School Performance Framework 2010

School: FORT LUPTON MIDDLE SCHOOL - 3066

Level: Middle School

District: WELD COUNTY S/D RE-8 - 3140 (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.

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	43.8%	(11 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	46.7%	(11.7 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		51.9%	(51.9 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.

COE Improving Academic Achievement

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 Scho
School: FORT LUPTO	N MIDDLE SCH	OOL - 3066						(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	-
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	1401	49.2%	14	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	1401	42.4%	31	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1400	41.3%	19	
Science	2	4		Approaching	463	27.6%	17	
Total	7	16	43.8%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	1315	45	43	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	1321	52	76	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1318	49	67	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	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	844	44	56	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	890	46	55	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	74	33	89	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	620	47	62	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	608	45	71	No
Mathematics	10	20	50.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	846	50	85	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	896	53	83	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	74	40	99	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	623	54	88	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	690	52	95	No
Writing	9	20	45.0%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	844	50	76	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	891	53	74	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	76	31	95	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	622	53	78	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	733	51	85	No
Total	28	60	46.7%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	98.9%			95% Participation	Rate Met	1450	1466	
Mathematics	99.2%			95% Participation	Rate Met	1449	1460	
Writing	98.4%			95% Participation		1449	1473	
Science	98.2%			95% Participation		483	492	

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	ne school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:										
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools. Exceeds										
Academic	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50	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 	th percentile of all schools.			Approaching	2	content area)					
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools. 	below the 15th percentile of all schools. Does Not Meet 1										
	If the school meets the median adequate student grow	wth percentile and its median	n student growth perce	entile 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	lent growth percentile and its	s median student grow	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.											
	• below 40.											
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate s	tudent growth percentile and	d its student growth pe	ercentile 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 g	rowth percentile was	s:		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 assignme	nt							
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	nis Indicator.		Cut Point: The so	chool earned of	the total Fra	mework points eligil	ole.				
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		 at or above 5 	59%			Performance				
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framew	ork • at or above 4	17% - below 59%			Improvement				
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 3	37% - below 47%		Pr	iority Improvemen				
	• below 37.5%		Turnaround									
chool plan type a												
	Plan description											
erformance Plan		Performance Plan.	A school may not impl	ement a Priority Imp	rovement and/or	Furnaround F	Plan for longer than a	combined total of				
nprovement Plar			ive consecutive years	, ,			0					
•	ent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a											
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a		school is notified that i		, ,		, .					

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.