## School Performance Framework 2010

# School: GREENWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 3647

Level: All Levels

District: DENVER COUNTY 1 - 0880 (1 Year\*\*\*)

# Improvement Plan (Revised)

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	Approaching	43.8%	( 11 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Approaching	54.2%	(27.1 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	59.4%	(14.9 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		53.0%	(53 out of 100 points)	
* Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	Ifficient numbers o	f 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 Indicat	ors						Level: Eler	mentary Schoo
School: GREENWOO	D ELEMENTARY	SCHOOL						(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	•
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	265	39.2%	7	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	264	41.7%	7	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	238	33.2%	16	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	82	13.4%	8	
Total	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	155	45	46	No
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	157	37	64	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	154	46	61	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	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	-	4		Approaching	135	45	49	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	147	46	46	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	120	48	49	No
Students needing to catch up	<b>2</b>	4		Approaching	92	49	59	No
Mathematics	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	137	38	66	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	149	37	63	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	-
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	122	38	65	No
Students needing to catch up	<b>2</b>	4		Approaching	84	43	76	No
Writing	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	-	4		Approaching	134	46	63	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	146	44	61	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	-
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	119	48	63	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	101	50	69	No
Total	22	48	45.8%	Approaching				••
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Part	icipation Rate Met		267	267	
Mathematics	99.6%			icipation Rate Met		266	267	
Writing	89.9%			t 95% Participation Ra	te	240	267	
Science	100.0%			icipation Rate Met		82	82	

Performance Indicat	ors						level	: Middle Schoo
School: GREENWOO		SCHOOL						(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	(
Reading	2	4		Approaching	153	62.8%	29	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	153	52.9%	50	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	153	45.8%	25	
Science	2	4		Approaching	49	30.6%	24	
Total	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	153	58	40	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	152	67	77	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	153	53	65	No
Total	8	12	66.7%	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	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4	, 3.070	Meets	144	56	41	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	152	59	40	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	100
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	124	59	41	Yes
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	72	61	62	No
Mathematics	13	16	81.3%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4	01.570	Meets	143	67	77	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	151	67	77	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	123	69	77	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Exceeds	75	76	91	No
Writing	10	16	62.5%	Meets	-			
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4		Meets	144	56	67	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	152	53	65	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	124	53	65	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	73	69	83	No
Total	35	48	72.9%	Meets	-			
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	d	F	Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			ipation Rate Met		153	153	
Mathematics	100.0%			ipation Rate Met		153	153	
Writing	100.0%		95% Partici	ipation Rate Met		153	153	
Science	100.0%			ipation Rate Met		49	49	

Scoring Guide							L	evel: All Levels			
Scoring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report									
Performance India	cator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points			
-	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	or advanced was:									
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.	16									
Academic	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50t	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.       Exceeds       4         • 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 15t</li> </ul>	h percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)				
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools.</li> </ul>				Does Not Meet	t 1					
	If the school meets the median adequate student grov	wth percentile and its median stu	udent growth percentil	e 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	t 1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	lent growth percentile and its me	edian student growth p	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>				Approaching	2					
	• below 40.				Does Not Meet	t 1					
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and its	s student growth perce	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	60				
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet	t 1	(5 for each subgroup				
Growth Gaps		equate student growth percentil	e and its student grow	th percentile was:			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	t 1					
Cut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for pla	an type assignment							
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	iis Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ool earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.			
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%	% - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen						
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround			
School plan type a	assignments										
	Plan description										
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan. A sc	chool may not impleme	ent a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	Furnaround P	lan for longer than a	combined total of			
Improvement Plai	n The school is required to adopt and implement ar		consecutive years bef								
	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a		•								
Furnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a		ool is notified that it is		•		, ,				

#### **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.