School Performance Framework 2012

School: WINGATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 9673

Performance

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.

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

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	Approaching	41.7%	(10.4 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate			
TOTAL		66.7%	(66.7 out of 100 points)	

ools 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.

Improving

Academic

Achievement

SCHOOLVIEW.org

	% 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	99.6%	-	-	99.6%	Meets	-	-	Meets	238	-	-	238	239	-	-	239
Mathematics	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	240	-	-	240	240	-	-	240
Writing	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	240	-	-	240	240	-	-	240
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	83	-	-	83	83	-	-	83
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

District: MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 - 2000 (1 Year¹)

1

Performance Indicators							Level: E	lementary Schoo
School: WINGATE ELEMENTARY S	SCHOOL						District: MESA COUNTY VALLE	Y 51 - 2000 (1 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	228	78.95	68	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	229	71.18	50	
Writing	3	4		Meets	229	55.46	53	
Science	3	4		Meets	81	49.38	53	
Total	12	16	75%	Meets				
	Defecto Francia d		0/ Deliste	Detting			Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned		% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	139	51	23	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	140	50	50	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	140	51	41	Yes
English Language Proficiency (CELApro)	0	0		-	N<20	-		
Total	9	12	75%	Meets				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
-					<u>N</u>	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growing
Reading	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	27	41	46	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	25	44	44	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-		-
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	37	36	51	No
Mathematics	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	27	45	64	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	25	42	68	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	36	39	79	No
Writing	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	34	65	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	25	48	64	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	59	45	65	No
Total	15	36	41.7%	Approaching				

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	10 baseline).		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	vas:		TCAP	CELA	English			
	• at o	r above 70.				Exceeds	4	2	language		
	• belo	ow 70 but at or above 55.	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	s median student growth p	percentile was.	:		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	ve 47% - below	59%			Improvement	
	 at or above 	ve 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	• at or abo	ve 37% - below 47%				Priority Improveme	
below 37.5% 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 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.		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	
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						
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.