School Performance Framework 2014

School: CLYDE MILLER K-8 - 1720

Improvement

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.

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Point	s Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	41.7%	(10.4 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	51.8%	(25.9 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	51.0%	(12.8 out of 25 points)	
³ Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate			

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned	
Performance	at or above 59%	T
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	25
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	fr
Turnaround	below 37%	35

ea 9%	TOTAL	49.1%	(49.1 out of 100 points)		
%	² Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicat	or due to ins	sufficient numbers of students.	In these cases, the po	oints are removed
%	from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.				

Turnaround below 37% 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 rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

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	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	100.0%	99.5%	-	99.7%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	184	181	-	365	184	182	-	366
Mathematics	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	185	182	-	367	185	182	-	367
Writing	99.5%	99.5%	-	99.5%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	184	181	-	365	185	182	-	367
Science	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	69	51	-	120	69	51	-	120
Social Studies	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	52	63	-	115	52	63	-	115
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



COLORADO Department of Education

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

District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J - 0180 (1 Year¹)

Level: EM

Performance Indicators							Lev	el: Elementary
School: CLYDE MILLER K-8 - 1720)					D	District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 2	8J - 0180 (1 Yeai
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	175	45.71	12	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	175	45.14	11	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	174	34.48	18	
Science	0	0		-	-	_	-	
Total	4	12	33.3%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	2	4		Approaching	111	46	48	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	113	45	63	No
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	110	35	57	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2		Meets	118	45	22	Yes
Total	6.5	14	46.4%	Approaching				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequat Growth?
Reading	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	85	46	52	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	91	46	53	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
English Learners	3	4		Meets	52	51	50	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	60	47	72	No
Mathematics	8	16	50%	Approaching		·		
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	86	42	65	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	92	44	65	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		_	N<20	_	-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	53	43	62	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	46	44	82	No
Writing	4	16	25%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	84	34	57	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	90	35	59	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		_	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	51	36	53	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	72	36	64	No
Total	21	48	43.8%	Approaching				

Performance Indicators								Level: Middle
School: CLYDE MILLER K-8 - 1720)						District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE	28J - 0180 (1 Yea
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	·
Reading	2	4		Approaching	164	56.1	19	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	164	43.29	33	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	163	45.4	25	
Science	0	0		-	-	-	-	
Total	6	12	50%	Approaching				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	159	54	49	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	160	43	78	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	159	51	60	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2		Approaching	47	44	57	No
Total	8	14	57.1%	Approaching				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequat
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	12	16	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	117	54	54	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	136	53	50	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	_
English Learners	3	4		Meets	86	53	52	Yes
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	65	57	69	No
Mathematics	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	118	43	80	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	137	41	79	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	86	42	75	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	74	45	95	No
Writing	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	117	50	63	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	136	51	59	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	85	50	60	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	92	54	77	No
Total	28	48	58.3%	Approaching				

Scoring Guide

Scoring Guide for Pe	erformance Indicators on the School Perform	nance Framework Report					
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide		Rating	Point	t 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		subject area)	
	below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			t 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 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	nments	
	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	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 TCAP and CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from	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
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 I	Proficien	t or Adv	anced by	y Percen	tile Cut-	Points - 2	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