## School Performance Framework 2010

# School: HIGHLINE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL - 3987

Level: All Levels

District: DENVER COUNTY 1 - 0880 (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%				
E	and a large of the state of the				

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	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Meets	65.6%	( 16.4 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Exceeds	87.5%	( 43.8 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	80.6%	( 20.2 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		80.4%	( 80.4 out of 100 points )	
* Schools may not be eligible for all the points eligible, so scores are no		ufficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved from both the points earned and

\*\* 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.





#### 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 Indicato							Level: El	ementary Scho
School: HIGHLINE AC								(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	466	79.4%	68	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	466	73.8%	59	
Writing	3	4		Meets	465	59.8%	59	
Science	3	4		Meets	157	46.5%	51	
Total	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	293	61	30	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	293	66	50	Yes
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	292	64	42	Yes
Total	12	12	100.0%	Exceeds				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	16	16	100.0%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	81	67	43	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	129	60	43	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	52	72	41	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	79	70	59	Yes
Mathematics	13	16	81.3%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	81	58	59	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	129	59	62	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	52	74	52	Yes
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	73	57	81	No
Writing	16	16	100.0%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	81	66	58	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	129	61	58	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	51	60	44	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	144	67	62	Yes
Total	45	48	93.8%	Exceeds				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1	Rat	ting		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Participa	tion Rate Met		466	466	
Mathematics	100.0%			tion Rate Met		466	466	
Writing	99.8%			tion Rate Met		465	466	
Science	100.0%	1	95% Participa			157	157	

Performance Indicate	ors						Level	: Middle Schoo
School: HIGHLINE AC		TER SCHOOL						(3 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	414	65.0%	35	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	416	44.7%	36	
Writing	3	4		Meets	416	60.6%	54	
Science	2	4		Approaching	129	34.9%	25	
Total	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	389	50	27	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	394	51	76	No
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	394	68	50	Yes
Total	9	12	75.0%	Meets				
Acadomic Crowth Cano	Points Earned	Dointo Elisible	% Dointe	Dating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Academic Growth Gaps		Points Eligible		Rating	N	Percentile	Growin Percentile	Growing
Reading	13	20	65.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	128	48	46	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	184	52	41	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	47	39	75	No
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	40	68	47	Yes
Students needing to catch up		4	== 00/	Approaching	132	47	63	No
Mathematics	11	20	55.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	128	47	88	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	186	51	90	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	50	52	98	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	40	55	62	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	200	50	95	No
Writing	18	20	90.0%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	128	64	63	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	186	67	62	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4		Meets	50	57	90	No
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	40	70	51	Yes
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	158	64	81	No
Total	42	60	70.0%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.5%		95% Partic	pation Rate Met		414	416	
Mathematics	100.0%		95% Partic	pation Rate Met		416	416	
Writing	100.0%		95% Partic	pation Rate Met		416	416	
Science	100.0%		95% Partic	pation Rate Met		129	129	

Scoring Guide							L	evel: All Levels			
Scoring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report									
Performance India	cator 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.	16									
Academic	<ul> <li>below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50t</li> </ul>	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.     Exceeds     4     • 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 15t</li> </ul>	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.									
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools.</li> </ul>				Does Not Meet	t 1					
	If the school meets the median adequate student grov	wth percentile and its median stu	udent growth percentil	e 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	t 1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	lent growth percentile and its me	edian student growth p	percentile was:			content area)				
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4					
	<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	t 1					
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and its	s student growth perce	ntile 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	t 1	(5 for each subgroup				
Growth Gaps		equate student growth percentil	e and its student grow	th percentile was:			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	t 1					
Cut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for pla	an type assignment							
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	iis 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 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%	% - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen						
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround			
School plan type a	assignments										
	Plan description										
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan. A sc	chool may not impleme	ent a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	Furnaround P	lan for longer than a	combined total of			
Improvement Plai	n The school is required to adopt and implement ar		consecutive years bef								
	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a		•								
Furnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a		ool is notified that it is		•		, ,				

## **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.