School Performance Framework 2011

Level: Middle School

School: LAKE MIDDLE SCHOOL - 4910

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

Improvement Plan	Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
This is the plan type the school is required to add and implement. Schools are assigned a plan bas on their overall framework score, which is	ed Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)	
percentage of the total points they earned out the total points eligible in each performar indicator. The overall score is then matched to t scoring guide below to determine the plan type.	ice	Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Plan Assignment Framework Points Earn Performance at or above 50 Image: State Sta	9% Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	60.0%	(15.0 out of 25 points)	
Improvementat or above 47% - below 5Priority Improvementat or above 37% - below 4	7% Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
Turnaroundbelow 3'Framework points are calculated using tpercentage of points earned out of points eligib	he TOTAL Ile.		50.5%	(50.5 out of 100 points)	
For schools with data on all indicators, the to points possible are: 25 points for Acader Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25	nic scores are not negatively impacted. ** Schools do not receive points for	r test participation. However, schools are a	assigned one plan	category lower than their points indicate if the	moved from both the points earned and the points eligible, so hey do not (1) meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but be in all or all but one cubiect area when individual cubiect rates

** 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 area when individual 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

Academic Growth Gaps.

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 Indicato	ors						Level	Middle Schoo
School: LAKE MIDDLE	E SCHOOL - 491	.0						(1 Year***
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	315	33.6%	2	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	318	23.9%	8	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	316	24.4%	5	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	141	18.4%	9	
lotal	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	2	4	/01/01/10	Approaching	294	53	70	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	295	53	95	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	288	59	84	No
Total	7	12	58.3%	Approaching	200			110
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	11	20	55%	Approaching		, ercentile		ciowin.
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	5570	Approaching	262	54	71	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	284	53	70	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	56	46	90	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	159	59	71	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	184	53	81	No
Mathematics	11	20	55%	Approaching	101			110
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	263	54	95	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	285	53	95	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	57	53	99	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	159	52	95	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	217	56	98	No
Vriting	14	20	70%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	259	59	86	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	278	59	86	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	51	54	95	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	156	61	87	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	226	58	89	No
Fotal	36	60	60%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.4%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	348	350	
Mathematics	99.7%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	350	351	
Writing	99.7%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	349	350	
Science	98.8%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	158	160	

coring Guide							Level	: Middle Schoo			
	erformance Indicators on the School Performance Framewo	ork Report									
Performance Indica					Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin			
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or										
	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools using 20				Exceeds	4	16 (4 for each	25			
Academic		• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools using 2010 (1-year SPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year SP									
Achievement	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th p			8-10 baseline (3-year SPF)		2	content area)				
	below the 15th percentile of all schools using 2010 (2)	• •			Does Not Mee	et 1					
	If the school meets the median adequate student growth	percentile and its median s	tudent growth percentile v	vas:		-					
	• 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	et 1	(4 for each	50			
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate student	t growth percentile and its n	nedian student growth per	centile was:			content area)				
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4					
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 		Meets	3		l .					
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				Approaching	2					
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	et 1					
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate stud	lent growth percentile and i	ts student growth percenti	le 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	et 1	(5 for each subgrou	25			
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequ	ate student growth percent	ile and its student growth	percentile was:			group in 3 content				
	• at or above 70.	above 70.									
	• below 70 but at or above 55.		Meets	3							
	• below 55 but at or above 40.				Approaching	2					
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	et 1					
t-Points for each	performance indicator		Cut-Points for plan	type assignment	-						
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on this	Indicator.		Cut Point: The school ea	rned of the	total Framew	ork 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% - be	low 59%			Improvement			
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% - be	low 47%		Pric	rity Improvement			
-	• below 37.5%	• below 37%		Turnaround							
hool plan type as	signments										
	Plan description										
erformance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pe	erformance Plan.	A school may not imple	ment a Priority Improvem	ent and/or Tur	naround Plan	for longer than a co	ombined total of			
provement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an I	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years b	efore the District or Instit	ute is required	to restructur	e or close the schoo	l. The five			
iority Improveme	nt Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school year	s commences on July 1 dι	iring the summ	ner immediate	ely following the fall	in which the			
urnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Tu	Irnaround Plan.	school is notified that it	is required to implement	a Priority Impr	ovement or T	urnaround Plan.				

al. Middle Cab

Reference

Comparison Data

Academic Achievement

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.