School Performance Framework 2011

School: MOUNT VIEW CORE KNOWLEDGE CHARTER SCHOOL - 6752

District: CANON CITY RE-1 - 1140 (3 Year***)

Level: All Levels

Performance 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	% of Points	s Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Academic Achievement	Meets	75.0%	(18.8 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	83.3%	(41.7 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	71.7%	(17.9 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation**	95% Participation Rate Met			
TOTAL		78.4%	(78.4 out of 100 points)	
* Schools may not be eligible for all are not negatively impacted.	possible points on an indicator due to insu	fficient counts of	students. In these cases, the points are remo	oved from both the points earned and the points eligible, so scores

** 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

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 Indicat	ors						Level: Ele	ementary Scho
School: MOUNT VIE	W CORE KNOW	LEDGE CHART	ER SCHO	OL				(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	235	78.3%	65	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	235	71.9%	54	
Writing	3	4		Meets	235	64.3%	69	
Science	3	4		Meets	77	48.0%	53	
Total	12	16	75%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	150	48	27	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	150	50	50	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	150	55	38	Yes
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	8	12	66.7%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	32	34	30	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	20	53	20	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	p 3	4		Meets	33	55	58	No
Mathematics	6	12	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	32	45	51	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	20	47	52	No
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch u	p 2	4		Approaching	40	49	70	No
Writing	10	12	83.3%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	32	48	44	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	20	50	36	Yes
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	p 4	4		Exceeds	60	70	57	Yes
Total	24	36	66.7%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Tester	d	Rc	iting		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Particip	ation Rate Met		238	238	
Mathematics	100.0%		95% Particip	ation Rate Met		238	238	
Writing	100.0%		95% Particip	ation Rate Met		238	238	
Science	100.0%		95% Particip	ation Rate Met		78	78	

Counts and ratings are not reported for metrics when the district/school does not meet the minimum student counts required for reportable data.

Performance Indicato	ors						Leve	I: Middle Scho
School: MOUNT VIE	W CORE KNOW	LEDGE CHART	ER SCHOO	CL				(3 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	-
Reading	3	4		Meets	208	86.1%	86	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	208	62.5%	73	
Writing	3	4		Meets	208	75.0%	85	
Science	3	4		Meets	62	67.7%	84	
Total	12	16	75%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	200	64	19	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	200	57	63	No
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	200	62	34	Yes
Total	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	8	8	100%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	50	66	26	Yes
Minority Students	0	0		-	N<20	_		-
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-		-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	29	65	59	Yes
Mathematics	5	8	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	50	55	64	No
Minority Students	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	67	48	84	No
Writing	6	8	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	50	56	44	Yes
Minority Students	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students w/ Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	53	57	71	No
Total	19	24	79.2%	Meets				
Test Participation	% of Students Teste	d	Rat	ting		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	100.0%		95% Participa	tion Rate Met		211	211	
Mathematics	100.0%		· · · · ·	tion Rate Met		211	211	
Writing	100.0%		95% Participa	tion Rate Met		211	211	
Science	100.0%		95% Participa	tion Rate Met		63	63	

Counts and ratings are not reported for metrics when the district/school does not meet the minimum student counts required for reportable data.

rformance Indica	ntorScoring Guide				Rating	Point Value	Total Possible	Framework Poin				
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or	advanced was:										
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools using 2	010 (1-year SPF) or 2008-10	baseline (3-year SPF).		Exceeds	4	16					
Academic	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th p	ercentile of all schools using	g 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 p	ercentile of all schools using	g 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 (2	1-year SPF) or 2008-10 base	line (3-year SPF).		Does Not Mee	t 1						
	If the school meets the median adequate student growth	percentile and its median s	tudent growth percentile	was:			l l					
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4	l l					
	 below 60 but at or above 45. 		Meets	3	l							
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 		Approaching	2	12							
Academic	• below 30.		Does Not Mee	t 1	(4 for each	50						
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate studen	t growth percentile and its n	nedian student growth p	ercentile was:			content area)					
	• at or above 70.											
	 below 70 but at or above 55. 	Meets	3	l								
	 below 55 but at or above 40. 				Approaching	2						
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1						
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate stua	lent growth percentile and in	ts student growth percer	tile was:			4					
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4	4					
	below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3	4					
	below 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching	2	60					
Academic	• below 30.				Does Not Meet 1		(5 for each subgrou	ρ				
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequ	late student growth percent	ile 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	3	4					
	below 55 but at or above 40.			Α			4					
	• below 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1						
t-Points for each	performance indicator		Cut-Points for pla	n type assignment								
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on this	Indicator.		Cut Point: The school ea	arned of the t	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 Framewor	k • at or above 47% - be	elow 59%			Improvement				
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% - be	elow 47%		Pric	ority Improvement				
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%				Turnaround				
ool plan type as	signments											
	Plan description											
rformance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pe	erformance Plan.	A school may not impl	ement a Priority Improvem	ent and/or Turr	naround Plan	for longer than a co	mbined total of				
provement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an I	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years	before the District or Instit	ute is required t	to restructure	e or close the school	. The five				
	ent Plan The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iarity Improvement Dlan	consecutive school yea				1. 6.11					

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.