## School Performance Framework 2010

## School: TELLURIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL - 8790

Level: Middle School

District: TELLURIDE R-1 - 2830 (3 Year\*\*\*)

#### **Performance Plan**

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement. Schools are assigned a plan based Ac 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%	Aca
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	Tes
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.

Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Exceeds	87.5%	(21.9 out of 25 points )	
Exceeds	91.7%	( 45.9 out of 50 points )	
Exceeds	89.6%	(22.4 out of 25 points)	
95% Participation Rate Met			
	90.2%	( 90.2 out of 100 points )	
	Exceeds Exceeds Exceeds	Exceeds87.5%Exceeds91.7%Exceeds89.6%95% Participation Rate Met	Exceeds87.5%( 21.9 out of 25 points )Exceeds91.7%( 45.9 out of 50 points )Exceeds89.6%( 22.4 out of 25 points )95% Participation Rate MetImage: Comparison of the second s

\* 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 Indicator							Level	: Middle Scho
School: TELLURIDE M	IDDLE SCHOOI	L - 8790						(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	305	87.5%	90	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	307	70.7%	85	
Writing	3	4		Meets	307	79.2%	89	
Science	4	4		Exceeds	146	87.7%	98	
Total	14	16	87.5%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	270	69	16	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	272	56	49	Yes
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	272	68	34	Yes
Total	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	16	16	100.0%	Exceeds		, ereentile		0.0000
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4	100.070	Exceeds	47	68	47	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	49	63	47	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	103
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	39	71	62	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	38	75	64	Yes
Mathematics	12	16	75.0%	Meets	30	,,,		105
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	75.070	Meets	47	63	85	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	50	61	89	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	110
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	40	63	94	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	58	65	94	No
Writing	15	16	93.8%	Exceeds	30			110
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	55.678	Meets	47	68	69	No
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	49	76	69	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	105
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	39	72	79	No
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	60	74	79	No
Total	43	48	89.6%	Exceeds		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		110
Test Participation %	of Students Tester	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.4%	-			pation Rate Met	312	314	
Mathematics	100.0%				pation Rate Met	314	314	
Writing	100.0%				pation Rate Met	314	314	
·······	100.070			5576 T ui titi	pation nate Mict	217	517	

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.									
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>				Does Not Meet	1					
	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.										
	• 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		• at or above 5	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%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 3	37% - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen			
	below 37.5%     Does Not Meet     below 37%							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.