# School: AURORA WEST COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMY - 9396

Level: Middle School

District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J - 0180 (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.

#### 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 subgroups and students needing to catch up. It disaggregates the Growth Indicator into 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.



SCHOOLView.

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	31.3%	(7.8 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	75.0%	( 37.5 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	73.3%	( 18.3 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		63.6%	( 63.6 out of 100 points )	

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.

#### Academic Growth Gaps

The Gaps Indicator measures the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student 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.

*** Data in this report is based	on results from:	2009-10	,2008-09,	2007-08
F	inal plan type ba	ised on:	3 Year SP	F report.

Performance Indicate	ors						Level:	Middle Scho
School: AURORA WE	ST COLLEGE PR	EPARATORY A	ACADEMY	′ - 9396				(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	2140	39.7%	7	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	2149	32.5%	16	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	2143	25.6%	6	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	765	13.5%	6	
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	3	4		Meets	1973	59	61	No
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	1984	67	89	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	1977	61	83	No
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	1887	59	62	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	1873	59	62	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	276	49	92	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	1567	60	63	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	1263	59	76	No
Mathematics	16	20	80.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	1896	66	90	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	1884	67	90	No
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4		Meets	281	57	99	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	1573	67	89	No
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	1325	70	97	No
Writing	14	20	70.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	1891	61	84	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	1876	61	84	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	277	47	96	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	1570	62	84	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	1479	62	89	No
Total	44	60	73.3%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.4%			95% Participation R	ate Met	2425	2439	
Mathematics	99.5%			95% Participation R	ate Met	2435	2447	
Writing	99.3%			95% Participation R		2426	2442	
Science	99.2%			95% Participation R	ate Met	853	860	

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	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	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools. Meets 3										
Achievement	<ul> <li>below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th</li> </ul>	th percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)					
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools.</li> </ul>				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						
	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>				Meets	3						
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>				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						
	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>				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						
	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>				Meets	3						
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>				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)					
	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>				Meets	3						
	<ul> <li>below 55 but at or above 40.</li> </ul>				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		<ul> <li>at or above 5</li> </ul>	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.