# School Performance Framework 2012

### School: MONTEREY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 6018

District: HARRISON 2 - 0980 (1 Year<sup>1</sup>)

Level: E

-	r		
Por	torm	nance	
I CI		ance	

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.

Improving

Academic

Achievement

SCHOOLVIew.org

#### % of Points Earned out of Points Eligible<sup>2</sup> Performance Indicators Rating/Plan Academic Achievement 50.0% (12.5 out of 25 points) Approaching **Academic Growth** ( 34.0 out of 50 points ) 67.9% Meets **Academic Growth Gaps** 72.9% (18.2 out of 25 points) Meets Test Participation<sup>3</sup> **Meets 95% Participation Rate**

TOTAL	64.7%	( 64.7 out of 100 points )	
<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible p			these cases, the points are removed from
both the points earned and the points eligibl	e, so scores are not negatively im	pacted.	

<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) 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				Student	ts 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	189	-	-	189	189	-	-	189
Mathematics	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	193	-	-	193	193	-	-	193
Writing	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	192	-	-	192	192	-	-	192
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	53	-	-	53	53	-	-	53
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Performance Indicators							Level: E	lementary Schoo
School: MONTEREY ELEMENTARY	SCHOOL						District: HARRISC	ON 2 - 0980 (1 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	169	67.46	40	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	171	62.57	33	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	171	45.61	34	
Science	2	4		Approaching	44	31.82	28	
Total	8	16	50%	Approaching				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	96	59	37	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	97	48	57	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	97	54	49	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	1.5	2		Meets	59	54	42	Yes
Total	9.5	14	67.9%	Meets				
		•			Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	14	16	87.5%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	86	57	37	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	68	56	39	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	23	62	43	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	29	71	70	Yes
Mathematics	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	87	48	57	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	69	49	60	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	24	50	64	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	41	57	77	No
Writing	12	16	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	87	54	51	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	69	55	54	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	24	72	56	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	55	54	65	No
Total	35	48	72.9%	Meets				

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	1	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	g 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		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 Mee	/leet 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	student growth percentile v	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	ow 40.				Does Not Mee	t 1	0.5					
	lf the sti	udent subgroup meets the median adequate studen											
	• at o	r above 60.		Exceeds	4		_						
	• belo	w 60 but at or above 45.		Meets		3	60						
	• belo	w 45 but at or above 30.			Approaching	2							
Academic	• belo	ow 30.				Does Not Meet	et 1		(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	vas:			subgroups in 3	25					
	• at o	r above 70.				Exceeds	1	4	subject areas)				
	• belo	w 70 but at or above 55.		Meets		3	]						
	• belo	w 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching		2	1						
	• 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 Improvemen			
• below 37.5% Doe		Does Not Meet		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 implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of									
provement Pla	n	The school is required to adopt and implement an I	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years b	efore the D	istrict or Institute i	is requir	ed to res	structure or close the school. T	ne 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 results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and	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
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
(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.