Level: Middle School

District: CHERRY CREEK 5 - 0130 (1 Year***)

School: HORIZON MIDDLE SCHOOL - 4100

Performance Plan		Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	:
This is the plan type the school is req and implement. Schools are assigned on their overall framework score	d a plan based e, which is a	Academic Achievement	Approaching	50.0%	(12.5 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 Crawth	Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Performance at	Points Earned t or above 59% % - below 59%	Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	55.0%	(13.8 out of 25 points)	
Priority Improvement at or above 37			95% Participation Rate Met			
Turnaround	below 37%					
Framework points are calculate percentage of points earned out of	J	TOTAL		55.5%	(55.5 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 the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

What do the performance indicators measure?

percentage of points earned out of points eligible. For schools with data on all indicators, the total

points possible are: 25 points for Academic

Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25 for

Academic Achievement

Academic Growth Gaps.

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 Achievement Indicator reflects how a school's students are doing at meeting the 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: Middle School (1 Year***) **Performance Indicators**

School:	HORIZON	MIDDLE	SCHOOL -	- 4100
---------	---------	--------	----------	--------

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	955	67.0%	38	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	955	48.4%	42	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	955	51.7%	35	
Science	2	4		Approaching	362	41.7%	37	
Total	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				

								Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	903	55	32	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	903	53	71	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	904	50	56	No
Total	7	12	58.3%	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	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	390	57	41	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	468	57	40	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4	'	Approaching	107	54	78	No
English Language Learners	2	4	'	Approaching	95	54	56	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	312	54	62	No
Mathematics	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	_	Approaching	390	53	80	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	468	54	80	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	109	43	99	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	95	63	89	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	434	55	94	No
Writing	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	390	47	67	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	467	49	65	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4	·	Does Not Meet	110	38	93	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	94	47	82	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	399	48	85	No
Total	33	60	55.0%	Approaching				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.2%	95% Participation Rate Met	988	996	
Mathematics	99.2%	95% Participation Rate Met	989	997	
Writing	99.2%	95% Participation Rate Met	988	996	
Science	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	376	376	

oring Guide							Level:	Middle Scho	
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report							
formance Indic	ator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin	
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	or advanced was:				1 .			
	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.				Exceeds	4	16		
Academic	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th				Meets	3	(4 for each	25	
Achievement		h percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)		
	below the 15th percentile of all schools.				Does Not Mee	t 1			
	If the school meets the median adequate student grow	vth percentile and its median st	tudent growth percentil	le was:		· ·			
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4		ĺ	
	below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3			
	below 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching	2	12		
Academic	• below 30.		Does Not Mee	t 1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	ent growth percentile and its m	nedian student growth រុ	percentile was:			content area)		
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4			
	• below 70 but at or above 55.	• below 70 but at or above 55.							
	• below 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching	2					
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1			
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and it	s student growth perce	ntile was:					
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4			
	below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3	60		
	below 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching	2			
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Mee	t 1	(5 for each subgroup		
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median ad	equate student growth percent	ile and its student grow	th 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 Mee	t 1			
-Points for each	performance indicator		Cut-Points for pla	n type assignment					
C	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	is Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ol earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.	
chievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		at or above 59%	6			Performance	
rowth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	at or above 47%	6 - below 59%			Improvement	
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	at or above 37%	6 - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvem	
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround	
ool plan type a	ssignments								
	Plan description								
formance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan. A s	chool may not impleme	ent a Priority Improv	ement and/or	Turnaround I	Plan for longer than a	combined total	
rovement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement as	Improvement Dlan five	consecutive years before	ora tha Dictrict or In	sctituto ic roqui	rad to ractru	stura or alosa tha sab	and The five	

Priority Improvement Plan 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

school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.

The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.

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)

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						<u> </u>					
	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.