School Performance Framework 2011

School: ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 7467

Level: Elementary School District: MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 - 2000 (1 Year***)

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 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	Earned out of Points Eligible*	
Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)	
Approaching	58.3%	(29.2 out of 50 points)	
Approaching	58.3%	(14.6 out of 25 points)	
95% Participation Rate Met			
	50.1%	(50.1 out of 100 points)	
	Does Not Meet Approaching Approaching	Does Not Meet25.0%Approaching58.3%Approaching58.3%OSS Participation Rate Met	Does Not Meet25.0%(6.3 out of 25 points)Approaching58.3%(29.2 out of 50 points)Approaching58.3%(14.6 out of 25 points)B5% Participation Rate MetComparison of the second se

** 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 Indicato	ors						Level: Ele	mentary Schoo
School: ROCKY MOU	NTAIN ELEMEN	TARY SCHOO	L - 7467					(1 Year**
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	•
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	207	44.4%	11	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	207	40.6%	6	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	207	24.2%	7	
Science	1	4		Does Not Meet	66	15.2%	10	
Fotal	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		Approaching	124	50	56	No
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	125	62	72	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	125	52	62	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	109	46	58	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	66	47	56	No
Students w/ Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	22	45	79	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	25	48	61	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	79	54	70	No
Mathematics	15	20	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	110	62	76	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	67	63	79	No
Students w/ Disabilities	3	4		Meets	23	60	88	No
English Language Learners	3	4		Meets	26	65	82	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	83	65	83	No
Writing	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	110	50	64	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	67	50	62	No
Students w/ Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	23	30	84	No
English Language Learners	2	4		Approaching	26	42	70	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	104	55 68		No
Total	35	60	58.3%	Approaching				
Test Participation	% of Students Tested	1		Rating		Students Tested	Total Students	
Reading	99.6%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	231	232	
Mathematics	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	234	234	
Writing	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	231	231	
Science	100.0%			95% Participation Ra	ate Met	78	78	

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						
	 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	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	proaching 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:		25				
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	areas)			
	 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				
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						
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or above 37% - below	Prior	ity Improvement				
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%						
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.