School Performance Framework 2010

School: CHAPPELOW K-8 MAGNET SCHOOL - 1500

Level: Elementary School

District: GREELEY 6 - 3120 (3 Year***)

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	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Meets	62.5%	(15.6 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	75.0%	(37.5 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	60.0%	(15 out of 25 points)	
fest Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		68.1%	(68.1 out of 100 points)	
Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	fficient numbers	of 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.

COE Improving Academic Achievement

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							Level: Ele	ementary Scho
School: CHAPPELOW								(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	661	79.0%	67	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	662	70.1%	49	
Writing	3	4		Meets	662	63.4%	66	
Science	2	4		Approaching	223	44.4%	47	
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	3	4		Meets	440	56	23	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	442	56	49	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	442	51	37	Yes
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 Adequat Growth?
Reading	14	20	70.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	156	54	40	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	150	57	37	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	50	49	68	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	71	53	40	Yes
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	101	56	65	No
Mathematics	10	20	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	157	53	63	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	150	53	62	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	50	51	80	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	71	53	64	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	127	53	77	No
Writing	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	157	48	50	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	150	50	47	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	50	50	75	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	71	50	56	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	170	58	63	No
Total	36	60	60.0%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.2%			95% Participation	n Rate Met	662	667	
Mathematics	99.4%			95% Participation		662	666	
Writing	99.4%			95% Participation		663	667	
Science	98.2%			95% Participation		223	227	

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 50	Oth percentile of all schools.			Meets	3	(4 for each	25	
Achievement		•			Approaching	2	content area)		
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 				Does Not Meet	1			
	If the school meets the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its medic	an student arowth percent	tile was:					
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4			
	• below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3			
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 45 but at or above 30.							
Academic	• below 30.			Does Not Meet	1	(4 for each	50		
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stu	Ident growth percentile and i	its median student growth	n 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	1			
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate	student growth percentile ar	nd its student growth perc	centile 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	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)		
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3			
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				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%	- below 47%		Pri	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 (Mea	n) Colorado ACT C	omposite 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: CHAPPELOW K-8 MAGNET SCHOOL - 1500

Level: Middle School

District: GREELEY 6 - 3120 (3 Year***)

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	Meets	62.5%	(15.6 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	66.7%	(33.4 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	66.7%	(16.7 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		65.7%	(65.7 out of 100 points)	
* Schools may not be eligible for al	possible points on an indicator due to insu	fficient numbers	of 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 Indicate							Level	: Middle Schoo
School: CHAPPELOW	K-8 MAGNET S	SCHOOL - 150)					(3 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	627	75.1%	60	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	623	48.0%	43	
Writing	3	4		Meets	627	65.9%	68	
Science	2	4		Approaching	183	48.6%	49	
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	3	4		Meets	611	59	23	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	608	51	69	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	611	56	44	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	16	20	80.0%	Meets				<u>crontin</u>
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	00.070	Meets	262	59	33	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	281	61	31	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	87	52	78	No
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	143	60	37	Yes
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	159	57	69	No
Mathematics		20	55.0%	Approaching	100			110
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	55.070	Approaching	259	51	74	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	280	53	75	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	84	47	97	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	141	51	79	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	278	55	90	No
Writing	13	20	65.0%	Meets	2.0			
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	00.070	Meets	261	54	53	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	282	54	52	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	85	38	88	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	143	56	62	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	203	56	80	No
Total	40	60	66.7%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.5%			95% Participation	Rate Met	627	630	
Mathematics	99.0%			95% Participation		623	629	
Writing	99.5%			95% Participation		627	630	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation		183	183	

coring Guide								Level:	Middle Schoo	
oring 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	t 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 	th percentile of all schools.				Meets	3	(4 for each	25	
Achievement	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15	th percentile of all schools.				Approaching	2	content area)		
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 					Does Not Meet	1			
	If the school meets the median adequate student gro	wth percentile and its median	n student growth per	rcentile	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	ching 2 12			
Academic	• below 30.					Does Not Meet	1	(4 for each	50	
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	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				
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	student growth percentile and	d its student growth	percer	ntile was:	-				
	• at or above 60.									
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 						3			
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 					Approaching	2	60		
Academic	• below 30.			Does N			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	growt	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	1			
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points fo	or plar	n type assignment					
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on tl	nis Indicator.		0	Cut Point: The scho	ol earned of	the total Fra	nework points eligit	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 Frame	work	• at or above 47%	6 - below 59%			Improvement	
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	-	• at or above 37%	6 - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen	
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		-	• below 37%				Turnaround	
hool plan type a	ssignments									
	Plan description									
erformance Plan	-	Performance Plan.	A school may not imi	pleme	nt a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	urnaround F	lan for longer than a	combined total of	
nprovement Plar			, ,		, ,			ture or close the sch		
•	ent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a									
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a					•		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.