School Performance Framework 2013

School: PRAIRIE WINDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 7165

Performance

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt an implement, based on the 3 Year School Performance Framework. Schools are assigned a plan type based on th overall percent of points earned for the official year. Th official percent of points earned is matched to the scorin 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.

Test Participation Rates

		% of Stude	ents Testea	1		Participati	ion Rating			Studen	ts Tested			Total	Students	
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.2%	-	-	99.2%	Meets	-	-	Meets	701	-	-	701	707	-	-	707
Mathematics	99.0%	-	-	99.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	700	-	-	700	707	-	-	707
Writing	98.7%	-	-	98.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	699	-	-	699	708	-	-	708
Science	99.4%	-	-	99.4%	Meets	-	-	Meets	175	-	-	175	176	-	-	176
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
	Academic Achievement	Exceeds	100.0%	(25.0 out of 25 points)	
and nce the	Academic Growth	Meets	83.3%	(41.7 out of 50 points)	
The ing	Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	83.3%	(20.8 out of 25 points)	
ing					

Test Participation³

Meets 95% Participation Rate

TOTAL	87.5%	(87.5 out of 100 points)	
2			

²Schools 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.

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).

District: LEWIS-PALMER 38 - 1080 (3 Year¹)

Level: E

Performance Indicators							Le	vel: Elementary
School: PRAIRIE WINDS ELEMEN	TARY SCHOOL	- 7165					District: LEWIS-PALMER	38 - 1080 (3 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	680	90.59	93	
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	678	88.64	91	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	677	82.57	95	
Science	4	4		Exceeds	170	75.29	92	
Total	16	16	100%	Exceeds				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	484	53	17	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	481	60	28	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	481	58	24	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	10	12	83.3%	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	13	16	81.3%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	26	54	25	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	66	58	20	Yes
Students with Disabilities	3	4		Meets	35	53	38	Yes
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	45	61	57	Yes
Mathematics	15	16	93.8%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	26	60	40	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	66	60	31	Yes
Students with Disabilities	3	4		Meets	35	60	67	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	48	71	78	No
Writing	12	16	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	25	52	39	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	65	56	29	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	34	53	59	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	84	64	53	Yes
Total	40	48	83.3%	Meets				

Scoring Guide for Per	formance Indicators on the So	hool Performance Framewo	rk Report					
Performance Indicator	e Indicator Scoring Guide				Point Value		Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points
	The school's percentage of students	s percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:				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	Meets		3	(4 for each	25		
	below the 50th percentile but at	Approaching		2	content area)			
	below the 15th percentile of all schools (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		

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	Proficier	t or Adv	anced b	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 includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results	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	34.96	30.95	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	
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 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