## School Performance Framework 2010

# School: LOUISVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 5302

Level: Elementary School

District: BOULDER VALLEY RE 2 - 0480 (3 Year\*\*\*)

#### **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.

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned
Performance	at or above 59%
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%
Turnaround	below 37%

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 Academic Growth Gaps.

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Exceeds	93.8%	(23.5 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	75.0%	( 37.5 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	45.8%	( 11.5 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		72.5%	( 72.5 out of 100 points )	
* Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	Ifficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved from both the points earned and

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**

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 Indicate	ors						Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: LOUISVILLE I		CHOOL - 5302						(3 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible		Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	643	89.4%	91	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	643	86.5%	87	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	643	76.7%	90	
Science	4	4		Exceeds	217	80.2%	96	
Total	15	16	93.8%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	402	49	17	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	402	48	31	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	402	51	26	Yes
Total	9	12	75.0%	Meets				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	47	25	31	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	50	49	25	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	46	40	40	Yes
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	38	45	54	No
Mathematics	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	47	32	53	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	50	39	43	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	46	36	50	No
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	45	53	70	No
Writing	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	47	36	48	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	50	54	32	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	46	40	53	No
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	102	53	52	Yes
Total	22	48	45.8%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation	Rate Met	657	657	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation		658	658	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation	Rate Met	659	659	
Science	99.6%			95% Participation		220	221	

Scoring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary Schoo			
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Fra	nework Report									
Performance Indi	cator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Point			
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficie	-									
		at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.									
Academic	<ul> <li>below the 90th percentile but at or above the 5</li> </ul>				Meets	3	(4 for each	25			
Achievement		5th percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)				
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools.</li> </ul>				Does Not Mee	1					
	If the school meets the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its media	in student growth percer	ntile 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 Mee	t 1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate st	udent growth percentile and i	ts median student growt	h percentile was:			content area)				
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4					
	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>				Meets	3					
	<ul> <li>below 55 but at or above 40.</li> </ul>	• below 55 but at or above 40.									
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1					
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate	e student growth percentile ar	nd its student growth per	centile was:							
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4					
	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>				Meets	3					
	• below 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching	2	60				
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Mee	t 1	(5 for each subgroup				
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median of	dequate student growth perc	entile 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.				Approaching	2					
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	1					
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for plar	type assignment		•		:			
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point: The schoo	l earned of tl	ne total Fram	ework points eligibl	e.			
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%				Performance			
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or above 47%	- below 59%			Improvement			
· · ·	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37%	- below 47%		Pri	ority Improvemer			
	• below 37.5%				Turnaround						
chool plan type a	issignments	Does Not Meet									
	Plan description										
erformance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement	a Performance Plan.	A school may not implen	nent a Priority Impro	vement and/or	Turnaround	Plan for longer than	a combined total			
mprovement Pla			five consecutive years be				•				
•	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement	· ·	•		•						
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement		school is notified that it 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.