School Performance Framework 2010

School: CARBONDALE MIDDLE SCHOOL - 1296

Level: All Levels

District: ROARING FORK RE-1 - 1180 (3 Year***)

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.

What do the performance indicators measure?

Academic Achievement

The Achievement Indicator reflects how a school's students are doing at meeting the The Gaps Indicator measures the academic progress of historically disadvantaged 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

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	28.1%	(7 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	62.5%	(31.3 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	53.3%	(13.3 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		51.6%	(51.6 out of 100 points)	

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 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.

Academic Growth Gaps

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	rs						Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: CARBONDALE	MIDDLE SCHO	DOL						(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	443	47.6%	13	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	445	27.6%	0	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	444	30.9%	12	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	229	15.7%	10	
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	70 F 01113	Approaching	419	48	50	No
Mathematics	1	4			419	35	73	NO
	2	4		Does Not Meet	427	46	69	NO NO
Writing	5		41 70/	Approaching	419	40		NO
Total	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequat
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
					/•	Fercentile	Growth Percentile	Growth:
Reading	11	20	55.0%	Approaching				•.
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	244	46	57	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	312	43	57	No
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4		Meets	31	55	86	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	288	43	59	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4	0- 00/	Approaching	246	46	67	No
Mathematics	5	20	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	252	31	78	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	320	31	78	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	33	26	96	No
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	294	32	78	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	271	37	86	No
Writing	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	244	44	75	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	312	41	75	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	32	29	92	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	286	41	76	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	304	42	79	No
Total	25	60	41.7%	Approaching				
Test Participation %	6 of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.6%		95% Parti	cipation Rate Met		473	475	
Mathematics	99.6%		95% Parti	cipation Rate Met		473	475	

244

243

95% Participation Rate Met

99.6%

Science

Performance Indicato							Eevel.	Middle Schoo
School: CARBONDAL								(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	427	45.9%	12	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	424	26.6%	11	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	427	30.9%	9	
Science	2	4		Approaching	210	29.5%	19	
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	4	4		Exceeds	395	65	59	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	396	56	92	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	395	57	81	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 Adequate Growth?
Reading	14	20	70.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	, 0.070	Meets	195	63	67	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	293	63	66	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	46	53	89	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	260	62	68	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	221	65	74	No
Mathematics	14	20	70.0%	Meets			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	70.070	Meets	196	56	97	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	294	56	96	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	46	51	99	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	262	56	96	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Meets	202	57	97	No
Writing	11	20	55.0%	Approaching	211	57	51	NO
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	20	55.070		195	53	87	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching Approaching	293	53	86	NO
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	46	44	96	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	260	55	88	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	260	55	90	No
Total	39	60	65.0%	Meets	201		30	NO
Tost Dartisination	V of Students Tosts	d		Dating		Students Tested	Total Students	
	% of Students Tester	u	050/ 0- 11	Rating			466	
Reading	100.0%			cipation Rate Met		466		
Mathematics	99.6%			cipation Rate Met		463	465	
Writing	100.0%		95% Parti	cipation Rate Met		466	466	

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.				Exceeds	4	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 15t 	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools. Meets S below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools. Approaching 2									
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 										
	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.