School Performance Framework 2010

School: RIVERSIDE SCHOOL - 7388

Level: Elementary School

District: GARFIELD RE-2 - 1195 (1 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%	Aca
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	Tes
Turnaround	below 37%	
-	are calculated using the earned out of points eligible.	то
For schools with data	on all indicators the total	

For schools with data on all indicators, the total $\overline{*_{SC}}$ points possible are: 25 points for Academic the Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25 for Academic Growth Gaps.

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	50.0%	(12.5 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	50.0%	(25 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	40.0%	(10 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		47.5%	(47.5 out of 100 points)	
* Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	Ifficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved 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 earned ar 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 Indicat	ors						Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: RIVERSIDE S	CHOOL - 7388							(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	341	65.4%	35	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	341	51.0%	16	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	341	50.2%	42	
Science	2	4		Approaching	178	35.4%	33	
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	3	4		Meets	324	45	28	Yes
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	324	32	57	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	324	40	48	No
Total	6	12	50.0%	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	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	-	4		Approaching	136	45	48	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	122	46	53	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	24	72	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	77	48	58	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	122	45	61	No
Mathematics	5	20	25.0%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4		Does Not Meet	136	35	69	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	122	34	70	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	17	90	No
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	77	37	78	No
Students needing to catch up	o 1	4		Does Not Meet	137	31	83	No
Writing	10	20	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible		4		Approaching	136	41	68	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	122	43	70	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	37	84	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	77	55	77	No
Students needing to catch up	p 2	4		Approaching	175	44	75	No
Total	24	60	40.0%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation I	Rate Met	356	356	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation I		357	357	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation I		356	356	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation I		184	184	

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.				Exceeds	4	16		
Academic	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50	Oth percentile of all schools.			Meets	3	(4 for each	25	
Achievement		•			Approaching	2	content area)		
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 				Does Not Meet	1			
	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.	• 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 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			
	 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	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.

School Performance Framework 2010

School: RIVERSIDE SCHOOL - 7388

Level: Middle School

District: GARFIELD RE-2 - 1195 (1 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%	Aca
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	Tes
Turnaround	below 37%	
-	are calculated using the earned out of points eligible.	то
For schools with data	a on all indicators, the total	* Sc

For schools with data on all indicators, the total points engine. 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	Approaching	50.0%	(12.5 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	54.2%	(13.6 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		55.3%	(55.3 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 ne 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	: Middle Schoo
School: RIVERSIDE SC	CHOOL - 7388							(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	313	62.0%	27	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	313	42.2%	31	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	313	51.1%	34	
Science	2	4		Approaching	141	38.3%	32	
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	3	4		Meets	291	49	31	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	293	40	73	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	293	45	54	No
Total	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible		Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	128	45	43	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	132	49	48	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	82	48	57	No
Students needing to catch up		4		Approaching	98	49	66	No
Mathematics	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	131	42	82	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	131	43	82	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	81	42	87	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	131	48	95	No
Writing	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	130	44	73	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	132	46	75	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	82	43	81	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	128	51	85	No
Total	26	48	54.2%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation	n Rate Met	334	334	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation	n Rate Met	333	333	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation	n Rate Met	334	334	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation	n Rate Met	154	154	

coring Guide								Level:	Middle Schoo
oring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	ework Report							
erformance Indic	ator Scoring Guide					Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	t 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 	th percentile of all schools.				Meets	3	(4 for each	25
Achievement	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15	th percentile of all schools.				Approaching	2	content area)	
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 					Does Not Meet	1		
	If the school meets the median adequate student gro	wth percentile and its median	n student growth per	rcentile	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 stud	dent growth percentile and its	s median student gro	owth p	ercentile was:			content area)	
	• at or above 70.	• at or above 70.							
	 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	student growth percentile and	d its student growth	percer	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 ad	equate student growth perce	ntile and its student	growt	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	1		
ut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points fo	or plar	n type assignment				
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on tl	nis Indicator.		0	Cut Point: The scho	ol earned of	the total Fra	nework points eligit	ole.
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds			• at or above 59%	6			Performance
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Frame	work	• at or above 47%	6 - below 59%			Improvement
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	-	• at or above 37%	6 - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		-	• below 37%				Turnaround
hool plan type a	ssignments								
	Plan description								
erformance Plan	-	Performance Plan.	A school may not imi	pleme	nt a Priority Improv	vement and/or 1	urnaround F	lan for longer than a	combined total of
nprovement Plar			, ,		, ,			ture or close the sch	
•	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.