School Performance Framework 2014

School: CLAYTON PARTNERSHIP SCHOOL - 0509

Level: EM

District: MAPLETON 1 - 0010 (3 Year')

— • • • •		
	/ Imnr/	ovement
		JVCIIICIIL

Will enter Year 1* of Priority Improvement or Turnaround

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%	Т
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	² S
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	fr
Turnaround	below 37%	ЗS

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Point	s Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	29.2%	(7.3 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	50.0%	(25.0 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	51.7%	(12.9 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate	2		

<u>a</u> %	TOTAL	45.2%	(45.2 out of 100 points)		
%	² Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator	r due to ins	sufficient numbers of students.	n these cases, the p	oints 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, social studies 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).

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.

* on July 1, 2015

Test Participation Rates

		% of Studer	nts 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	99.6%	99.5%	-	99.6%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	461	434	-	895	463	436	-	899
Mathematics	100.0%	99.1%	-	99.6%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	462	432	-	894	462	436	-	898
Writing	99.6%	99.8%	-	99.7%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	461	435	-	896	463	436	-	899
Science	100.0%	99.3%	-	99.7%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	157	139	-	296	157	140	-	297
Social Studies	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	52	55	-	107	52	55	-	107
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



COLORADO Department of Education ¹ Data in this report is based on results from: 2011-12,2012-13,2013-14

Performance Indicators							Lev	el: Elementary
School: CLAYTON PARTNERSHIP	SCHOOL - 050	9					District: MAPLETON	
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	445	43.6	9	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	442	47.96	14	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	444	33.56	16	
Science	0	0		-	-	_	-	
Total	4	12	33.3%	Does Not Meet				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	291	50	51	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	291	47	65	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	291	48	60	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2		Meets	95	48	32	Yes
Total	7.5	14	53.6%	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	11	20	55%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	215	49	52	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	228	51	54	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	23	44	82	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	129	56	52	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	167	54	71	No
Mathematics	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	217	47	65	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	228	49	67	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	20	30	91	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	131	57	64	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	151	48	83	No
Writing	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	215	48	60	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	229	50	61	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	23	39	88	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	129	54	58	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	206	48	69	No
Total	30	60	50%	Approaching				

Performance Indicators								Level: Middle
School: CLAYTON PARTNERSHIP	SCHOOL - 050	9					District: MAPLETON	1 - 0010 (3 Year
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	414	43.48	10	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	413	24.94	9	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	415	29.88	8	
Science	0	0		-	-	_	-	
Total	3	12	25%	Does Not Meet				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	399	53	57	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	397	43	88	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	401	48	75	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0.5	2		Does Not Meet	51	36	61	No
Total	6.5	14	46.4%	Approaching				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequat
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Growth Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	268	53	62	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	300	55	59	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	39	54	89	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	175	56	61	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	223	56	73	No
Mathematics	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	268	45	90	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	300	43	89	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	39	44	99	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	176	45	86	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	273	43	96	No
Writing	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	270	47	78	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	302	49	75	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	39	35	97	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	176	47	74	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	276	51	84	No
Total	32	60	53.3%	Approaching				

Scoring Guide for Pe	erformance Indicators on the School Perform	ance Framework Report						
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide		Rating	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 of all schools (using 20	09-10 baseline).	Exceeds		4	16		
Achievement	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th per	centile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets		3	(4 for each	25	
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th per	centile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching		2	content area)		
	 below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10) 	Does Not Meet		1				
	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP		TCAP	ACCESS			
Academic	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.	Exceeds	4	2	14		
Growth	 below 60 but at or above 45. 	below 70 but at or above 55.	Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each subject	50	
	 below 45 but at or above 30. 	below 55 but at or above 40.	Approaching	2	1	area and 2 for English		
	• below 30.	• below 40.	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 Indicate	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 Assig	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 State Board of Education must direct the authorizing district's local school board								
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.	or the Institute to restructure or close the school. The five consecutive school years commence on July 1 of the								
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.	summer immediately following the fall in which the 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	ntile 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 TCAP and CoAlt in reading,	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
mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.	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
	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	ntile 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
And win Crowth and Andersia Crowth Corre									- dom (on				

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 (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 TCAP, students are expected to score proficient or advanced within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. Students classified as English learners are expected to reach certain levels of language proficiency on ACCESS in set amounts of time. The median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth (AGP).

	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP
Exceeds	60-99	70-99
Meets	45-59	55-69
Approaching	30-44	40-54
Does Not Meet	1-29	1-39

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