# School Performance Framework 2013

# School: ENGLEWOOD LEADERSHIP ACADEMY - 2750

# Performance

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement, based on the 3 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.

Academic Achievement       Exceeds       93.8%       ( 23.5 out of 25 points )         Academic Growth       Meets       75.0%       ( 37.5 out of 50 points )         Academic Growth Cape       Meets       93.8%       ( 20.8 out of 25 points )	Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
	Academic Achievement	Exceeds	93.8%	(23.5 out of 25 points)	
Academic Crowth Cape Nexts 92.2% (20.9 out of 25 points)	Academic Growth	Meets	75.0%	( 37.5 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps Weets 65.5% (20.6 out of 25 points)	Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	83.3%	( 20.8 out of 25 points )	

Test Participation<sup>3</sup> Mee

Meets 95% Participation Rate

TOTAL	81.8%	(81.8 out of 100 points)			
<sup>2</sup> Schools 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 the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted. <sup>3</sup>Schools 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).

#### **Test Participation Rates** % of Students Tested Total Students Participation Rating Students Tested Content Area Elem Middle High Overall Elem Middle High Overall Elem Middle High Overall Elem Middle High Overall 100.0% 100.0% Meets 201 201 201 201 Reading Meets \_ -------201 201 201 Mathematics 100.0% 100.0% Meets Meets 201 ---\_ ----Meets Writing 100.0% 100.0% Meets -201 201 201 -201 ------Science 100.0% 100.0% 66 66 66 --Meets -Meets -66 ----Colorado ACT --\_ \_ \_ \_ -\_ \_ -\_ \_ \_ -

Level: M

Performance Indicators								Level: Middle
School: ENGLEWOOD LEADERSH	IP ACADEMY -						District: ENGLEWOOI	0 1 - 0120 (3 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	196	89.8	93	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	196	68.88	83	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	196	82.14	92	
Science	4	4		Exceeds	62	80.65	95	
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	3	4		Meets	191	53	15	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	191	51	52	No
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	191	64	32	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	9	12	75%	Meets				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequat
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	15	16	93.8%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	·	Meets	68	57	25	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	54	62	24	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	31	64	30	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	21	64	58	Yes
Mathematics	10	16	62.5%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	68	48	66	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	55	58	68	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	3	4		Meets	32	68	71	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	51	50	79	No
Writing	15	16	93.8%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	68	58	38	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	54	72	38	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	31	78	42	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	37	68	67	Yes
Total	40	48	83.3%	Meets				

<b>Scoring Guide for Perf</b>	coring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report							
Performance Indicator					Point Value		Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points
	The school's percentage of students	scoring proficient or advanced was:			T	CAP		
Academic	at or above the 90th percentile o	f all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).		Exceeds		4	16	
Achievement	below the 90th percentile but at	or above the 50th percentile of all sc	hools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets		3	(4 for each	25
	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).					2	content area)	
	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all s</li> </ul>	entile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).				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.	<ul> <li>below 65 but at or above 50.</li> </ul>	Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each subject	50
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.	<ul> <li>below 50 but at or above 35.</li> </ul>	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)	

<b>Cut-Points for Each Perf</b>	ormance 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	<ul> <li>at or above 47% - below 59%</li> </ul>	Improvement	
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching	Points	<ul> <li>at or above 37% - below 47%</li> </ul>	Priority Improvement	
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%	Turnaround	

School 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	45-59	55-69	50-64
Approaching	g 30-44 40-54		35-49
Does Not Meet	Does Not Meet 1-29		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