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	**Approaching**	59.4%	(14.9 out of 25 points)
Academic Growth	**Approaching**	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)
Academic Growth Gaps	**Approaching**	45.7%	(11.4 out of 25 points)
Test Participation**	**95% Participation Rate Met**		
TOTAL		**55.5%**	**(55.5 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.

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.

*** Data in this report is based on results from: 2009-10,2008-09,2007-08
Final plan type based on: 1 Year SPF report.

1

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile
Reading	2	4		Approaching	284	68.3%	39
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	283	56.5%	23
Writing	2	4		Approaching	283	49.1%	38
Science	3	4		Meets	90	52.2%	60
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	163	51	33	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	163	43	55	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	159	54	42	Yes
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	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	72	51	39	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	31	34	27	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	21	46	56	No
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	51	52	55	No
Mathematics	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	72	38	59	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	31	46	55	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	21	27	71	No
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	55	39	69	No
Writing	8	12	66.7%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	70	55	46	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	31	46	45	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	80	54	61	No
Total	**22**	**44**	**50.0%**	**Approaching**				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested		Rating	Students Tested	Total Students
Reading	99.6%		95% Participation Rate Met	286	287
Mathematics	100.0%		95% Participation Rate Met	285	285
Writing	99.6%		95% Participation Rate Met	285	286
Science	100.0%		95% Participation Rate Met	90	90

Counts are not reported when they do not meet minimum N requirements for a metric.

School: AKRON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL   **(3 Year***)**

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile
Reading	3	4		Meets	252	73.0%	53
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	252	52.8%	52
Writing	2	4		Approaching	252	56.4%	45
Science	2	4		Approaching	87	41.4%	35
Total	**10**	**16**	**62.5%**	**Meets**			

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	235	39	27	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	235	45	64	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	234	41	48	No
Total	**6**	**12**	**50.0%**	**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	7	16	43.8%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	84	32	35	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	41	40	30	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	24	51	66	No
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	59	44	54	No
Mathematics	6	16	37.5%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	84	37	71	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	41	50	72	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	25	22	86	No
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	86	46	86	No
Writing	7	16	43.8%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	83	41	53	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	41	45	52	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	24	32	82	No
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	92	45	70	No
Total	**20**	**48**	**41.7%**	**Approaching**				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students
Reading	99.2%	95% Participation Rate Met	253	255
Mathematics	99.2%	95% Participation Rate Met	253	255
Writing	99.2%	95% Participation Rate Met	253	255
Science	98.9%	95% Participation Rate Met	88	89

Counts are not reported when they do not meet minimum N requirements for a metric.

Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report

Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide	Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points
Academic Achievement	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:			16 (4 for each content area)	25
	• 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		
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.	Approaching	2		
	• below the 15th percentile of all schools.	Does Not Meet	1		
Academic Growth	If the school meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:			12 (4 for each content area)	50
	• at or above 60.	Exceeds	4		
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	Meets	3		
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	Approaching	2		
	• below 30.	Does Not Meet	1		
	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.	Meets	3		
	• below 55 but at or above 40.	Approaching	2		
	• below 40.	Does Not Meet	1		
Academic Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was:			60 (5 for each subgroup group in 3 content areas)	25
	• at or above 60.	Exceeds	4		
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	Meets	3		
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	Approaching	2		
	• below 30.	Does Not Meet	1		
	If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was:				
	• 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	1		

Cut-Points for each performance indicator

	Cut Point: The school earned … of the points eligible on this Indicator.	
Achievement; Growth; Gaps	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds
	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet

Cut-Points for plan type assignment

	Cut Point: The school earned … of the total Framework points eligible.	
Total Framework Points	• at or above 59%	Performance
	• at or above 47% - below 59%	Improvement
	• at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement
	• below 37%	Turnaround

School plan type assignments

	Plan description	
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.	A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.	
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.	
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.	

Comparison Data

Academic Achievement

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2010)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	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

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 consideredwithin 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.