### School Performance Framework 2014

## School: DARTMOUTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 2114

# Performance

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%
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.

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>			
Academic Achievement	Approaching	50.0%	( 12.5 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 <sup>3</sup>	Meets 95% Participation Rate				

TOTAL	55.8%	( 55.8 out of 100 points )		
<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indica	ator due to in	sufficient numbers of students. I	n these cases, the poin	ts are removed

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, 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).

Students Tested

# **Test Participation Rates** % of Students Tested Participation Rating

Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.6%	-	-	99.6%	Meets	-	-	Meets	517	-	-	517	519	-	-	519
Mathematics	99.2%	-	-	99.2%	Meets	-	-	Meets	513	-	-	513	517	-	-	517
Writing	99.2%	-	-	99.2%	Meets	-	-	Meets	514	-	-	514	518	-	-	518
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	171	-	-	171	171	-	-	171
Social Studies	98.4%	-	-	98.4%	Meets	-	-	Meets	63	-	-	63	64	-	-	64
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Total Students

Level: E

District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J - 0180 (3 Year<sup>1</sup>)

Performance Indicators							Lev	vel: Elementary
School: DARTMOUTH ELEMENTA	RY SCHOOL - 2	2114					District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE	28J - 0180 (3 Year
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	481	50.52	15	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	480	51.04	17	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	480	35.42	17	
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	2	4		Approaching	300	44	44	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	299	56	66	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	299	53	57	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2		Meets	57	55	18	Yes
Total	8.5	14	60.7%	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	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	181	40	51	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	188	41	49	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	38	28	86	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	97	49	64	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	152	44	71	No
Mathematics	12	20	60%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	180	52	70	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	187	55	72	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	38	41	89	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	97	54	73	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	158	55	84	No
Writing	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	180	50	62	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	187	50	58	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	38	44	86	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	96	50	68	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	195	53	72	No
Total	31	60	51.7%	Approaching				

Scoring Guide for Pe	Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report							
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide			Point Value		Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points	
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or	advanced was:		TCAP				
Academic	<ul> <li>at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 200</li> </ul>	09-10 baseline).	Exceeds		4	16		
Achievement	<ul> <li>below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th per</li> </ul>	centile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets		3	(4 for each	25	
	<ul> <li>below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th per</li> </ul>	centile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching		2	content area)		
	below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).				1			
	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP		TCAP	ACCESS			
Academic	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.	Exceeds	4	2	14		
Growth	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>	Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each subject	50	
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>below 55 but at or above 40.</li> </ul>	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		т	CAP			
Academic	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.	Exceeds		4	60		
Growth Gaps	<ul> <li>below 60 but at or above 45.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>	Meets		3	(4 for each of 5	25	
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>below 55 but at or above 40.</li> </ul>	Approaching	2		subgroups in 3		
	• below 30.	• below 40.	Does Not Meet		1	subject areas)		

<b>Cut-Points for Each Per</b>	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	<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			

ichool 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	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 Plan					
		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	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	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