School Performance Framework 2012

School: BAYFIELD MIDDLE SCHOOL - 0636

District: BAYFIELD 10 JT-R - 1530 (3 Year¹)

Level: N

-	^		
PD	rto	r <mark>ma</mark> ı	nre
-	1101	ina	

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%	² Sc

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	66.7%	(33.4 out of 50 points)
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	58.3%	(14.6 out of 25 points)
Test Participation ³ M	eets 95% Participation Rate		

ò				
Ś	TOTAL	66.8%	(66.8 out of 100 points)	
ò				
'n	² Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicate	or due to insul	ifficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed fro	m

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

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

Test Participation Rates

	% of Students Tested					Participation Rating				Student		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	-	886	-	886	-	886	-	886
Mathematics	-	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	888	-	888	-	888	-	888
Writing	-	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	887	-	887	-	887	-	887
Science	-	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	286	-	286	-	286	-	286
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.

Final plan type based on: 3 Year SPF report.

Performance Indicators							Lev	el: Middle School
School: BAYFIELD MIDDLE SCHOO	OL						District: BAYFIELD 10	JT-R - 1530 (3 Year)
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	852	79.46	74	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	853	57.09	62	
Writing	3	4		Meets	852	64.08	63	
Science	3	4		Meets	273	54.95	64	
Total	12	16	75%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
			% POINts					
Reading	3	4		Meets	794	52	22	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Approaching	794	47	63	No
Writing		4		Meets	794	58	45	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)		0	66 70/	-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	8	12	66.7%	Meets				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	226	55	29	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	149	54	29	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	60	51	73	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	158	54	64	No
Mathematics	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	227	42	73	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	149	48	77	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	60	54	98	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	280	52	92	No
Writing	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	226	57	54	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	149	59	63	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	60	44	91	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	287	51	79	No
Total	28	48	58.3%	Approaching				

SPF 2012 - 1530 - 0636

coring Guide										Level: N	
coring Guide for	Performance	e Indicators on the School Performance Fran	nework Report								
erformance Indi	cator Scoring	Guide				Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible per EMH Lev	elFramework Poin	
	The scho	ol's percentage of students scoring proficient or ad	vanced was:			5					
		above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200				Exceeds		4	16		
Academic	• belo	w the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th perc	entile 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	entile of all schools (using 2009-10) baseline).		Approaching		2	content area)		
	• belo	w the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10	baseline).	Does Not Meet		1	1 1				
		nool meets the median adequate student growth pe	•	owth percentile was:			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	50	
Growth	If the sch	nool does not meet the median adequate student gr	owth percentile and its median stu	ident growth percentile w	vas:		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	dent subgroup meets the median adequate studen	t growth percentile and its median	student growth percentile	e was:						
	• 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		1	(4 for each of 5		
Growth Gaps	s If the stu	dent subgroup does not meet the median adequate	subgroups in 3	25							
-	• at or	above 70.			Exceeds	ceeds 4		subject areas)			
	• belo	w 70 but at or above 55.			Meets		3	1			
	• belo	w 55 but at or above 40.			Approaching		2	-			
	• belo	w 40.			Does Not Meet		1	-			
-Points for eac	ch performan	ice indicator		Cut-Points for plan	type assign	ment					
	Cut Point: Tl	ne school earned of the points eligible on	this Indicator.		Cut Point: T	he school ear	rned	of the	total Framework points elig	ible.	
chievement;	 at or abov 	e 87.5%	Exceeds		• at or abov	/e 59%				Performance	
rowth; Gaps	 at or abov 	e 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets	Total Framework	• at or abov	/e 47% - below	59%			Improvement	
	 at or abov 	e 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or abov	/e 37% - below	47%			Priority Improvemen	
	below 37.5% Does Not Meet		Does Not Meet	• below 37%						Turnaround	
ool plan type	assignments										
		Plan description									
formance Plar	ו <u>ו</u>	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 combine							
provement 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							
ority Improver	nent Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Pr	iority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years	commences c	n July 1 during	the sum	nmer im	mediately following the fall in w	hich 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 Stude	nts Profi	cient or A	Advanced	d by Pere	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 (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.