School Performance Framework 2010

School: CARBONDALE MIDDLE SCHOOL - 1296

Level: All Levels

District: ROARING FORK RE-1 - 1180 (1 Year***)

Improvement 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.

What do the performance indicators measure?

Academic Achievement

The Achievement Indicator reflects how a school's students are doing at meeting the The Gaps Indicator measures the academic progress of historically disadvantaged 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

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	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	50.0%	(12.5 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		51.1%	(51.1 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.

** 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.

Academic Growth Gaps

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	ors						Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: CARBONDAL		DOL						(1 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	.
Reading	2	4		Approaching	154	53.2%	18	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	154	26.6%	0	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	154	32.5%	14	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	79	16.5%	12	
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	3	4		Meets	146	50	45	Yes
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	147	32	72	No
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	146	38	66	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	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	87	47	55	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	104	45	53	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	96	45	55	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	83	48	61	No
Mathematics	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	88	28	74	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	105	27	78	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	97	27	78	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	93	37	86	No
Writing	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	87	35	68	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	104	36	69	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	96	36	71	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Does Not Meet	104	37	77	No
Total	16	48	33.3%	Does Not Meet	-			-
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.4%		95% Part	icipation Rate Met		162	163	
Mathematics	98.8%			icipation Rate Met		161	163	
Writing	99.4%			icipation Rate Met		162	163	
Science	98.8%			icipation Rate Met		84	85	

Performance Indicate	ors						Level	: Middle Schoo
School: CARBONDAL	E MIDDLE SCH	DOL						(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	131	57.2%	21	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	129	27.9%	13	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	131	40.5%	18	
Science	2	4		Approaching	67	43.3%	40	
Total	7	16	43.8%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	127	64	49	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	126	47	88	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	127	62	78	No
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	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4		Meets	64	61	64	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	93	60	61	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	-
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	78	61	63	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	59	61	70	No
Mathematics	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4		Approaching	63	52	95	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	92	46	95	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	78	47	95	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	83	45	97	No
Writing	12	16	75.0%	Meets		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4		Meets	64	56	86	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	93	56	85	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	78	56	88	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	76	59	90	No
Total	32	48	66.7%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Partic	ipation Rate Met		140	140	
Mathematics	98.6%			ipation Rate Met		138	140	
Writing	100.0%			ipation Rate Met		140	140	
Science	100.0%			ipation Rate Met		69	69	

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	(4 for each	25								
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15t 	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools. Meets Meets Approaching 2									
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 				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					
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 				Meets	3					
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 				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					
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3					
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				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					
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 				Meets	3					
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 				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)				
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3					
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				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.