## School Performance Framework 2013

## School: LAWRENCE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 5024

# Level: E

District: JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1 - 1420 (3 Year<sup>1</sup>)

Im	n	<u>``\</u>	/er	ne	nt
	P	01	CI	inc	IIC.

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%	T
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	2
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	fı
Turnaround	below 37%	3

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 Point	ts Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	56.3%	(14.1 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	53.6%	( 26.8 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	53.3%	(13.3 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation <sup>3</sup>	Meets 95% Participation Rate			

<b>1</b> 6	TOTAL	54.2%	( 54.2 out of 100 points )		
6	<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator	r due to ins	ufficient numbers of students. In	n these cases, the poir	nts are removed
6	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 Rat	tes
------------------------	-----

		% of Stude	nts Tested	1		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	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	607	-	-	607	609	-	-	609
Mathematics	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	610	-	-	610	612	-	-	612
Writing	99.5%	-	-	99.5%	Meets	-	-	Meets	607	-	-	607	610	-	-	610
Science	99.4%	-	-	99.4%	Meets	-	-	Meets	153	-	-	153	154	-	-	154
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Performance Indicators							Lev	el: Elementary
School: LAWRENCE ELEMENTARY	( SCHOOL - 502	24				Di	istrict: JEFFERSON COUNTY R	
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	564	70.39	46	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	564	61.88	33	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	563	52.22	44	
Science	3	4		Meets	143	53.15	62	
Total	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
And with County	Deinte Franzis		(C) De insta	Detie e	•		Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% POINTS	Rating	<u> </u>	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	405	49	31	Yes
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	411	30	49	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	406	44	42	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2	= 2 <i>C</i> 2/	Meets	84	53	-	-
Total	7.5	14	53.6%	Approaching				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	14	20	70%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	7010	Meets	274	51	34	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	172	55	32	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	33	42	63	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	50	58	50	Yes
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	121	58	64	No
Mathematics	6	20	30%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	280	32	57	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	177	35	56	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	35	33	75	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	55	46	75	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	131	39	80	No
Writing	12	20	60%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	275	49	47	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	175	50	45	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	34	54	72	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	53	51	67	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	184	53	67	No
Total	32	60	53.3%	Approaching				

	formance Indicators on the So						Total Possible Points per	Framework
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide			Rating	Poin	t Value	EMH Level	Points
	The school's percentage of students	scoring proficient or advanced was:		ТСАР				
Academic	• at or above the 90th percentile of	f 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.	<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			Т	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 Assign	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	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													

## 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