Level: Elementary School

District: WESTMINSTER 50 - 0070 (3 Year***)

School: CLARA E. METZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 1622

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 Earne
Performance	at or above 599
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 599
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 479
Turnaround	below 379

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	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	37.5%	(9.4 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	50.0%	(12.5 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		51.1%	(51.1 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 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.





^{**} 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).

Danfa In diast							Lavala El	Cab a a
Performance Indicat School: CLARA E. M		Y SCHOOL - 1	622				Level: Ele	mentary Schoo ****(3 Year
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible		Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	(5 1 ca.
Reading	1	4	70 1 011110	Does Not Meet	584	47.1%	12	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	583	52.5%	18	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	583	29.8%	11	
Science	2	4		Approaching	194	24.7%	18	
Total	6	16	37.5%	Approaching			-	
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	374	44	47	No
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	376	55	59	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	374	44	55	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	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	299	46	49	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	327	44	49	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	26	48	74	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	200	49	50	No
Students needing to catch u	p 2	4		Approaching	201	54	66	No
Mathematics	11	20	55%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	302	56	59	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	329	54	59	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	26	42	84	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	205	53	60	No
Students needing to catch u	p 2	4		Approaching	170	40	74	No
Writing	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	299	42	56	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	327	43	57	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	26	39	84	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	200	45	59	No
Students needing to catch u	p 2	4		Approaching	277	44	63	No
Total	30	60	50%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	d		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.5%			95% Participation	Rate Met	631	634	
Mathematics	99.8%			95% Participation	Rate Met	631	632	
Writing	99.7%			95% Participation	Rate Met	631	633	
Science	99.5%			95% Participation	Rate Met	212	213	

Scoring Guide				Level: Eler	mentary Schoo
Scoring Guide for Pe	rformance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report				
Performance Indicat	or <mark>Scoring Guide</mark>	Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Point
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:				
	at or above the 90th percentile of all schools using 2010 (1-year SPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year SPF).	Exceeds	4	16	
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 SPF)	Meets	3	(4 for each	25
Achievement	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools using 2010 (1-year SPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year SPF)	Approaching	2	content area)	
	below the 15th percentile of all schools using 2010 (1-year SPF) or 2008-10 baseline (3-year SPF).	Does Not Mee	1		
	If the school meets the median adequate student growth 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 Mee	1	(4 for each	50
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth 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 Mee	1		
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its 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	60	
Academic	• below 30.	Does Not Mee	1	(5 for each subgroup	
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its student growth percentile was:			group in 3 content	25
	• at or above 70.	Exceeds	4	areas)	
	below 70 but at or above 55.	Meets	3		

	Cut Point	: The school earned of the points eligible on th	s Indicator.		Cut Point: The school earned of the total Framework 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 59%	Improvement				
• at or		above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement				
• below 3		v 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%	Turnaround				
School plan type a	assignmen	nts								
		Plan description								
Performance Plan	1	The school is required to adopt and implement a	Performance Plan.	A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of						
Improvement Plan	n	The school is required to adopt and implement ar	Improvement Plan.	five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five						
Priority Improvem	nent 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						
Turnaround Plan		The school is required to adopt and implement a	Turnaround Plan.	school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.						

Cut-Points for plan type assignment

• below 55 but at or above 40.

• below 40.

Cut-Points for each performance indicator

Does Not Meet

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 Elem Middle High			Math			Writing			Science		
				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.