School Performance Framework 2010

School: DELTA ACADEMY OF APPLIED LEARNING - 2152

Level: All Levels

District: DELTA COUNTY 50(J) - 0870 (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.

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Meets	78.6%	(19.7 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Exceeds	91.7%	(45.9 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps			(out of points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		87.5%	(65.6 out of 75 points)	
* Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	ifficient numbers o	f students. In these cases, the points are ren	noved 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.

COE Improving Academic Achievement

SCHOOLVIEW.org

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 Indicat							Level: Ele	ementary Scho
School: DELTA ACAD	DEMY OF APPLIE	D LEARNING						(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	30	76.7%	62	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	30	80.0%	74	
Writing	3	4		Meets	30	63.3%	66	
Science	0	0		N/A	<16 students	N/A	N/A	
Total	9	12	75.0%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	30	58	27	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	30	66	55	Yes
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	30	67	44	Yes
Total	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	0	0						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Minority Students	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up) 0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Mathematics	0	0						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Minority Students	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up) 0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Writing	0	0						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Minority Students	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Total	0	0		N/A		·		
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	d	Rat	ing		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Participa			30	30	
Mathematics	100.0%		95% Participa			30	30	
Writing	100.0%		95% Participa	tion Rate Met		30	30	
Science	0.0%					0	1	

School: DELTA ACAD	EMY OF APPLIE	D LEARNING						(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	(0.100.
Reading	3	4		Meets	43	74.4%	57	
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	43	76.7%	91	
Writing	3	4		Meets	43	74.4%	84	
Science	3	4		Meets	20	70.0%	87	
Total	13	16	81.3%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4	/01 01110	Meets	42	53	23	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	42	72	57	Yes
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	42	66	44	Yes
Total	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				100
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	0	0						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Minority Students	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Mathematics	0	0						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Minority Students	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Writing	0	0						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Minority Students	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Total	0	0		N/A				
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	d	Ra	ting		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Participa	ition Rate Met		43	43	
Mathematics	100.0%		95% Participa	ition Rate Met		43	43	
Writing	100.0%		95% Participa	ition Rate Met		43	43	
Science	100.0%		95% Participa	ition Rate Met		20	20	

coring Guide							l	evel: All Level		
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report								
erformance Indic	cator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin		
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	or advanced was:								
	 at or above the 90th percentile of all schools. 	16								
Academic	 below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50t 	(4 for each	25							
Achievement		below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools. Approaching 2								
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 				Does Not Meet	. 1				
	If the school meets the median adequate student grow	vth percentile and its median stu	dent growth percentil	e 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 stua	lent growth percentile and its me	edian student growth p	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 its	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 Meet	: 1	(5 for each subgroup			
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median add	equate student growth percentile	e and its student grow	th percentile was:			group in 3 content			
	 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 pla	an type assignment						
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	is Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ool earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.		
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 599	%			Performance		
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or above 479	% - below 59%			Improvement		
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%		Pr	iority Improveme						
	• below 37.5%			Turnaround						
hool plan type a	assignments			-						
	Plan description									
erformance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan. A sc	hool may not impleme	ent a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	Turnaround P	lan for longer than a	combined total of		
nprovement Plar	n The school is required to adopt and implement ar	n Improvement Plan. five	consecutive years before	ore the District or Ir	nstitute is requir	ed to restruc	ture or close the sch	ool. The five		
iority Improvem	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a	Priority Improvement Plan. cons	secutive school years o	commences on July	1 during the sur	nmer immed	ately following the f	all in which the		
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Turnaround Plan. scho	ool is notified that it is	required to implem	ent a Priority Im	provement o	or Turnaround Plan.			

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.