Plan description
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.

A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which 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			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	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

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.