# School Performance Framework 2010

# School: MRACHEK MIDDLE SCHOOL - 6160

Level: Middle School

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

#### **Improvement Plan**

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

	rned	oints Ea	ramework Po	F	Plan Assignment					
Aca	59%	r above	at o		Performance					
	59%	- below	r above 47%	at o	Improvement					
Tes	47%	- below	r above 37%	t at o	ovement	Priority Impr				
	37%	below				Turnaround				
то	the	using	calculated	are	points	Framework				

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 Growth Gaps.

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	37.5%	( 9.4 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Approaching	41.7%	( 20.9 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	40.0%	( 10 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		40.3%	( 40.3 out of 100 points )	
* Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	fficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved from both the points earned and

\* Sc 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?

#### **Academic Achievement**

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.

Performance Indicato	rs						Level	: Middle Schoo
School: MRACHEK M	IDDLE SCHOOL	- 6160						(3 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	2858	45.2%	11	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	2868	34.1%	18	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	2869	33.3%	12	
Science	2	4		Approaching	1000	29.0%	18	
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	1	4		Does Not Meet	2681	38	46	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	2700	45	80	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	2691	40	71	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	20	30.0%	Does Not Meet	1	<i>i creentile</i>	Growth refeetule	Growth
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	1545	39	55	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	1916	39	53	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	295	35	85	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	917	43	55	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	1349	39	70	No
Mathematics	9	20	45.0%	Approaching	1349	33	70	INU
		-	45.0%		4550	10	00	N -
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4 4		Approaching	1556 1936	46 45	86 83	No No
Minority Students Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Approaching	302	39	99	NO
	2	4		Does Not Meet	919	48		
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	1582	48 47	95	No No
Students needing to catch up	9		45.00/	Approaching	1582	47	95	INU
Writing	-	20	45.0%	Approaching	4552	40	70	Nia
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	1553 1927	40 42	78 75	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4 4		Approaching Does Not Meet	298	29	94	No No
English Language Learners	2	4 4			298 920	29	94 76	NO
	2	4 4		Approaching	920 1637	44 41	85	NO
Students needing to catch up Total	24	60	40.0%	Approaching Approaching	1021	41	C0	INU
	% of Students Tested			Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	98.8%			95% Participation F		3123	3160	
Mathematics	99.1%			95% Participation F		3130	3157	
Writing	99.2%			95% Participation F		3134	3160	
Science	98.7%			95% Participation F	Rate Met	1097	1111	

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	e school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:									
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.										
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	<ul> <li>below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th</li> </ul>	th percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)				
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools.</li> </ul>	below the 15th percentile of all schools.									
	If the school meets the median adequate student grow	wth percentile and its median	n student growth perce	entile 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	1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	lent growth percentile and its	s median student grow	th percentile was:			content area)				
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4					
	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>				Meets	3					
	below 55 but at or above 40.				Approaching	2					
	• below 40.										
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and	d its student growth pe	ercentile 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	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 g	rowth percentile was	s:		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	1					
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for	plan type assignme	nt						
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on the	nis Indicator.		Cut Point: The so	chool earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.			
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		<ul> <li>at or above 5</li> </ul>	59%			Performance			
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framew	ork • at or above 4	17% - below 59%			Improvement			
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%										
	• below 37.5%		Turnaround								
chool plan type a											
	Plan description										
erformance Plan		Performance Plan.	A school may not impl	ement a Priority Imp	rovement and/or	Furnaround F	Plan for longer than a	combined total of			
nprovement Plar			ive consecutive years	, ,			0				
•	ent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a										
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a		school is notified that i		, ,		, .				

## **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.