School Performance Framework 2013

School: ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 7467

District: MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51 - 2000 (3 Year')

Level: E

Improvement

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement, based on the 1 Year School Performance Framework. Schools are assigned a plan type based on the overall percent of points earned for the official year. The official percent of points earned is matched to the scoring guide below to determine the plan type. Additionally, failing to meet test administration and/or test participation assurances will result in a lower plan type category.

| 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.

100.0%

_

-

_

-

_

Fest Participation Rates

Science

Colorado ACT

Performance Indicators Rating % of Points Earned out of Points Eligible² Academic Achievement (9.4 out of 25 points) Approaching 37.5% Academic Growth Approaching 60.7% (30.4 out of 50 points) Academic Growth Gaps Approaching 55.0% (13.8 out of 25 points)

Test Participation³ **Meets 95% Participation Rate**

| TOTAL | 53.6% | (53.6 out of 100 points) | |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| ² Schools may not be eligible for all possible p | oints on an indicator due to in | nsufficient numbers of students. In | n these cases, the points are removed |

from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

³Schools do not receive points for test participation. However, schools are assigned one plan type 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).

-

-

-

-

_

203

_

Meets

-

-

_

Students Tested

High

-

-

-

-

_

Overall

690

695

692

203

_

Elem

693

695

693

203

-

% of Students Tested Participation Rating Content Area Elem Middle High Overall Elem Middle High Overall Elem Middle Reading 99.6% 99.6% 690 --Meets -_ Meets Mathematics 100.0% --100.0% Meets --Meets 695 99.9% 99.9% 692 Writing Meets Meets --_ -

100.0%

-

Meets

_

-

_

COLORADO DEPARTMENT of EDUCATION

Total Students

High

_

-

_

_

_

Overall

693

695

693

203

Middle

-

-

-

-

_

| Performance Indicators | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|----------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| School: ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELEN | JENTARY SCHO | DOL - 7467 | | | | Dis | trict: MESA COUNTY VALLEY | 51 - 2000 (3 Year) |
| Academic Achievement | Points Earned | Points Eligible | % Points | Rating | N | % Proficient/Advanced | School's Percentile | |
| Reading | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 624 | 50.48 | 15 | |
| Mathematics | 1 | 4 | | Does Not Meet | 620 | 45.32 | 11 | |
| Writing | 1 | 4 | | Does Not Meet | 622 | 27.33 | 9 | |
| Science | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 179 | 23.46 | 17 | |
| Total | 6 | 16 | 37.5% | Approaching | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Median Adequate Growth | Made Adequate |
| Academic Growth | Points Earned | Points Eligible | % Points | Rating | N | Median Growth Percentile | Percentile | Growth? |
| Reading | 3 | 4 | | Meets | 366 | 50 | 50 | Yes |
| Mathematics | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 371 | 54 | 67 | No |
| Writing | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 370 | 49 | 61 | No |
| English Language Proficiency (ACCESS) | 1.5 | 2 | | Meets | 180 | 50 | _ | - |
| Total | 8.5 | 14 | 60.7% | Approaching | | | | |
| | | | | | Subgroup | Subgroup Median | Subgroup Median Adequate | Made Adequate |
| Academic Growth Gaps | Points Earned | Points Eligible | % Points | Rating | N | Growth Percentile | Growth Percentile | Growth? |
| Reading | 13 | 20 | 65% | Meets | | | | 0.01111 |
| Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible | 2 | 4 | 05/0 | Approaching | 308 | 49 | 51 | No |
| Minority Students | 3 | 4 | | Meets | 178 | 49 | 48 | Yes |
| Students with Disabilities | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 58 | 48 | 78 | No |
| English Learners | 3 | 4 | | Meets | 66 | 56 | 51 | Yes |
| Students needing to catch up | 3 | 4 | | Meets | 206 | 55 | 65 | No |
| Mathematics | 11 | 20 | 55% | Approaching | | | | |
| Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 313 | 54 | 70 | No |
| Minority Students | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 181 | 49 | 72 | No |
| Students with Disabilities | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 61 | 42 | 87 | No |
| English Learners | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 68 | 46 | 74 | No |
| Students needing to catch up | 3 | 4 | | Meets | 212 | 55 | 82 | No |
| Writing | 9 | 20 | 45% | Approaching | | | | |
| Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 312 | 48 | 62 | No |
| Minority Students | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 180 | 43 | 62 | No |
| Students with Disabilities | 1 | 4 | | Does Not Meet | 61 | 31 | 80 | No |
| English Learners | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 68 | 41 | 61 | No |
| Students needing to catch up | 2 | 4 | | Approaching | 295 | 50 | 69 | No |
| Total | 33 | 60 | 55% | Approaching | | | | |

