Level: Middle School

District: PUEBLO CITY 60 - 2690 (1 Year***)

School: RONCALLI MIDDLE SCHOOL - 7481

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%

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 the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted. 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	41.7%	(20.9 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	46.7%	(11.7 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		45.1%	(45.1 out of 100 points)	
* Schools may not be eligible for all	possible points on an indicator due to insu	ufficient numbers	of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved from both the points earned a

What do the performance indicators measure?

Academic Achievement

Turnaround

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.

below 37%

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 Achievement Indicator reflects how a school's students are doing at meeting the 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.





^{**} 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.

Level: Middle School (1 Year***) **Performance Indicators**

School:	RONCALLI	MIDDLE	SCHOOL	7481
---------	----------	--------	--------	------

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	584	59.1%	23	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	585	34.5%	20	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	585	43.9%	23	
Science	2	4		Approaching	210	31.9%	24	
Total	8	16	50.0%	Approaching				

								Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	557	36	33	Yes
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	562	37	74	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	559	41	57	No
Total	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				

					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N .	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	12	20	60.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	415	39	36	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	371	35	35	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4	'	Meets	74	55	67	No
English Language Learners	3	4	'	Meets	22	49	45	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	231	46	59	No
Mathematics	8	20	40.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	422	39	78	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	374	37	75	No
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4		Meets	75	68	95	No
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	26	37	86	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	307	45	93	No
Writing	8	20	40.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	417	41	62	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	372	39	60	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	75	48	91	No
English Language Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	24	37	66	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	280	46	83	No
Total	28	60	46.7%	Approaching				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	98.9%	95% Participation Rate Met	608	615	
Mathematics	99.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	610	616	
Writing	99.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	609	615	
Science	99.1%	95% Participation Rate Met	215	217	

oring Guide							Level:	Middle Scho
	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report						-
formance Indic	ator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient	or advanced was:				1 .		
	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.				Exceeds	4	16	
Academic	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th	_ '		Meets	3	(4 for each	25	
Achievement	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th	h percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)	
	below the 15th percentile of all schools.				Does Not Mee	t 1		
	If the school meets the median adequate student grov	vth percentile and its median st	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 Mee	t 1	(4 for each	50		
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stud	lent growth percentile and its m	edian student growth រុ	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.	• below 55 but at or above 40.						
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1		
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and its	student growth perce	ntile was:				
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4	60	
	below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3		
	below 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching	2		
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Mee	t 1	(5 for each subgroup	
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median add	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 Mee	t 1		
-Points for each	performance indicator		Cut-Points for pla	n type assignment				
C	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	is Indicator.		Cut Point: The scho	ol earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.
chievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		at or above 59%	ó			Performance
rowth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• 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 Improveme	
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet	• below 37%				Turnaround	
ool plan type a	ssignments							
	Plan description							
formance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan. A sc	hool may not impleme	ent a Priority Improv	rement and/or	Turnaround I	Plan for longer than a	combined total
rovement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement ar	Improvement Plan. five	consecutive years befo	ore the District or In	stitute is reaui	red to restru	cture or close the sch	ool. The five

Priority Improvement Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan. consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the

school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.

The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.

Turnaround Plan

Comparison Data

Academic Achievement

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2010)

	Reading Math				Writing			Science				
	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

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.