

Performance

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible ²		
Academic Achievement	Approaching	46.9%	(11.7 out of 25 points)	<div style="width: 46.9%; height: 10px; background-color: black;"></div>
Academic Growth	Meets	67.9%	(34.0 out of 50 points)	<div style="width: 67.9%; height: 10px; background-color: black;"></div>
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	62.5%	(15.6 out of 25 points)	<div style="width: 62.5%; height: 10px; background-color: black;"></div>
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate			
TOTAL		61.3%	(61.3 out of 100 points)	<div style="width: 61.3%; height: 10px; background-color: black;"></div>

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
Performance	at or above 59%
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%
Turnaround	below 37%

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.

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.

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

Content Area	% of Students Tested				Participation Rating				Students Tested				Total Students			
	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	147	106	-	253	147	106	-	253
Mathematics	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	147	106	-	253	147	106	-	253
Writing	99.3%	100.0%	-	99.6%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	146	106	-	252	147	106	-	253
Science	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	47	22	-	69	47	22	-	69
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

¹ Data in this report is based on results from: 2011-12

Final plan type based on: 1 Year SPF report.

Performance Indicators

Level: Elementary School

School: AXL ACADEMY

District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J - 0180 (1 Year)

<i>Academic Achievement</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>	<i>School's Percentile</i>
Reading	2	4		Approaching	145	60	26
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	145	44.83	11
Writing	2	4		Approaching	144	37.5	22
Science	2	4		Approaching	46	26.09	21
Total	7	16	43.8%	Approaching			

<i>Academic Growth</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
Reading	3	4		Meets	88	51	40	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	88	42	64	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	87	40	54	No
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	2	2		Exceeds	45	72	49	Yes
Total	9	14	64.3%	Meets				

<i>Academic Growth Gaps</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Subgroup N</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
Reading	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	59	46	45	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	58	49	48	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	22	49	58	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	37	49	67	No
Mathematics	7	16	43.8%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	59	40	65	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	58	40	73	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	22	35	77	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	47	41	83	No
Writing	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	59	36	60	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	58	42	60	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	22	38	59	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	53	35	69	No
Total	22	48	45.8%	Approaching				

Counts and ratings are not reported for metrics when the school does not meet the minimum student counts required for reportable data.

Performance Indicators

Level: Middle School

School: AXL ACADEMY

District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J - 0180 (1 Year)

<i>Academic Achievement</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>	<i>School's Percentile</i>
Reading	2	4		Approaching	104	61.54	26
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	104	27.88	13
Writing	2	4		Approaching	104	47.12	27
Science	3	4		Meets	22	50	52
Total	8	16	50%	Approaching			

<i>Academic Growth</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	99	70	50	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	99	53	88	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	99	67	71	No
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	1	2		Approaching	21	40	59	No
Total	10	14	71.4%	Meets				

<i>Academic Growth Gaps</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Subgroup N</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
Reading	16	16	100%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	55	71	52	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	72	71	55	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	29	65	59	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	51	73	67	Yes
Mathematics	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	55	50	88	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	72	49	91	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	29	47	94	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	68	49	95	No
Writing	14	16	87.5%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	55	61	71	No
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	72	71	76	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	29	71	80	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	67	68	80	No
Total	38	48	79.2%	Meets				

Counts and ratings are not reported for metrics when the school does not meet the minimum student counts required for reportable data.

Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report

Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide	Rating	Point Value	Total Possible per EMH Level	Framework Points	
Academic Achievement	<i>The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:</i>					
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Exceeds	4	16 (4 for each content area)	25	
	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets	3			
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching	2			
	• below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Does Not Meet	1			
Academic Growth	<i>If the school meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</i>		TCAP	CELA	14 (4 for each content area and 2 for English language proficiency)	50
	• at or above 60.	Exceeds	4	2		
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	Meets	3	1.5		
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	Approaching	2	1		
	• below 30.	Does Not Meet	1	0.5		
	<i>If the school does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</i>		TCAP	CELA		
	• at or above 70.	Exceeds	4	2		
	• below 70 but at or above 55.	Meets	3	1.5		
	• below 55 but at or above 40.	Approaching	2	1		
	• below 40.	Does Not Meet	1	0.5		
Academic Growth Gaps	<i>If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</i>				60 (4 for each of 5 subgroups in 3 subject areas)	25
	• at or above 60.	Exceeds	4			
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	Meets	3			
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	Approaching	2			
	• below 30.	Does Not Meet	1			
	<i>If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</i>					
	• at or above 70.	Exceeds	4			
	• below 70 but at or above 55.	Meets	3			
	• below 55 but at or above 40.	Approaching	2			
	• below 40.	Does Not Meet	1			

Cut-Points for each performance indicator			Cut-Points for plan type assignment		
Achievement; Growth; Gaps	Cut Point: The school earned ... of the points eligible on this Indicator.	Total Framework Points	Cut Point: The school earned ... of the total Framework points eligible.	Total Framework Points	Plan Type
Achievement; Growth; Gaps	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds	• at or above 59%	Performance	Performance
	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	• at or above 47% - below 59%	Improvement	Improvement
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	• at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement	Priority Improvement
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet	• below 37%	Turnaround	Turnaround

School plan type assignments		
Plan description	Plan description	Plan description
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.	A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five 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.
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.	
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement 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

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or 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.

All achievement data is compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released (2009-10 for 1-year reports and 2008-10 for 3-year reports).

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
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
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)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	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
50th percentile	72.05	71.35	72.21	70.11	51.53	30.53	54.84	58.34	49.57	45.36	48.72	50.00
90th percentile	88.21	87.40	86.17	87.48	74.41	52.19	76.51	79.17	71.00	72.65	71.26	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.



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.