| Scoring Guide for Per | formance Indicators on the So | nool Performance Framewo | гк керогс | | | | Tatal Daarik la Dainta nan | F |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|---------------|------|---------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Performance Indicator | cator Scoring Guide | | | Rating | Poin | t Value | Total Possible Points per | Framework |
| | | | | - | | | EMH Level | Points |
| | · · · · · · | s scoring proficient or advanced was: | | | 10 | CAP | | |
| Academic | at or above the 90th percentile of | of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline). | | Exceeds | | 4 | 16 | |
| Achievement | below the 90th percentile but at | or above the 50th percentile of all sch | nools (using 2009-10 baseline). | Meets | | 3 | (4 for each | 25 |
| | below the 50th percentile but at | or above the 15th percentile of all sch | nools (using 2009-10 baseline). | Approaching | | 2 | content area) | |
| | • below the 15th percentile of all s | chools (using 2009-10 baseline). | Does Not Meet | | 1 | | | |
| | Made AGP | Did Not Make AGP | No AGP | | TCAP | ACCESS | | |
| Academic | • at or above 60. | • at or above 70. | • at or above 65. | Exceeds | 4 | 2 | 14 | |
| Growth | • below 60 but at or above 45. | • below 70 but at or above 55. | below 65 but at or above 50. | Meets | 3 | 1.5 | (4 for each subject | 50 |
| | • below 45 but at or above 30. | • below 55 but at or above 40. | below 50 but at or above 35. | Approaching | 2 | 1 | area and 2 for English | |
| | • below 30. | • below 40. | • below 35. | Does Not Meet | 1 | 0.5 | language proficiency) | |
| | Made AGP | Did Not Make AGP | | | T | CAP | | |
| Academic | • at or above 60. | • at or above 70. | | Exceeds | | 4 | 60 | |
| Growth Gaps | • below 60 but at or above 45. | • below 70 but at or above 55. | | Meets | | 3 | (4 for each of 5 | 25 |
| | below 45 but at or above 30. | • below 55 but at or above 40. | | Approaching | | 2 | subgroups in 3 | |
| | • below 30. | • below 40. | | Does Not Meet | | 1 | subject areas) | |

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

| ichool Plan Type Assignments | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 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 | | | | | |
| Improvement Plan | The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan. | five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five | | | | | |
| Priority Improvement Plan | The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan. | consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which 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 category for the school: the one under which the school has ratings on a greater number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it earned a higher total percent of points. 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 | Proficien | t or Adv | anced by | y Percen | tile Cut- | Points - | 1-year (2 | 2009-10 | baseline |) | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|--------|-------|
| The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's | | | Reading | | Math | | Writing | | | Science | | | |
| 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 | N of Schools | 1008 | 479 | 327 | 1007 | 480 | 327 | 1007 | 480 | 327 | 912 | 407 | 286 |
| includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in | 15th percentile | 49.18 | 50.44 | 54.92 | 48.60 | 29.72 | 15.97 | 32.48 | 34.96 | 30.95 | 19.67 | 23.85 | 27.50 |
| reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results | 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 |
| from Lectura and 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 | Proficien | t or Adv | anced by | y Percen | tile Cut- | Points - | 3-year a | ggregate | (2008-1 | 0 baseli | ne) | |
| Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from | | Reading | | | Math | | Writing | | Science | | | | |
| the first year the performance framework reports were | | Elem | Middle | High | Elem | Middle | High | Elem | Middle | High | Elem | Middle | High |
| released. | 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 | 51.63 | 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 |
| Andomia Crowth and Anodomia Crowth Cons | | | | | | | | | n dame an | | | | |

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 (ACCESS) 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. The median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth (AGP). For 2012-13, Adequate Growth cannot be calculated for English language proficiency by the median growth percentile.

| | Made AGP | Did Not Make AGP | No AGP | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------|--|--|
| Exceeds | 60-99 | 70-99 | 65-99 | | |
| Meets | Meets 45-59 | | 50-64 | | |
| Approaching | 30-44 | 40-54 | 35-49 | | |
| Does Not Meet 1-29 | | 1-39 | 1-34 | | |

The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator disaggregates the results of the Academic Growth Indicator, measuring the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English learners) and students needing to catch up.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator measures the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates, dropout rates, and mean Colorado ACT (COACT) composite scores.

State Mean Dropout Rate (2009-10 baseline)

| | N of Students | Mean Rate |
|------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 1-year (2009) | 416,953 | 3.6 |
| 3-year (2007-09) | 1,238,096 | 3.9 |

State Mean COACT Composite Score (2009-10 baseline)

| | N of Students | Mean Rate |
|------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 1-year (2010) | 51,438 | 20.0 |
| 3-year (2008-10) | 151,439 | 20.1 |