School Performance Framework 2010

School: MOUNTAIN VISTA COMMUNITY SCHOOL - 6162

Level: Elementary School District: HARRISON 2 - 0980 (1 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	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	56.3%	(14.1 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	68.8%	(17.2 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		60.5%	(60.5 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.



SCHOOL**view**.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 Indicato							Level: Ele	mentary Scho
School: MOUNTAIN	VISTA COMMU		- 6162					(1 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	144	65.3%	35	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	144	73.6%	56	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	144	48.6%	39	
Science	2	4		Approaching	36	33.3%	30	
Fotal	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	2	4		Approaching	92	44	34	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	92	56	54	Yes
Writing	2	4		Approaching	92	47	48	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	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	78	41	34	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	72	41	36	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	4	4		Exceeds	28	60	43	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	34	63	55	Yes
Mathematics	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	78	55	54	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	72	58	56	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	28	52	58	No
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	28	72	73	No
Writing	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	78	48	48	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	72	48	54	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	28	49	61	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	53	50	64	No
Total	33	48	68.8%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation	Rate Met	152	152	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation		152	152	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation		152	152	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation		40	40	

coring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary Schoo			
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Fran cator Scoring Guide	nework Report			Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin			
erjormance mail	The school's percentage of students scoring proficien	nt or advanced was:			Kuting	Foint Vulue		FIGHTEWORK FOR			
		• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.									
Academic		below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools.									
Achievement		below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.									
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 				Approaching Does Not Meet	2	content area)				
	If the school meets the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its medic	an student arowth percent	tile 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 stu	Ident growth percentile and i	its median student growth	n 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	student growth percentile ar	nd its student growth perc	centile 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	s If the student subgroup does not meet the median a	dequate student growth perc	entile and its student gro	wth percentile was:			group in 3 content	25			
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	areas)				
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 				Meets	3		l			
	 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 plan	type assignment							
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on t	his Indicator.		Cut Point: The schoo	l earned of th	ne total Fram	nework points eligibl	e.			
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			
Ī	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37%	- below 47%		Pri	ority Improvemer			
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround			
hool plan type a	assignments										
	Plan description										
erformance Plan		a Performance Plan.	A school may not implem	nent a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	Furnaround F	Plan for longer than a	combined total			
provement Pla			five consecutive years be				•				
iority Improven	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement	a Priority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years	commences on July	1 during the sur	nmer immed	liately following the i	all in which the			
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement	a Turnaround Plan.	school is notified that it i	s required to implem	ent a Priority In	provement	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 Hi

	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 (Mea	n) Colorado ACT C	omposite 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.

School Performance Framework 2010

School: MOUNTAIN VISTA COMMUNITY SCHOOL - 6162

Level: Middle School

District: HARRISON 2 - 0980 (1 Year***)

Performance	P	lan	

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.

Framework Points Earned
at or above 59%
at or above 47% - below 59%
at or above 37% - below 47%
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	Approaching	50.0%	(12.5 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	83.3%	(41.7 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	77.1%	(19.3 out of 25 points)	
Fest Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		73.5%	(73.5 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 rer	noved from both the points earned and

* 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 earn 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.



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 Indicate							Level	Middle Scho
School: MOUNTAIN	VISTA COMMU	NITY SCHOOL	- 6162					(1 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	177	62.7%	28	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	177	45.2%	35	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	177	57.1%	48	
Science	2	4		Approaching	60	30.0%	23	
Total	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	173	60	36	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	173	61	77	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	173	58	60	No
Total	10	12	83.3%	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	16	87.5%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	144	60	36	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	127	60	36	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	39	53	49	Yes
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	64	66	71	No
Mathematics	12	16	75.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	144	61	75	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	127	61	78	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	39	59	78	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	88	67	95	No
Writing	11	16	68.8%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	144	57	60	No
Minority Students	3	4	1	Meets	127	57	57	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	39	54	77	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	81	58	87	No
Total	37	48	77.1%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation	n Rate Met	187	187	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation		187	187	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation		187	187	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation		62	62	

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	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:										
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.				Exceeds	4	16					
Academic	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50		Meets	3	(4 for each	25						
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th 	Approaching	2	content area)								
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 	below the 15th percentile of all schools.										
	If the school meets the median adequate student grow	If the school meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was: • at or above 60. Exceeds 4										
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 60.										
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 	• below 60 but at or above 45.										
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 	• below 45 but at or above 30.										
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 growth	n percentile was:			content area)					
	• at or above 70.											
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 	below 70 but at or above 55.										
	below 55 but at or above 40.	• below 55 but at or above 40.										
	• below 40.											
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	• below 40. Does Not Meet 1 If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was:										
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 60.										
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 	• below 60 but at or above 45.										
	 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 ad	equate student growth perce	ntile and its student gro	wth percentile was:			group in 3 content	25				
	• at or above 70.	• at or above 70.										
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 	below 70 but at or above 55.										
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 	below 55 but at or above 40.										
	• below 40.				Does Not Meet	1						
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for p	lan type assignment								
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on the	nis Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ol earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.				
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%											
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framewor	k • at or above 47%	% - below 59%			Improvement				
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%											
	• below 37.5%											
chool plan type a												
	Plan description											
erformance Plan		Performance Plan.	school may not implen	nent a Priority Improv	vement and/or	Furnaround F	Plan for longer than a	combined total of				
nprovement Plai			ive consecutive years be	, ,			0					
	ent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a				•							
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a						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 Hi

	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.