School Performance Framework 2012

School: CANON CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL - 1262

Improvement

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	re
Performance	at or above 59%	
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	тс
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	
Turnaround	below 37%	² Sc

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
Academic Achievement	Meets	62.5%	(15.6 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	50.0%	(25.0 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	45.8%	(11.5 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate			
TOTAL		52.1%	(52.1 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.

Test Participation Rates

Improving

Academic

Achievement

SCHOOLVIew.org

	% of Students Tested					Participation Rating				Studen		Total Students				
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	-	99.5%	-	99.5%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	1270	-	1270	-	1276	-	1276
Mathematics	-	99.6%	-	99.6%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	1271	-	1271	-	1276	-	1276
Writing	-	99.5%	-	99.5%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	1270	-	1270	-	1276	-	1276
Science	-	99.1%	-	99.1%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	455	-	455	-	459	-	459
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Performance Indicators							Leve	el: Middle School
School: CANON CITY MIDDLE SCH	IOOL						District: CANON CITY	RE-1 - 1140 (3 Year)
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	1208	71.77	50	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	1209	52.03	50	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1208	55.96	43	
Science	2	4		Approaching	434	43.78	39	
Total	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
	3	4	78 F UIIILS	Meets	1152	46	28	
Reading Mathematics	<u> </u>	4		Does Not Meet	1152	39	64	Yes No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1152	44	48	NO
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	0	0		Approaching	N<20	- 44	-	-
Total	6	12	50%	Approaching	11<20		-	-
	•							
					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	2	4		Approaching	528	44	34	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	138	44	30	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	130	53	73	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	290	48	65	No
Mathematics	6	16	37.5%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	528	37	71	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	137	39	66	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	128	41	99	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	438	42	92	No
Writing	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	527	44	53	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	138	45	52	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	128	49	91	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	453	45	78	No
Total	22	48	45.8%	Approaching				

coring Guide										Level:
coring Guide for	Performanc	e Indicators on the School Performance Fran	nework Report							
erformance Indi	cator Scoring	n Guide				Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Lev	elFramework Poi
		, pol's percentage of students scoring proficient or ad	vanced was:			1 9			·	
		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 2009-1	0 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 2009-1	0 baseline).		Approaching		2	content area)	
		w the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10		Does Not Meet		1				
		hool meets the median adequate student growth pe		owth 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	1	0.5	and 2 for	50
Growth	lf the sci	hool does not meet the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its median st	udent growth percentile w	vas:		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	w 40.	Does Not Meet	1	0.5					
	lf the stu	udent subgroup meets the median adequate studen	t growth percentile and its mediar	n student growth percentil	e was:					
	• at o	r 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	ow 30.				Does Not Meet		1	(4 for each of 5	
Growth Gap	s If the stu	udent subgroup does not meet the median adequate	e student growth percentile and its	s median student growth p	percentile wa	s:			subgroups in 3	25
	• at o	r above 70.		Exceeds		4	subject areas)			
	• belo	w 70 but at or above 55.		Meets		3				
	• belo	w 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching		2				
	• belo	ow 40.			Does Not Meet		1			
t-Points for eac	h performa	nce indicator		Cut-Points for plan	type assig	nment				
	Cut Point: T	he school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point:	The school ea	rned	of the	total Framework points elig	ible.
Achievement;	 at or abov 	ve 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or abo	ove 59%				Performance
Growth; Gaps	• at or abov	/e 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or abo	ove 47% - below	59%			Improvement
· ·	 at or abov 	ve 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or abo	ove 37% - below	47%			Priority Improvem
below 37.5% Does Not f		Does Not Meet		• below 3	37%				Turnaround	
hool plan type	assignments									
		Plan description								
rformance Plan	ı	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pe	erformance Plan.	A school may not impler	nent a Priorit	y Improvement a	and/or T	urnarou	Ind Plan for longer than a combir	ned total of
provement Pla	n	The school is required to adopt and implement an I	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years be	efore the Dist	rict or Institute i	s require	ed to re	structure or close the school. The	e five
iority Improver	nent Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years	s commences	on July 1 during	the sum	nmer im	mediately following the fall in wl	nich the
		,				, 0			, ,	

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	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

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.

58.34

79.17

49.57

71.00

45.36

72.65

48.72

71.26

50.00

71.45

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.