## School Performance Framework 2010

# School: CORWIN INTERNATIONAL MAGNET SCHOOL - 2096

Level: Elementary School

District: PUEBLO CITY 60 - 2690 (3 Year\*\*\*)

	Perf	ormance	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	Meets	75.0%	( 18.8 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Approaching	58.3%	( 29.2 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	52.1%	( 13 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		61.0%	( 61 out of 100 points )	
* Schools may not be eligible for all		ufficient numbers c	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved from both the points earned and

\*\* 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.



SCHOOLView.

#### 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 Indicato							Level: Ele	mentary Scho
School: CORWIN INTE	RNATIONAL N	AGNET SCHC	OCL - 2096	5				(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	288	82.6%	76	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	288	86.1%	87	
Writing	3	4		Meets	288	75.4%	88	
Science	3	4		Meets	140	50.7%	58	
Fotal	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	264	44	21	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	264	37	35	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	264	56	31	Yes
Total	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequat Growth?
Reading	7	16	43.8%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	151	41	23	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	144	35	23	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	25	40	29	Yes
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	32	34	48	No
Mathematics	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	151	38	37	Yes
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	144	34	37	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	25	41	42	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	31	57	63	No
Writing	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	151	52	32	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	144	52	31	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	25	44	40	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	73	52	57	No
Total	25	48	52.1%	Approaching				
Test Participation %	6 of Students Tester	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation	Rate Met	304	304	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation	Rate Met	304	304	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation		304	304	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation	Rate Met	147	147	

coring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary Schoo	
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Fran cator Scoring Guide	nework Report			Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin	
erjormance mail	The school's percentage of students scoring proficien	nt or advanced was:			Kuting	Foint Vulue		FIGHTEWORK FOR	
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.				Exceeds	4	16		
Academic		below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools.							
Achievement		below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.							
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools.</li> </ul>								
	If the school meets the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its medic	an student arowth percent	tile was:	Does Not Meet				
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4			
	• below 60 but at or above 45.								
	• below 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching	2	12	50	
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet	1	(4 for each		
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stu	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.								
	• below 55 but at or above 40.	Approaching	2	-					
	• below 40.	Does Not Meet	1						
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate	student growth percentile ar	nd its student growth perc	centile was:					
	• at or above 60.								
	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>								
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>				Approaching	2	60	1	
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet	1	(5 for each subgroup		
Growth Gaps	s If the student subgroup does not meet the median a	dequate student growth perc	entile and its student gro	wth 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	1			
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for plan	type assignment					
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on t	his Indicator.		Cut Point: The schoo	l earned of th	ne total Fram	nework 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	
Ī	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37%				ority Improvemer	
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround	
hool plan type a	assignments								
	Plan description								
erformance Plan		a Performance Plan.	A school may not implem	nent a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	Furnaround F	Plan for longer than a	combined total	
provement Pla			five consecutive years be				•		
iority Improven	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement	a Priority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years	commences on July	1 during the sur	nmer immed	liately following the i	all in which the	
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement	a Turnaround Plan.	school is notified that it i	s required to implem	ent a Priority In	provement	or Turnaround Plan.		

# **Comparison Data**

## Academic Achievement

# Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2010) Reading Math Writing Elem Middle High Hi

	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.

## School Performance Framework 2010

# School: CORWIN INTERNATIONAL MAGNET SCHOOL - 2096

Level: Middle School

District: PUEBLO CITY 60 - 2690 (3 Year\*\*\*)

Performance	P	lan
renormance		an

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	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Meets	75.0%	( 18.8 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Approaching	58.3%	( 29.2 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	48.3%	( 12.1 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		60.1%	( 60.1 out of 100 points )	
* Schools may not be eligible for all		ifficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved from both the points earned and

\*\* 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.



SCHOOLView.

#### 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	: Middle Scho
School: CORWIN INT		AGNET SCHC	OL - 2096	5				(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	637	81.8%	80	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	638	53.9%	54	
Writing	3	4		Meets	638	71.2%	79	
Science	3	4		Meets	147	55.1%	64	
Total	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	605	51	20	Yes
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	607	29	57	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	606	48	36	Yes
Fotal	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequat Growth?
Reading	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	342	45	26	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	322	50	23	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	25	36	43	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	54	45	39	Yes
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	134	53	56	No
Mathematics	5	20	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	349	27	64	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	323	27	60	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	26	20	95	No
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	54	35	72	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	206	38	86	No
Nriting	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	342	49	47	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	322	48	40	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	25	47	79	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	54	52	60	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	175	49	73	No
Fotal	29	60	48.3%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.8%			95% Participation	Rate Met	657	658	
Mathematics	99.8%			95% Participation		658	659	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation		658	658	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation		152	152	

coring Guide							Level	Middle Schoo			
coring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	ework Report									
erformance Indic	ator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points			
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	hool's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:									
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.				Exceeds	4	16				
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									
Achievement	<ul> <li>below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th</li> </ul>	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.     Approaching									
	<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										
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 60.									
	<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 growth	n 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	l its student growth perc	centile was:							
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 60. Exceeds									
	<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 gro	wth 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	1					
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for p	lan type assignment							
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	nis Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ol earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.			
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%	6			Performance			
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framewor	k • at or above 47%	% - below 59%	Improvement					
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37%	% - below 47%	•					
	• below 37.5%			Turnaround							
chool plan type a											
	Plan description										
erformance Plan		Performance Plan.	school may not implen	nent a Priority Improv	vement and/or	Furnaround F	Plan for longer than a	combined total of			
nprovement Plar		The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan. five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to r									
	ent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a				•						
urnaround Plan		The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan. school is notified that it is required to implement a Priorit									

# **Comparison Data**

## Academic Achievement

# Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2010) Reading Math Writing Elem Middle High Hi

	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.