School Performance Framework 2011

Level: Elementary School

District: DENVER COUNTY 1 - 0880 (1 Year***)

School: HARRINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 3778

Improvement Plan (Revised)

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.

Rating	% of Points	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)	
Meets	75.0%	(37.5 out of 50 points)	
Meets	70.0%	(17.5 out of 25 points)	
95% Participation Rate Met			
	61.3%	(61.3 out of 100 points)	
-	Does Not Meet Meets Meets	Does Not Meet25.0%Meets75.0%Meets70.0%95% Participation Rate Met	Does Not Meet 25.0% (6.3 out of 25 points) Meets 75.0% (37.5 out of 50 points) Meets 70.0% (17.5 out of 25 points) 95% Participation Rate Met

c scores are not negatively impacted

** Schools do not receive points for test participation. However, schools are assigned one plan category lower than their points indicate if they do not (1) meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one subject (reading, writing, math, science, and COACT), or (2) for schools serving multiple grade levels, meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one subject rates are rolled up across grade levels AND the school makes AYP participation (in reading and math) for each grade level overall (not including disaggregated groups).

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) median 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 median 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: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: HARRINGTO	N ELEMENTARY	(SCHOOL - 37	78					(1 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	193	27.5%	1	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	193	43.5%	10	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	193	27.5%	10	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	51	7.8%	3	
Total	4	16	25%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	132	57	63	No
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	133	60	64	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	132	61	68	No
Total	9	12	75%	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%	Meets			·	
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	126	57	63	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	128	57	63	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	24	49	87	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	96	57	64	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	91	59	78	No
Mathematics	14	20	70%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	127	60	64	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	129	60	64	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	25	43	85	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	97	62	63	No
Students needing to catch up) 3	4		Meets	72	59	78	No
Writing	14	20	70%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	126	59	68	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	128	61	68	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	24	50	87	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	96	65		
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	110	65	73	No
Total	42	60	70%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ite Met	217	217	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	217	217	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	217	217	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	54	54	

Scoring Guide							Level: Ele	mentary School
Scoring Guide for I	Performance Indicators on the School Performance Frame	work Report						
Performance Indic	catorScoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Points
-	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient of	or advanced was:						
	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools using	2010 (1-year SPF) or 2008-10	0 baseline (3-year SPF).		Exceeds	4	16	
Academic	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th	percentile of all schools usir	ng 2010 (1-year SPF) or 20	08-10 baseline (3-year SPF).	Meets	3	(4 for each	25
Achievement	 below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th 	percentile of all schools usir	ng 2010 (1-year SPF) or 20	08-10 baseline (3-year SPF).	Approaching	2	content area)	
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools using 2010 				Does Not Mee	t 1		
	If the school meets the median adequate student grow	th percentile and its median	student growth percentile	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 stude	ent growth percentile and its	median student growth pe	ercentile 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 Mee	t 1		
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate st	udent growth percentile and	its student growth percen	tile 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 Mee	t 1	(5 for each subgrou	р
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median ade	quate student growth percen	tile and its student growt	h percentile was:			group in 3 content	25
	• at or above 70.			Exceeds 4			areas)	
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 			Meets				
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				Approaching	2		
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1		
Cut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for plan ty	pe assignment				
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	is Indicator.		Cut Point: The school earn	ed of the tot	al Framewor	k points eligible.	
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	w 59%		Improvement	
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% - below	w 47%		Prior	ity Improvement
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%		Turnaround		
School plan type a	ssignments			-				
	Plan description							
Performance Plan		Performance Plan.	A school may not impl	ement a Priority Improveme	ent and/or Turr	naround Plan	for longer than a co	ombined total of
Improvement Plar	The school is required to adopt and implement ar	n Improvement Plan.		before the District or Institu				
Priority Improvem	nent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a	Priority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school yea	ars commences on July 1 du	ring the summ	er immediate	ly following the fall	in which the
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Turnaround Plan.	- '	it is required to implement a	•		, ,	

Reference

Comparison Data

Academic Achievement


Percent of Stude	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 2010 baseline (1-year SPF)											
	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 - 2008-10 baseline (3-year SPF)

	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	

All achievement data is compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released (2009-10 for 1-year reports and 2008-10 for 3-year reports).





For Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps, the median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth. Schools that met adequate growth use the rubric on the left; schools that did not meet adequate growth use the rubric on the right.

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 insufficient student counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the student 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. For both 1-year and 3-year SPFs, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized on the Performance Indicators detail page.