## School Performance Framework 2012

### School: DELTA ACADEMY OF APPLIED LEARNING - 2152

District: DELTA COUNTY 50(J) - 0870 (1 Year<sup>1</sup>)

Level: EM

<b>D</b>	<b>r</b>		
νor	form	าวท	CD.
		an	

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.

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned	Test Participation <sup>3</sup>
Performance	at or above 59%	
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	TOTAL
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	
Turnaround	below 37%	<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eli

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
Academic Achievement	Exceeds	91.7%	( 22.9 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	-	-	( 0.0 out of 0 points )	1
Academic Growth Gaps	-	-	( 0.0 out of 0 points )	I

-					
	TOTAL		91.6%	( 22.9 out of 25 points )	
	, 0				hese cases, the points are removed from
	both the points earned and the	ne points eligible, so scores are not n	egatively in	ipacted.	

<sup>3</sup>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 content area (reading, writing, math, science and COACT), or (2) for schools serving multiple

levels (elementary, middle and high school grades, e.g., a 6-12 school), meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area when

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.

Improving

Academic

Achievement

SCHOOLVIew.org

#### **Test Participation Rates**

	% of Students Tested F					Participat	Participation Rating Stud				s Tested			Total Students			
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	
Reading	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	-	-	Meets	7	16	-	23	7	16	-	23	
Mathematics	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	-	-	Meets	7	16	-	23	7	16	-	23	
Writing	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	-	-	Meets	7	16	-	23	7	16	-	23	
Science	0.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-	0	6	-	6	0	6	-	6	
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

1

individual content area rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

Meets 95% Participation Rate

Final plan type based on: 3 Year SPF report.

Performance Indicators							Level: El	ementary School
School: DELTA ACADEMY OF APP	LIED LEARNING	ì					District: DELTA COUNTY 5	0(J) - 0870 (1 Year)
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	0	0		-	N<16	-	_	
Mathematics	0	0		-	N<16	-	_	
Writing	0	0		-	N<16	-	- -	
Science	0	0		-				
Total	0	0	%	-				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Mathematics	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Writing	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)				-				
Total	0	0	%	-				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	0	0	%	-		<i>r ercentile</i>		Growth:
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0	/0	-	N<20	-		<u>-</u>
Minority Students	0	0			N<20	-		<u> </u>
Students with Disabilities	0	0		_	N<20	-		<u> </u>
English Learners	0	0		_	N<20	-	_	
Students needing to catch up	0	0		-	N<20	-	_	
Mathematics	0	0	%	-				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0	<i>,</i> ,,		N<20		-	-
Minority Students	0	0		-	N<20	-		_
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	_		-
Students needing to catch up	0	0		-	N<20	-	_	-
Writing	0	0	%	-				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		-	N<20		· _	-
Minority Students	0	0		-	N<20	_		-
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-		-
Students needing to catch up	0	0		-	N<20	-	_	-
Total	0	0	%	-				

Performance Indicators							Leve	l: Middle Schoo
School: DELTA ACADEMY OF A	APPLIED LEARNING	ì					District: DELTA COUNTY 5	0(J) - 0870 (1 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	16	81.25	73	
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	16	87.5	96	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	16	87.5	96	
Science	0	0		-	N<16	-	-	
Total	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Mathematics	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Writing	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Language Proficiency (CELA	oro)			-				
Total	0	0	%	-				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	0	0	%	-				Growth
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0	70	_	N<20	-		
Minority Students	0	0			N<20			
Students with Disabilities	0	0			N<20			
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20		_	-
Students needing to catch up	0	0		-	N<20	-	_	-
Mathematics	0	0	%	-				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Minority Students	0	0		-	N<20	-	_	_
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20		_	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
Students needing to catch up	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Writing	0	0	%	-				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Minority Students	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	0	0	%	-				

Scoring Guide									Level: EN				
Scoring Guide for	Performance Indicators on the School Performance I	Framework Report											
Performance Indi	catorScoring Guide				Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Leve	Framework Point				
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient o	r advanced was:											
	<ul> <li>at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using</li> </ul>	2009-10 baseline).			Exceeds		4	16					
Academic	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th	percentile of all schools (using 2009-	-10 baseline).		Meets		3	(4 for each	25				
Achievement	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th	percentile of all schools (using 2009-	Approaching		2	content area)							
	below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009	-10 baseline).		1									
	If the school meets the median adequate student growt	w the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline). Does Not Meet hool meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:											
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds	4	2	14					
	• below 60 but at or above 45.				Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each					
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>			А	Approaching	2	1	content area					
Academic	• below 30.			Do	oes Not Meet	1	0.5	and 2 for					
Growth	If the school does not meet the median adequate stude	nt growth percentile and its median s	student growth percentile w	/as:		TCAP	CELA	English					
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4	2	language					
	below 70 but at or above 55.				Meets	3	1.5	proficiency)					
	below 55 but at or above 40.			Α	Approaching	2	1						
	• below 40.			Do	oes Not Meet	1	0.5						
	If the student subgroup meets the median adequate stu	dent growth percentile and its media	an student growth percentile	le was:									
	• at or above 60.				Exceeds		4						
	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>				Meets		3						
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>			A	Approaching		2	60					
Academic	• below 30.			Do	oes Not Meet		1	(4 for each of 5					
Growth Gaps	If the student subgroup does not meet the median adeq	uate student growth percentile and	its median student growth p	percentile was:				subgroups in 3					
	• at or above 70.				Exceeds	4 subject ar		subject areas)					
	• below 70 but at or above 55.				Meets		3						
	• below 55 but at or above 40.			A	Approaching		2						
	• below 40.			Do	oes Not Meet		1						
Cut-Points for eac	h performance indicator		Cut-Points for plan	type assignme	ent								
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible	on this Indicator.				rned	of the t	total Framework points eligi	ole.				
Achievement:	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds		at or above					Performance				
Growth; Gaps	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or above		59%			Improvement				
Crown, Caps	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Points	• at or above				P	riority Improvement					
	• below 37.5%		• below 37%				Turnaround						
School plan type a		Does Not Meet											
	Plan description												
Performance Plar		a Performance Plan.	A school may not implem	nent a Priority Im	nprovement a	nd/or T	urnarou	nd Plan for longer than a combine	ed total of				
Improvement Pla	· · · ·				•			tructure or close the school. The					
Priority Improven						•							
		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.

C ....

Turnaround Plan

The school is required to adopt and implement a 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 Stude	nts Profi	cient or A	Advanced	d by Pero	centile Cu	t-Points	- 3-year	aggrega	te (2008 <sup>.</sup>	10 base	line)	
All achievement data is compared to baselines from the first			Reading			Math			Writing			Science	
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.