School Performance Framework 2012

School: BATTLE ROCK CHARTER SCHOOL - 0609

District: MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1 - 2035 (1 Year¹)

Level: E

						-
100	0	20	10	100	en	
			VE		en	
		-			U	

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.

lest	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	-	-	(0.0 out of 0 points)	I
Academic Growth	-	-	(0.0 out of 0 points)	I
Academic Growth Gaps	-	-	(0.0 out of 0 points)	I
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate	2		

9%			
9%	TOTAL	-	(0.0 out of 0 points)
7%			
70/	² Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator d	ue to insuf	fficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from

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

both the points earned and the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted. ³Schools 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 individual content area rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

Test Participation Rates

	% of Students Tested			Participation Rating			Students 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%	Meets	-	-	Meets	20	-	-	20	20	-	-	20
Mathematics	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-	19	-	-	19	19	-	-	19
Writing	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-	19	-	-	19	19	-	-	19
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4	4	-	-	4
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

School: BATTLE ROCK CHARTER S							District: MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ F	
			a	- <i></i>				(E-1 - 2035 (1 fea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	J	% 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		-	N<16	-		
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)	0	0		-	N<20	-	_	-
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?
						Percentile	Percentile	Growing
Reading	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			-
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	%	-				

SPF 2012 - 2035 - 0609

Scoring Guide										Level:	
Scoring Guide for	Performance	e Indicators on the School Performance Fran	nework Report								
Performance Indi			-			Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Lev	el Framework Point	
-	The scho	ol's percentage of students scoring proficient or ad	anced was:								
	• at or	above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200	9-10 baseline).	Exceeds		4	16				
Academic	• belo	w the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th perc	entile of all schools (using 2009-1	0 baseline).		Meets		3	(4 for each		
Achievemen	• belo	w the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th perc	entile of all schools (using 2009-1	Approaching	2		content area)				
	• belo	w the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10	paseline).	Does Not Meet		1	1				
	If the sch	nool meets the median adequate student growth pe	rcentile and its median student gr		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		
Growth	If the sch	nool does not meet the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its median st	udent growth percentile w	/as:		TCAP	CELA	English		
	• at or	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			
	If the stu	ident subgroup meets the median adequate student									
	• 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	t 1		(4 for each of 5		
Growth Gap	i If the stu	ident subgroup does not meet the median adequate	student growth percentile and its				subgroups in 3				
	• at or	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	w 40.				Does Not Meet		1			
ut-Points for eac	h performar	nce indicator		Cut-Points for plar	type assign	ment					
	Cut Point: T	he school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point:	The school ear	rned	of the	total Framework points elig	gible.	
Achievement;	 at or abov 	e 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 	e 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	at or abc	ove 37% - below	47%			Priority Improvement	
	below 37.5% Does Not Meet			7%				Turnaround			
hool plan type	assignments										
		Plan description									
erformance Plan		The school is required to adopt and implement a Pe	rformance Plan.	A school may not impler	nd Plan for longer than a combi	ned total of					
nprovement 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							
riority Improver	nent Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school year	s commences	on July 1 during	the sum	nmer im	mediately following the fall in w	hich 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 results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading,	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
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 Stude	nts Profi	cient or A	Advanced	d by Pero	centile Cu	t-Points	- 3-year	aggrega	te (2008 [.]	10 base	line)	
All achievement data is compared to baselines from the first		Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
year the performance framework reports were released		Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
(2009-10 for 1-year reports and 2008-10 for 3-year reports).	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.