School Performance Framework 2012

School: EAGLEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 2361

District: ADAMS 12 FIVE STAR SCHOOLS - 0020 (3 Year¹)

Level: E

_	~		
Doi	rtor	mar	
ГСІ		iiiai	ILE

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement. Schools are assigned a plan based on their **A** 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 **A** matched to the score ranges below to determine the plan type.

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

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan % of Points Earned out of Points Eligible ²									
Academic Achievement	Meets	75.0%	(18.8 out of 25 points)							
Academic Growth	Meets	75.0%	(37.5 out of 50 points)							
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	70.0%	(17.5 out of 25 points)							
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate									
TOTAL		73.8%	(73.8 out of 100 points)							

pols 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 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) 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.

	% 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	99.6%	-	-	99.6%	Meets	-	-	Meets	932	-	-	932	936	-	-	936
Mathematics	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	934	-	-	934	937	-	-	937
Writing	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	933	-	-	933	936	-	-	936
Science	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	320	-	-	320	321	-	-	321
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Performance Indicators							Level: Ele	ementary Scho
School: EAGLEVIEW ELEMENTARY	Y SCHOOL					Di	strict: ADAMS 12 FIVE STAR SCHOO	DLS - 0020 (3 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	918	76.47	61	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	920	83.91	82	
Writing	3	4		Meets	920	60.54	60	
Science	3	4		Meets	316	56.96	68	
Total	12	16	75%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	604	56	28	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	603	58	38	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	603	49	37	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	1.5	2		Meets	75	47	43	Yes
Total	10.5	14	75%	Meets				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth		Made Adequat
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	14	20	70%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	121	49	35	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	181	54	32	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	50	43	69	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	41	44	35	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	139	60	60	Yes
Mathematics	15	20	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	120	46	49	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	181	56	47	Yes
Students with Disabilities	3	4		Meets	49	58	80	No
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	41	62	57	Yes
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	102	61	77	No
Writing	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	120	45	45	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	181	49	39	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	49	42	75	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	41	56	45	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	235	47	58	No
Total	42	60	70%	Meets				

coring Guide										Level:	
coring Guide for	Performanc	e Indicators on the School Performance Fran	nework Report				_	_			
erformance Indi	cator Scoring	g Guide				Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Leve	el Framework Poir	
	The sch	ool's percentage of students scoring proficient or ad	vanced was:			. –			- -		
	• at o	r above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200	9-10 baseline).			Exceeds		4	16		
Academic	• belo	ow the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th perc	centile of all schools (using 2009-1	10 baseline).		Meets	3		(4 for each	25	
Achievement	t • belo	ow the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th perc	centile of all schools (using 2009-1	Approaching		2	content area)				
	• belo	ow the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10	baseline).	Does Not Meet		1					
	If the sc	hool meets the median adequate student growth pe	rcentile and its median student g		TCAP	CELA					
	• at o	r above 60.		Exceeds	4	2	14				
	• belo	ow 60 but at or above 45.		Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each				
	• belo	ow 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	If the sc	hool does not meet the median adequate student gr	rowth percentile and its median st	tudent growth percentile w	vth percentile was:			CELA	English		
	• at o	r above 70.				Exceeds	4	2	language		
	• belo	ow 70 but at or above 55.				Meets	3	1.5	proficiency)		
	• belo	ow 55 but at or above 40.			Approaching	2	1				
	• belo	ow 40.				Does Not Meet	1	0.5			
	If the st	udent subgroup meets the median adequate studen									
	• at o	r above 60.		Exceeds		4					
	• belo	ow 60 but at or above 45.		Meets		3					
	• belo	ow 45 but at or above 30.			Approaching		2	60			
Academic	• belo	ow 30.				Does Not Meet		1	(4 for each of 5		
Growth Gaps	s If the st	udent subgroup does not meet the median adequate	e student growth percentile and it	:			subgroups in 3	25			
	• at o	r above 70.			Exceeds 4			subject areas)			
	• belo	ow 70 but at or above 55.			Meets		3				
	• belo	ow 55 but at or above 40.			Approaching		2				
	• belo	ow 40.		Does Not Meet		1					
Points for eac	ch performa	nce indicator		Cut-Points for plan	type assign	ment					
	Cut Point: T	he school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point: T	he school ea	rned	of the	total Framework points elig	ible.	
chievement;	 at or above 	ve 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or abo	ve 59%				Performance	
rowth; Gaps	• at or abov	ve 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or abo	• at or above 47% - below 59% • at or above 37% - below 47%				Improvement	
	 at or above 	ve 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or abo					Priority Improveme	
	below 37.5% Does Not Meet		Does Not Meet		below 37	%				Turnaround	
ool plan type a	assignments										
		Plan description									
formance Plar	<u>ו</u>	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pe	erformance Plan.	A school may not implem	nent a Priority	Improvement a	and/or T	urnarou	nd Plan for longer than a combir	ed total of	
provement Pla	n	The school is required to adopt and implement an I	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years be	efore the Distr	ict or Institute i	s require	ed to res	structure or close the school. The	five	
ority Improven	nent Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years	commences of	on July 1 during	the sum	nmer im	mediately following the fall in wh	nich 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	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			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

45.36

72.65

48.72

71.26

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.