# School Performance Framework 2013

# School: GARNET MESA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 3330

# 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.

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>					
Academic Achievement	Meets	75.0%	( 18.8 out of 25 points )				
Academic Growth	Meets	64.3%	( 32.2 out of 50 points )				
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	55.0%	(13.8 out of 25 points)				

Test Participation <sup>3</sup> Meets 95% Participation Rate

TOTAL	64.8%	( 64.8 out of 100 points )	
<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indica	ator due to i	nsufficient numbers of students. Ir	n 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).

<b>Test Participation Rates</b>																
		% of Studer	ts Tested			Participati	on Rating			Studen	ts Tested			Total S	Students	
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.9%	-	-	99.9%	Meets	-	-	Meets	773	-	-	773	774	-	-	774
Mathematics	99.9%	-	-	99.9%	Meets	-	-	Meets	772	-	-	772	773	-	-	773
Writing	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	772	-	-	772	774	-	-	774
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	254	-	-	254	254	-	-	254
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Level: E

# District: DELTA COUNTY 50(J) - 0870 (3 Year')

Performance Indicators		2220						el: Elementary
School: GARNET MESA ELEMENT				<b>-</b>			District: DELTA COUNTY 50	( <u>)</u> - 08/0 (3 Year
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	743	72.95	51	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	742	76.15	65	
Writing	3	4		Meets	742	64.02	68	
Science	3	4		Meets	239	47.28	51	
Total	12	16	75%	Meets				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	476	43	29	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	476	47	44	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	478	49	34	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2		Approaching	175	45	-	_
Total	9	14	64.3%	Meets				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequat
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Growth Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
		<b>T</b>			/•	Giowurrercentue	Growth Fercentile	GIOWLII:
Reading	11	20	55%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	276	43	35	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	159	46	42	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	31	47	73	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	80	46	50	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	136	47	56	No
Mathematics	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	276	44	50	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	159	47	55	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	31	39	77	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	80	51	61	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	101	47	73	No
Writing	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	277	48	39	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	159	51	42	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	32	43	71	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	80	49	46	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	179	48	55	No
Total	33	60	55%	Approaching				

Scoring Guide for Per	formance Indicators on the So	noot Performance Framewo	гк керогс				Tatal Daarik la Dainta nan	<b>F</b>
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide			Rating	Point Value		Total Possible Points per	Framework
				-			EMH Level	Points
	· · · · · ·	s scoring proficient or advanced was:			10	CAP		
Academic	<ul> <li>at or above the 90th percentile of</li> </ul>	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).	ools (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.	• 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
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>	• 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 Per</b>	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				

School Plan Type Assign	chool 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 Adva	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 dan san					

# 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	Exceeds 60-99		65-99		
Meets	<b>Meets</b> 45-59		50-64		
Approaching	Approaching 30-44		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