School Performance Framework 2010

School: TREVISTA ECE-8 AT HORACE MANN - 8909

Level: All Levels

District: DENVER COUNTY 1 - 0880 (1 Year

Priority Improvement 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	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	45.8%	(22.9 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	50.9%	(12.7 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		41.9%	(41.9 out of 100 points)	
* Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	fficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved 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.



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 Indicate	ors						Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: TREVISTA EC	E-8 AT HORACI	E MANN						(1 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	172	26.7%	0	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	173	31.2%	1	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	173	19.1%	3	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	64	3.1%	1	
Total	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	116	30	63	No
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	119	38	78	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	117	48	80	No
Total	4	12	33.3%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	5		31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4	31.370	Does Not Meet	103	30	62	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	109	30	63	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	61	42	75	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Does Not Meet	83	30	75	No
Mathematics	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				-
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	106	38	75	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	112	38	78	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	63	37	78	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	78	38	86	No
Writing	8	16	50.0%	Approaching	-			-
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	104	47	80	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	110	49	81	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students		N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	61	47	82	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	101	50	83	No
Total	17	48	35.4%	Does Not Meet				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.5%		95% Part	icipation Rate Met		187	188	
Mathematics	100.0%			icipation Rate Met		189	189	
Writing	100.0%			icipation Rate Met		189	189	
Science	100.0%			icipation Rate Met		68	68	

Performance Indicate	ors						Level	Middle Schoo
School: TREVISTA EC	E-8 AT HORACE	MANN						(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	207	36.2%	3	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	209	23.9%	8	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	209	22.0%	4	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	71	9.9%	3	
Total	4	16	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	187	51	61	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	191	51	93	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	189	55	86	No
Total	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	14	20	70.0%	Meets				<u>Growth.</u>
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	70.070	Meets	167	57	62	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	107	57	61	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	25	48	89	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	98	59		No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	134	58	76	No
Mathematics	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	171	52	94	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	181	51	93	No
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4		Meets	25	59	99	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	102	57	94	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	141	53	98	No
Writing	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	169	52	86	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	179	55	86	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	25	36	96	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	100	55	89	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	146	55	89	No
Total	38	60	63.3%	Meets	110			
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.1%		95% Part	icipation Rate Met		227	229	
Mathematics	99.6%			icipation Rate Met		228	229	
Writing	99.6%			icipation Rate Met		228	229	
Science	100.0%			icipation Rate Met		76	76	
Juence	100.0%		90% Pdft			/0	/0	

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	 below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50t 	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools.									
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15t 	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.									
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 				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					
	 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	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					
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3					
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				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					
	 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	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)				
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3					
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				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.