

Turnaround 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	Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	37.5%	(18.8 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	42.7%	(10.7 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	Does Not Meet 95% Participation Rate			
TOTAL		35.8%	(35.8 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.

Performance Indicators

Level: Elementary School

School: CLAYTON PARTNERSHIP SCHOOL

(1 Year*)**

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	131	28.2%	1
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	125	36.0%	4
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	127	18.9%	2
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	43	4.6%	1
Total	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet			

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	73	46	59	No
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	73	39	73	No
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	72	32	72	No
Total	4	12	33.3%	Does Not Meet				

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	56	44	62	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	53	46	64	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	37	47	69	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	54	52	71	No
Mathematics	6	16	37.5%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	56	36	73	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	54	39	74	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	38	42	74	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	45	42	86	No
Writing	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	54	30	72	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	53	36	78	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	38	37	81	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	60	34	80	No
Total	18	48	37.5%	Approaching				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students
Reading	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	138	138
Mathematics	98.5%	95% Participation Rate Met	132	134
Writing	99.3%	95% Participation Rate Met	134	135
Science	92.0%	Does Not Meet 95% Participation Rate	46	50

Performance Indicators

Level: Middle School

School: CLAYTON PARTNERSHIP SCHOOL

(1 Year*)**

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	128	40.6%	6
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	126	16.7%	3
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	128	21.1%	3
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	18	16.7%	7
Total	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet			

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	119	49	54	No
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	117	39	93	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	119	44	80	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	81	49	57	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	77	53	55	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	38	49	56	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	74	52	69	No
Mathematics	7	16	43.8%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	79	47	95	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	75	47	95	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	37	42	93	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	97	39	95	No
Writing	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	81	42	81	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	77	44	85	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	38	49	83	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	91	41	87	No
Total	23	48	47.9%	Approaching				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students
Reading	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	131	131
Mathematics	98.5%	95% Participation Rate Met	129	131
Writing	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	131	131
Science	48.8%	Does Not Meet 95% Participation Rate	20	41

Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report

Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide	Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points
Academic Achievement	<i>The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:</i>			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		
Academic Growth	• below the 15th percentile of all schools.	Does Not Meet	1	12 (4 for each content area)	50
	<i>If the school meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</i>				
	• 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		
	<i>If the school does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</i>				
	• at or above 70.	Exceeds	4		
• below 70 but at or above 55.	Meets	3			
Academic Growth Gaps	• below 55 but at or above 40.	Approaching	2	60 (5 for each subgroup group in 3 content areas)	25
	• below 40.	Does Not Meet	1		
	<i>If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was:</i>				
	• 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		
	<i>If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was:</i>				
	• 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.	

Reference

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 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.