# School Performance Framework 2012

### School: D C S MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL - 5997

# 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.

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned	Tes
Performance	at or above 59%	
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	то
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	
Turnaround	below 37%	<sup>2</sup> Scł

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan			
Academic Achievement	Exceeds	87.5%	( 21.9 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Approaching	58.3%	( 29.2 out of 50 points )	]
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	55.6%	( 13.9 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation <sup>3</sup>	Meets 95% Participation Rate			
TOTAL		65.0%	( 65.0 out of 100 points )	3

chools 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 <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) of points earned out of points eligible. For schools with 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 data on all indicators, the total points possible are: 25 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 points for Academic Achievement, 50 for Academic individual content area rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

#### **Test Participation Rates**

Growth, and 25 for Academic Growth Gaps.

mproving

Academic

Achievement

SCHOOLVIew.org

	% of Students Tested				Participation Rating					Student	ts Tested		Total Students			
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.8%	-	-	99.8%	Meets	-	-	Meets	501	-	-	501	502	-	-	502
Mathematics	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	501	-	-	501	501	-	-	501
Writing	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	502	-	-	502	502	-	-	502
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	123	-	-	123	123	-	-	123
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Final plan type based on: 1 Year SPF report.

1

Level: E

Performance Indicators							Level: El	ementary Schoo
School: D C S MONTESSORI CHAR	TER SCHOOL						District: DOUGLAS COUNTY F	RE 1 - 0900 (3 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	499	92.18	95	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	499	81.16	77	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	500	76.6	90	
Science	3	4		Meets	122	69.67	87	
Total	14	16	87.5%	Exceeds				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	<b>j</b>	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	332	53	20	Yes
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	332	34	37	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	332	47	31	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
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	9	12	75%	Meets			Growth refeetute	0.0000
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	13/0	Approaching	22	44	18	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	41	49	17	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20		-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20		_	
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	36	68	54	Yes
Mathematics	4	12	33.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	22	26	47	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	41	37	42	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20		-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	50	41	71	No
Writing	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	22	49	37	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	41	39	33	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	78	49	59	No
Total	20	36	55.6%	Approaching				

coring Guide										Level:		
coring Guide for	Performanc	e Indicators on the School Performance Fran	nework Report									
erformance Indi			· ·			Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Le	vel Framework Poir		
<u> </u>	The scho	ool's percentage of students scoring proficient or ad	vanced was:									
		r above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200				Exceeds	4		16			
Academic	• belo	w the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th perc	centile 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	centile of all schools (using 2009-	Approaching		2	content area)					
	• belo	w the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10	baseline).	Does Not Mee	t	1	1					
	If the sci	hool meets the median adequate student growth pe	ercentile and its median student o	growth percentile was:			TCAP	CELA				
	• at o	r 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	ow 30.				Does Not Meet	t 1	0.5	and 2 for	50		
Growth	lf the sci	hool does not meet the median adequate student gr	rowth percentile and its median s		TCAP	CELA	English					
	• at o	r above 70.				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	ow 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1	0.5				
	lf the sti	udent subgroup meets the median adequate studen	l l									
	• at o	r above 60.		Exceeds	4		4					
	• belo	w 60 but at or above 45.		Meets		3						
	• belo	w 45 but at or above 30.			Approaching		2	60				
Academic	• belo	ow 30.			Does Not Meet				(4 for each of 5			
Growth Gaps	s If the stu	udent subgroup does not meet the median adequate	e student growth percentile and i	its median student growth	percentile w	vas:			subgroups in 3	25		
	• at o	r above 70.				Exceeds	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	ow 40.			Does Not Meet	t	1					
-Points for eac	h performa	nce indicator		Cut-Points for pla	n type assi	gnment						
	Cut Point: T	he school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Poin	t: The school ea	rned	of the	total Framework points el	gible.		
chievement;	• at or abov	ve 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or a	above 59%				Performance		
rowth; Gaps	• at or abov	ve 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or a	above 47% - below	59%			Improvement		
	• at or abov	ve 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or a	above 37% - below	47%			Priority Improveme		
below 37.5%     Does Not Meet					<ul> <li>below</li> </ul>	37%			Turnaround			
ool plan type	assignments											
		Plan description										
formance Plar	1	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pe	erformance Plan.	A school may not imple	ment a Prio	rity Improvement	and/or T	urnarou	nd Plan for longer than a comb	ined total of		
provement Pla	n	The school is required to adopt and implement an I	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five								
ority Improver	nent Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school year	rs commenc	es on July 1 during	g the sun	nmer im	mediately following the fall in v	vhich the		

school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.

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	N of Schools	1008	479	327	1007	480	327	1007	480	327	912	407	286
results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading,	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
mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.	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.