School Performance Framework 2012

School: NEVIN PLATT MIDDLE SCHOOL - 6224

Performance

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 score ranges below to determine the plan type.

Test	Framework Points Earned	Plan Assignment
	at or above 59%	Performance
тот	at or above 47% - below 59%	Improvement
	at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement
² Scho	below 37%	Turnaround

				• •
Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
Academic Achievement	Exceeds	100.0%	(25.0 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Meets	83.3%	(41.7 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	66.7%	(16.7 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate			
TOTAL		83.4%	(83.4 out of 100 points)	

²Schools 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.

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.

SCHOOLVIew.org

Test Participation Rates

Improving

Academic

Achievement

	% of Students Tested					Participation Rating				Studen	ts Tested		Total Students				
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	
Reading	-	98.8%	-	98.8%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	492	-	492	-	498	-	498	
Mathematics	-	99.2%	-	99.2%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	494	-	494	-	498	-	498	
Writing	-	98.8%	-	98.8%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	492	-	492	-	498	-	498	
Science	-	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	179	-	179	-	179	-	179	
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Level: N

¹ Data in this report is based on results from: 2011-12

Performance Indicators							Leve	el: Middle Schoo
School: NEVIN PLATT MIDDLE SCI	HOOL						District: BOULDER VALLEY	RE 2 - 0480 (1 Yeai
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	486	91.77	95	
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	488	83.61	95	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	486	82.1	92	
Science	4	4		Exceeds	175	82.86	96	
Total	16	16	100%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4	701 011113	Meets	468	50	14	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	408	62	37	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	468	57	32	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	10	12	83.3%	Meets	11 120			
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N .	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	40	57	25	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	75	54	17	Yes
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	22	28	41	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	34	35	57	No
Mathematics	14	16	87.5%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	42	71	62	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	75	62	46	Yes
Students with Disabilities	3	4		Meets	22	57	79	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	69	69	83	No
Writing	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	40	49	47	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	75	58	39	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	22	49	70	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	72	54	70	No
Total	32	48	66.7%	Meets				

coring Guide										Level: N
coring Guide for	Performance	e Indicators on the School Performance Fran	nework Report							
erformance Indi	cator Scoring	Guide	·			Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Lev	elFramework Poin
	The scho	ol's percentage of students scoring proficient or adv	vanced was:			5				
		above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200				Exceeds	I .	4	16	
Academic	• belo	w the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th perc	entile of all schools (using 2009-10) baseline).	Meets	3		(4 for each	25	
Achievemen	t • belo	w the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th perc	entile of all schools (using 2009-10	0 baseline).		Approaching		2	content area)	
	• belo	w the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 l	paseline).			Does Not Meet			1 1	
		nool meets the median adequate student growth pe	•	owth percentile was:			TCAP	CELA		
	• at or	above 60.		·		Exceeds	4	2	14	
	• belo	w 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each	
	• belo	w 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching	2	1	content area	
Academic	• belo	w 30.				Does Not Meet	1	0.5	and 2 for	50
Growth	If the sch	nool does not meet the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its median stu	vas:		TCAP	CELA	English		
	• at or	above 70.	•		1	Exceeds	4	2	language	
	• belo	w 70 but at or above 55.				Meets	3	1.5	proficiency)	
	• belo	w 55 but at or above 40.				Approaching	2	1		
	• belo	w 40.				Does Not Meet	1	0.5	-	
	If the stu	dent subgroup meets the median adequate student	growth percentile and its median	student growth percentile	e was:					
	• at or	above 60.		Exceeds		4				
	• belo	w 60 but at or above 45.			Meets		3			
	• belo	w 45 but at or above 30.				Approaching		2	60	
Academic	• belo	w 30.				Does Not Meet	1	(4 for each of 5		
Growth Gaps	s If the stu	dent subgroup does not meet the median adequate	student growth percentile and its	median student growth p	percentile was:				subgroups in 3	25
-	• at or	above 70.		Exceeds	I .	4	subject areas)			
	• belo	w 70 but at or above 55.			Meets		3	1		
	• belo	w 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching		2	-			
	• belo	w 40.				Does Not Meet		1	-	
-Points for eac	ch performan	ice indicator		Cut-Points for plan	type assign	ment				
	Cut Point: Tl	ne school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point: T	he school ear	rned	of the	total Framework points elig	ible.
chievement;	 at or abov 	e 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or abov	/e 59%				Performance
rowth; Gaps	 at or abov 	e 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or abov	/e 47% - below	59%			Improvement
	 at or abov 	e 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or abov	/e 37% - below	47%			Priority Improvemen
below 37.5% Does Not Meet					• below 379	%			Turnaround	
ool plan type	assignments									
		Plan description								
formance Plar	ו <u>ו</u>	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pe	rformance Plan.	A school may not implem	nent a Priority	Improvement a	and/or T	urnarou	ind Plan for longer than a combi	ned total of
provement Pla	n	The school is required to adopt and implement an li	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years be	efore the Distri	ct or Institute is	s require	ed to res	structure or close the school. The	e five
ority Improver	nent Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years	commences c	n July 1 during	the sum	nmer im	mediately following the fall in w	hich 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.

Reference

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 small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count. Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) 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 and plan assignment. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available.

· · ·

. .

Reference Data for Key Performance Indicators

Academic Achievement

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)														
The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's		Reading			Math			Writing						
proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or		Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	
advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.	N of Schools	1008	479	327	1007	480	327	1007	480	327	912	407	286	
	15th percentile	49.18	50.44	54.92	48.60	29.72	15.97	32.48	34.95	30.96	19.67	23.85	27.50	
	50th percentile	71.65	71.43	73.33	70.89	52.48	33.52	53.52	57.77	50.00	47.53	48.00	50.00	
Escritura.	90th percentile	89.10	88.24	87.23	89.34	75.00	54.79	76.83	79.67	72.24	75.96	75.11	72.41	
	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregate (2008-10 baseline)													
All achievement data is compared to baselines from the first			Reading		Math			Writing						
year the performance framework reports were released (2009-10 for 1-year reports and 2008-10 for 3-year reports).		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	50.00	50.56	53.34	48.73	29.69	13.49	32.56	36.84	30.00	20.46	25.00	27.93	

71.35

87.40

72.21

86.17

70.11

87.48

51.53

74.41

30.53

52.19

54.84

76.51

58.34

79.17

49.57

71.00

48.72

71.26

45.36

72.65

50.00

71.45

Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

The Academic Growth Indicator measures academic progress using the Colorado Growth Model. This Indicator reflects 1) normative (median) growth: how the academic progress of the students in this school compared to that of other students statewide with a similar content proficiency (CSAP/TCAP) score history or a similar English language proficiency (CELApro) score history, and 2) criterion-referenced (adequate) growth: whether this level of growth was sufficient for the typical (median) student in the school to reach or maintain a specified level of proficiency within a given length of time. For CSAP/TCAP, students are expected to score proficient or advanced within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. Students classified as English learners are expected to reach the next level of language proficiency on CELApro in either 1 or 2 years, depending upon the proficiency target.

72.05

88.21

50th percentile

90th percentile



The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator measures the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups and students needing to catch up. It disaggregates the Growth Indicator into student groups, and reflects their normative and adequate growth. The student groups include students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English learners, and students needing to catch up.

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.