# School Performance Framework 2012

### School: RAY E KILMER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 4686

District: LEWIS-PALMER 38 - 1080 (3 Year<sup>1</sup>)

Level: E

Perf	ormance
	ormanice

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	Ie
Performance	at or above 59%	
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	тс
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	
Turnaround	below 37%	<sup>2</sup> Sc

Performance Indicators	Rating/Plan	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>
Academic Achievement	Exceeds	93.8%	( 23.5 out of 25 points )
Academic Growth	Meets	83.3%	( 41.7 out of 50 points )
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	77.8%	( 19.5 out of 25 points )
Test Participation <sup>3</sup> M	leets 95% Participation Rate		

6			
6	TOTAL	84.7%	( 84.7 out of 100 points )
6			
6	<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicato	or due to insuf	ficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from

<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

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**

	% of Students Tested					Participation Rating				Student	s Tested		Total Students			
Content Area Elem Middle High Overall					Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.8%	-	-	99.8%	Meets	-	-	Meets	627	-	-	627	628	-	-	628
Mathematics	99.8%	-	-	99.8%	Meets	-	-	Meets	624	-	-	624	625	-	-	625
Writing	99.8%	-	-	99.8%	Meets	-	-	Meets	625	-	-	625	626	-	-	626
Science	99.5%	-	-	99.5%	Meets	-	-	Meets	185	-	-	185	186	-	-	186
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

individual content area rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

both the points earned and the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

SCHOOLVIew.org

Performance Indicators								lementary Scho
School: RAY E KILMER ELEMENTA	RY SCHOOL						District: LEWIS-PALME	R 38 - 1080 (3 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	597	89.45	91	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	596	85.74	86	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	595	78.82	92	
Science	4	4		Exceeds	173	75.14	92	
Total	15	16	93.8%	Exceeds				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	417	60	20	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	417	51	32	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	417	54	32	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	10	12	83.3%	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	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	34	52	19	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	58	63	20	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	37	73	59	Yes
Mathematics	6	12	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	34	35	43	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	58	48	31	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	47	52	73	No
Writing	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	34	56	36	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	58	62	33	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	89	60	56	Yes
Total	28	36	77.8%	Meets				

coring Guide										Level:			
coring Guide for	Performanc	e Indicators on the School Performance Fran	nework Report										
Performance Indi	icator Scoring	g Guide				Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Leve	el Framework Poin			
-	The sch	ool's percentage of students scoring proficient or ad	vanced was:										
		r above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200				Exceeds		4	16				
Academic	• belo	ow 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	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	1						
	If the sc	hool meets the median adequate student growth pe	rcentile and its median student gi	rowth percentile was:			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				
	below 45 but at or above 30.					Approaching	2	1	content area				
Academic	• belo	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	udent growth percentile w	vas:		TCAP	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	t 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	iment							
	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.			
chievement;	• at or above	ve 87.5%	Exceeds		at or abc					Performance			
irowth; Gaps	• at or abov	ve 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework		bove 47% - below 59% bove 37% - below 47%				Improvement			
	• at or abov	ve 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points						Priority Improvemen			
			Does Not Meet		below 37	7%				Turnaround			
ool plan type													
		Plan description											
rformance Plar	n	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	In	The school is required to adopt and implement an I	mprovement Plan.	five consecutive years be	efore the Disti	rict or Institute i	s require	ed to res	structure or close the school. The	five			
ority Improver	nent Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years	commences	on July 1 during	the sum	nmer im	mediately following the fall in wh	nich 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,	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 Pere	centile Cu	t-Points	- 3-year	aggrega	te (2008 <sup>.</sup>	10 base	line)	
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

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.