School Performance Framework 2010

School: MESA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 5834

Turnaround Plan

Level: Elementary School

District: WESTMINSTER 50 - 0070 (1 Year***)

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%	Ac					
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%						
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	Те					
Turnaround	below 37%						
		τo					

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* Performance Indicators (7.8 out of 25 points) Academic Achievement **Does Not Meet** 31.3% **Academic Growth Does Not Meet** 25.0% (12.5 out of 50 points) 27.1% (6.8 out of 25 points) cademic Growth Gaps **Does Not Meet** est Participation** 95% Participation Rate Met TOTAL 27.1% (27.1 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 The Gaps Indicator measures the academic progress of historically disadvantaged 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

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	ors						Level: Fle	mentary Schoo
School: MESA ELEME		1 - 5834						(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	(1) Cui
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	193	34.2%	4	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	193	35.8%	4	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	192	24.0%	7	
Science	2	4		Approaching	61	19.7%	15	
Total	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	123	29	49	No
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	127	35	64	No
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	123	32	65	No
Total	3	12	25.0%	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	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	99	29	52	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	82	29	56	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	37	39	60	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	65	28	67	No
Mathematics	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	103	31	65	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	86	31	67	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	41	37	69	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	77	35	82	No
Writing	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet			·	
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	99	30	65	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	82	33	69	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	37	51	68	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	91	32	75	No
Total	13	48	27.1%	Does Not Meet				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	215	215	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation R	ate Met	215	215	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	214	214	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation R	ate Met	70	70	

Scoring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary Schoo			
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Fra	nework Report									
Performance Indi	cator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Point			
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficie	nt or advanced was:			-						
		at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.									
Academic	 below the 90th percentile but at or above the 5 				Meets	3	(4 for each	25			
Achievement		5th percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)				
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 				Does Not Mee	t 1					
	If the school meets the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its media	in student growth percer	ntile 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	12				
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Mee	t 1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate st	udent growth percentile and i	ts median student growt	h 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. 	• below 55 but at or above 40.									
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1					
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate	e student growth percentile ar	nd its student growth per	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 Mee	t 1	(5 for each subgroup				
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median of	dequate student growth perc	entile and its student gro	owth 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 Mee	1					
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for plar	type assignment				:			
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point: The schoo	l earned of tl	ne total Fram	ework 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			
· · ·	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37%	- below 47%		Pri	ority Improvemer			
	• below 37.5%				Turnaround						
chool plan type a	issignments	Does Not Meet									
	Plan description										
erformance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement	a Performance Plan.	A school may not implen	nent a Priority Impro	vement and/or	Turnaround	Plan for longer than	a combined total			
mprovement Pla			five consecutive years be				•				
•	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement	· ·	•		•						
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement		school is notified that it 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.