Level: Elementary School

District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J - 0180 (3 Year***)

School: CLYDE MILLER K-8 - 1720

Performance 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.

Priority Improvement at or above 37% - below 47%

Framework points are calculated using the 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

Framework Points Earned

at or above 47% - below 59%

at or above 59%

below 37%

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	75.0%	(37.5 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	63.3%	(15.8 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		59.6%	(59.6 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 the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

What do the performance indicators measure?

Academic Achievement

Academic Growth Gaps.

Plan Assignment

Performance

Improvement

Turnaround

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: CLYDE MILLER K-8 - 1720

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	675	43.6%	9	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	674	46.9%	12	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	674	32.3%	14	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	212	19.3%	13	
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	3	4		Meets	425	51	50	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	427	65	68	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	427	55	65	No
Total	9	12	75.0%	Meets				

					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	10	20	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	326	51	53	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	287	52	54	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	51	42	81	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	202	53	62	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	251	51	71	No
Mathematics	14	20	70.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	327	66	70	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	289	67	72	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	51	51	90	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	203	66	72	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	249	67	83	No
Writing	14	20	70.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	327	56	68	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	289	56	69	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	51	43	87	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	203	58	73	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	322	55	74	No
Total	38	60	63.3%	Meets				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.9%	95% Participation Rate Met	733	734	
Mathematics	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	733	733	
Writing	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	733	733	
Science	99.6%	95% Participation Rate Met	231	232	

coring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary Schoo			
coring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Fra	mework Report									
erformance Indi	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	25			
Academic	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 5	50th percentile of all schools.			Meets	3	(4 for each				
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 3 	15th percentile of all schools.		Ар	oproaching	2	content area)				
	below the 15th percentile of all schools.			Doe	es Not Meet	1					
	If the school meets the median adequate student g	rowth percentile and its medic	an student growth percer	ntile was:							
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4					
	• below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3					
	• below 45 but at or above 30.		Ар	oproaching	2	12	50				
Academic	• below 30.		Doe	es Not Meet	1	(4 for each					
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate st	If the school does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:									
	• at or above 70.		Exceeds	4							
	below 70 but at or above 55.				Meets	3]				
	below 55 but at or above 40.			Ap	oproaching	2					
	• below 40.			Doe	es Not Meet	1					
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequat	e student growth percentile a	nd its student growth per	rcentile was:		•					
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4					
	• below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3					
	below 45 but at or above 30.			Ар	oproaching	2	60				
Academic	• below 30.			Doe	es Not Meet	1	(5 for each subgrou	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	25			
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	areas)				
	below 70 but at or above 55.				Meets	3					
	below 55 but at or above 40.			Ар	oproaching	2					
	• below 40.			Doe	es 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 ear	rned of th	ne total Fran	nework points eligib	le.			
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%				Performance			
rowth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or above 47% - bel	low 59%			Improvement			
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% - bel	low 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen			
	• helow 37 5%	Does Not Meet		• helow 37%				Turnaround			

Cut-Points for ea	Cut-Points for each 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		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.