School Performance Framework 2010

School: LAREDO MIDDLE SCHOOL - 4975

Level: Middle School

District: CHERRY CREEK 5 - 0130 (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%	Aca
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	Tes
Turnaround	below 37%	
percentage of points	are calculated using the earned out of points eligible.	тот
For schools with data	a on all indicators, the total	* Sch

formance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
ademic Achievement	Meets	75.0%	(18.8 out of 25 points)	
ademic Growth	Meets	66.7%	(33.4 out of 50 points)	
ademic Growth Gaps	Approaching	56.7%	(14.2 out of 25 points)	
t Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TAL		66.4%	(66.4 out of 100 points)	
nools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	fficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are rer	noved from both the points earned an

points possible are: 25 points for Academic 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?

Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25 for

Academic Achievement

Academic Growth Gaps.

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.

Per

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.

School: LAREDO MID	DLE SCHOOL - 4	4975						(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	3461	72.4%	52	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	3467	60.0%	69	
Writing	3	4		Meets	3463	61.6%	56	
Science	3	4		Meets	1172	50.2%	53	
Total	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
								Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	3311	47	24	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	3317	48	58	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	3314	47	43	Yes
Гotal	8	12	66.7%	Meets				
		1			Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	1044			
Minority Students					2011	45	37	Yes
winnerity students	3	4		Meets	1386	45 47	37 34	Yes Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4			-			
	-	•		Meets	1386	47	34	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Meets Approaching	1386 270	47 42	34 70	Yes No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up	2 2 2	4	55.0%	Meets Approaching Approaching	1386 270 227	47 42 51	34 70 58	Yes No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up	2 2 2 2	4 4 4 4	55.0%	Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching	1386 270 227	47 42 51	34 70 58	Yes No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up Mathematics	2 2 2 11	4 4 4 20	55.0%	Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching	1386 270 227 887	47 42 51 48	34 70 58 63	Yes No No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up <i>Mathematics</i> Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2 2 2 11 2	4 4 4 20 4	55.0%	Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching	1386 270 227 887 1047	47 42 51 48 52	34 70 58 63 75	Yes No No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up Mathematics Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible Minority Students	2 2 2 11 2 2 2 2 2	4 4 4 20 4 4 4	55.0%	Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching	1386 270 227 887 1047 1389	47 42 51 48 52 52 52	34 70 58 63 75 71	Yes No No No No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up Mathematics Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible Minority Students Students w/ Disabilities	2 2 2 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	4 4 20 4 4 4 4 4	55.0%	Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching	1386 270 227 887 1047 1389 273	47 42 51 48 52 52 45	34 70 58 63 75 71 98	Yes No No No No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up Mathematics Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible Minority Students Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up	2 2 2 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 3	4 4 20 4 4 4 4 4 4	55.0%	Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Meets	1386 270 227 887 1047 1389 273 228	47 42 51 48 52 52 45 62	34 70 58 63 75 71 98 82	Yes No No No No No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up Mathematics Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible Minority Students Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners	2 2 2 11 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 3 2	4 4 20 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Meets Approaching	1386 270 227 887 1047 1389 273 228	47 42 51 48 52 52 45 62	34 70 58 63 75 71 98 82	Yes No No No No No No No
Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up Mathematics Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible Minority Students Students w/ Disabilities English Language Learners Students needing to catch up Writing	2 2 2 11 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 11	4 4 20 4 4 4 4 4 4 20		Meets Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Approaching Meets Approaching Approaching	1386 270 227 887 1047 1389 273 228 1129	47 42 51 48 52 52 45 62 52	34 70 58 63 75 71 98 82 92	Yes No No No No No No No

Total	34	60	56.7%	Approaching			
Test Participation	% of Students Tested			Rating	Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.3%			95% Participation Rate Met	3619	3644	
Mathematics	99.4%			95% Participation Rate Met	3623	3644	
Writing	99.3%			95% Participation Rate Met	3620	3645	
Science	99.3%			95% Participation Rate Met	1224	1233	

Approaching

Approaching

Meets

No

No

No

Students w/ Disabilities

English Language Learners

Students needing to catch up

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	ne school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:									
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools. Exceeds 4									
Academic	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50	(4 for each	25								
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th 	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 grow	wth percentile and its median	n student growth perce	entile 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 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					
	 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	tudent growth percentile and	d its student growth pe	ercentile 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	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)				
	 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 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%		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.