Level: Elementary School

District: ENGLEWOOD 1 - 0120 (1 Year***)

School: WM E BISHOP ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 9620

Priority 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	43.8%	(11.0 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	41.7%	(20.9 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	41.7%	(10.4 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		42.3%	(42.3 out of 100 points)	payed from both the points exceed and the points eligible so

^{*} 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).

o (' ' ' '								
Performance Indicate School: WM E BISHO		, scuooi - 0c	20				Level: Ele	ementary Schoo
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible		Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	(1 Year***
Reading	1	4	70 FUIILS	Does Not Meet	97	47.4%	13	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	96	49.0%	15	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	98	37.8%	22	
Science	2	4		Approaching	30	20.0%	15	
Total	7	16	43.8%	Approaching	30	20.0%	15	
Total	/	10	43.670	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	50	45	47	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	49	44	62	No
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	50	35	46	No
Total	5	12	41.7%	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	6	12	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	_	Approaching	42	42	47	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	36	40	52	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	24	49	66	No
Mathematics	4	12	33.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4	_	Does Not Meet	41	37	61	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	35	36	70	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	26	46	81	No
Writing	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	42	35	46	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	36	44	51	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	35	48	61	No
Total	15	36	41.7%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%			95% Participation F	Rate Met	105	105	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation F	Rate Met	104	104	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation F	Rate Met	105	105	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation F	Rate Met	32	32	

coring Guide				Level: Eler	mentary Schoo
oring Guide for Per	formance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report				
erformance Indicato	rScoring Guide	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 Meet	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	12	
	below 45 but at or above 30.	Approaching	2		
Academic	• below 30.	Does Not Meet	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 Meet	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 Meet	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

Cut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for plan type assignment								
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on th	is 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 Points	• at or above 47% - below 59%	Improvement						
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching		• at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement						
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%	Turnaround						
School plan type a	chool plan type assignments										

school plan type assignine	
	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.

• at or above 70.

• below 40.

• below 70 but at or above 55.

• below 55 but at or above 40.

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.

Exceeds

Meets

Approaching

Does Not Meet

4

3

2

areas)

Comparison Data

Academic Achievement


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

	Reading Elem Middle High			Math			Writing			Science		
				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.

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.