Level: Middle School

District: LITTLETON 6 - 0140 (3 Year***)

School: NEWTON MIDDLE SCHOOL - 4316

Performance Pla	n	Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
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.		Academic Achievement	Meets	75.0%	(18.8 out of 25 points)	
		Acadamia Crawth	Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Plan Assignment Framewo	rk Points Earned			50.00 <i>/</i>	(10 0	
Performance	at or above 59%	Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	53.3%	(13.3 out of 25 points)	
Improvement at or above 4	47% - below 59%					
Priority Improvement at or above 3	37% - below 47%	Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
Turnaround	below 37%					
Framework points are calcula percentage of points earned out of	•	TOTAL		61.3%	(61.3 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.

What do the performance indicators measure?

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 Achievement

Academic Growth Gaps.

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.





Final plan type based on: 3 Year SPF report.

^{**} 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.

Level: Middle School (3 Year***) **Performance Indicators**

School:	NEWTON	MIDDLE	SCHOOL	L - 4316
---------	--------	--------	--------	----------

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	2044	82.0%	80	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	2042	65.9%	78	
Writing	3	4		Meets	2045	69.7%	77	
Science	3	4		Meets	682	66.1%	82	
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	1950	47	17	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	1951	43	46	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1949	42	35	Yes
Total	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				

					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	233	49	30	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	232	47	33	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	233	43	54	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	79	52	54	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	329	48	60	No
Mathematics	11	20	55.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	232	42	71	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	234	44	70	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	235	40	83	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	81	56	82	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	515	52	89	No
Writing	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	234	45	52	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	231	42	50	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	231	39	76	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	79	53	74	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	478	45	75	No
Total	32	60	53.3%	Approaching				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.3%	95% Participation Rate Met	2068	2082	
Mathematics	99.3%	95% Participation Rate Met	2068	2083	
Writing	99.4%	95% Participation Rate Met	2069	2082	
Science	99.4%	95% Participation Rate Met	687	691	

oring Guide							Level:	Middle Scho	
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report							
formance Indic	ator Scoring Guide	 			Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin	
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	or advanced was:				1 .			
	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.				Exceeds	4	16		
Academic	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th				Meets	3	(4 for each	25	
Achievement		h 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 grov	yth percentile and its median st	udent growth percentil	e was:		1 .			
	• 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 stud	ent growth percentile and its m	nedian student growth p	percentile was:			content area)		
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds Meets	3			
		• below 70 but at or above 55.							
	below 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching	2					
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1			
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and it	s student growth perce	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	60		
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Mee	t 1	(5 for each subgroup		
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median ad	equate student growth percent	ile and its student grow	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 Mee	t 1			
Points for each	performance indicator		Cut-Points for pla	n type assignment					
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	is Indicator.			ol earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ble.	
chievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%	, 5			Performance	
rowth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework					Improvement	
,	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%			• at or above 37%			Pr	riority Improvem	
-	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround	
ool plan type a									
os-piem-type di	Plan description								
formance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan. A se	chool may not impleme	ent a Priority Improv	ement and/or	Turnaround I	Plan for longer than a	combined total	
rovement Plan			consecutive years before	, ,	•		Ü		

Priority Improvement Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan. 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.

The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.

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)

								<u> </u>				
	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.