School Performance Framework 2014

School: MISSIO

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.

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	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	356	-	-	356	357	-	-	357
Mathematics	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	357	-	-	357	358	-	-	358
Writing	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	356	-	-	356	357	-	-	357
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	132	-	-	132	132	-	-	132
Social Studies	99.1%	-	-	99.1%	Meets	-	-	Meets	105	-	-	105	106	-	-	106
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1

COLORADO **Department of Education**

¹Data in this report is based on results from: 2013-14

ON VIEJO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	5934			District: Cl
	Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	s Earned out of Points Eligible ²
Performance	Acadomic Achievement	Approaching	E0 20	(146 out of 25 points)

	Nacing	201101113		
Academic Achievement	Approaching	58.3%	(14.6 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	60.7%	(30.4 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	51.7%	(12.9 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation ³ Me	ets 95% Participation Ra	te		

TOTAL	57.9%	(57.9 out of 100 points)		
² Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indica	ator due to i	nsufficient numbers of students. I	n these cases, the point	s 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).

District: CHERRY CREEK 5 - 0130 (1 Year¹)

Performance Indicators								vel: Elementary
School: MISSION VIEJO ELEMENT							District: CHERRY CREEK	(5 - 0130 (1 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	342	69.01	43	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	343	71.72	51	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	342	45.32	33	
Science	0	0		-	-	-	-	
Total	7	12	58.3%	Approaching				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	221	39	31	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	221	45	45	Yes
Writing	2	4		Approaching	221	44	45	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2		Meets	30	52	13	Yes
Total	8.5	14	60.7%	Approaching				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequat
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Ň	Growth Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	93	38	38	Yes
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	101	43	33	Yes
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	25	72	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	23	58	34	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	60	44	67	No
Mathematics	11	20	55%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	94	42	49	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	101	53	48	Yes
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	34	81	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	23	54	43	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	58	49	82	No
Writing	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	94	45	54	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	101	40	45	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	27	74	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	23	51	44	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	112	45	66	No
Total	31	60	51.7%	Approaching				

Scoring Guide

Scoring Guide for Pe	rformance Indicators on the School Perform	ance Framework Report					
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide				Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or a	advanced was:		TC	CAP		
Academic	 at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200 	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 	Approaching		2	subject 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		тс	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.	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 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 I	Proficien	t or Adv	anced by	y Percen	tile Cut-	Points - '	1-year (2	2009-10	paseline))		
The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's		Reading		Math			Writing			Science			
proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from TCAP and CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.		Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
	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
	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 I	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

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 Score
1-year (2010)	51,438	20.0
3-year (2008-10)	151,439	20.1