Level: Elementary School

District: KEENESBURG RE-3(J) - 3090 (1 Year***)

School: HOFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 4526

Per	form	anc	Pl م	an	

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	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Meets	68.8%	(17.2 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	75.0%	(37.5 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	75.0%	(18.8 out of 25 points)	
Test 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 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.

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 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.





^{**} 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: Elementary School (1 Year***) Performance Indicators

School: HOFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 4526

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating N		% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	184	83.7%	79	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	184	72.3%	53	
Writing	3	4		Meets	183	64.5%	71	
Science	2	4		Approaching	46	34.8%	32	
Total	11	16	68.8%	Meets				

								Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	135	52	30	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	135	54	50	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	134	55	39	Yes
Total	9	12	75.0%	Meets				

					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	10	12	83.3%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	45	52	34	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	32	48	31	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0	'	N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	30	70	58	Yes
Mathematics	8	12	66.7%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	45	45	58	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	32	52	50	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0	'	N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	42	61	81	No
Writing	9	12	75.0%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	44	53	43	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	31	60	34	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0	'	N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
English Language Learners	0	0		N/A	<20 students	N/A	N/A	
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	48	53	69	No
Total	27	36	75.0%	Meets				

Test Participation	% of Students Tested	Rating	Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.5%	95% Participation Rate Met	188	189	
Mathematics	99.5%	95% Participation Rate Met	187	188	
Writing	98.9%	95% Participation Rate Met	187	189	
Science	100.0%	95% Participation Rate Met	46	46	

coring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary Schoo	
oring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Fra	mework Report							
erformance India	cator Scoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Point	
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficie	ent 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 5 	50th percentile of all schools.			Meets	3	(4 for each	25	
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 3 	15th percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)		
	below the 15th percentile of all schools.				Does Not Meet	t 1			
	If the school meets the median adequate student g	rowth percentile and its medic	an student growth percei	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	12	50	
Academic	• below 30.			[Does Not Meet	1	(4 for each		
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate st	tudent growth percentile and i	its median student growt	th 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 adequat	e student growth percentile ai	nd its student growth per	rcentile was:		•			
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4	1		
	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	р	
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median	adequate student growth perc	centile and its student gro	owth percentile was:		•	group in 3 content	i	
·	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	areas)		
	below 70 but at or above 55.				Meets	3	1		
	below 55 but at or above 40.				Approaching	2			
	• below 40.				Does Not Meet	1			
t-Points for eac	th performance indicator		Cut-Points for plan	n type assignment					
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point: The school	earned of th	ne total Fran	nework points eligib	le.	
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or above 59%			рошоство	Performance	
rowth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework		below 59%			Improvement	
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% -			Pr	iority Improvemen	
	• helow 37 5%	Does Not Meet		• helow 37%				Turnaround	

Cut-Points for ea	Cut-Points for each performance indicator									
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on this Indicator.									
Achievement;	nt; • at or above 87.5% Exceeds									
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets								
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching								
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet								

Cut-Points for plan	Cut-Points for plan type assignment							
	Cut Point: The school earned of the total Framework points eli	gible.						
	• at or above 59%	Performance						
Total Framework	• at or above 47% - below 59%	Improvement						
Points	• at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement						
	• below 37%	Turnaround						

School plan type assignme	nts
	Plan description
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.

A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five 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.

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	Elem Middle High			Elem Middle High			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)

	1 00 0 1											
	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.