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

Priority Improvement

Entering Year 1* of Priority Improvement or Turnaround

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.

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	25.0%	(6.3 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Does Not Meet	35.7%	(17.9 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	37.5%	(9.4 out of 25 points)	

Test Participation Meets 95% Participation Rate

TOTAL 33.6% (33.6 out of 100 points)
--

²Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points 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).

Test Participation Rate	s															
% of Students Tested						Participation Rating			Students Tested				Total Students			
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	98.5%	-	-	98.5%	Meets	-	-	Meets	197	-	-	197	200	-	-	200
Mathematics	97.0%	-	-	97.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	195	-	-	195	201	-	-	201
Writing	98.5%	-	-	98.5%	Meets	-	-	Meets	197	-	-	197	200	-	-	200
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	76	-	-	76	76	-	-	76
Social Studies	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	59	-	-	59	59	-	-	59
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

^{*} on July 1, 2015

Cabacilla NICINIC ELEMENTARY		CLIOOL 4070				6		el: Elementary
School: LANSING ELEMENTARY C			~ - 1 :				istrict: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 2	8) - 0180 (1 Yeai
Academic Achievement	Points Earned		% Points	Rating	<i>N</i>	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	177	41.81	9	
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	177	45.2	11	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	177	29.94	12	
Science	0	0		-	-	<u>-</u>	-	
Total	3	12	25%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating		Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	115	37	51	No
Mathematics	1	4		Does Not Meet	115	33	61	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	115	45	65	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2	11-	Approaching	112	35	27	Yes
Total	5	14	35.7%	Does Not Meet				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	6	16	37.5%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	98	40	54	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	106	37	51	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
English Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	64	32	57	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	65	41	73	No
Mathematics	4	16	25%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	98	34	66	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	106	33	63	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
English Learners	1	4		Does Not Meet	64	33	60	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	48	31	87	No
Writing	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	98	41	67	No
Minority Students	2	4	4,0	Approaching	106	44	66	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	2	4	11	Approaching	64	49	66	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	78	42	75	No

Scoring Guide Level: E

Scoring Guide for Pe	erformance Indicators on the School Perform	mance 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 o	r advanced was:		TO	CAP		
Academic	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 2	Exceeds	4		16		
Achievement	below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile.	Meets	3		(4 for each	25	
	below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile.	Approaching	2		subject area)		
	below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-1)	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		TO	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 Assignments								
	Plan description							
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.							
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.							
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.							
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.							

A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the State Board of Education must direct the authorizing district's local school board or the Institute to restructure or close the school. The five consecutive school years commence on July 1 of the summer immediately following the fall in which the school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.

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

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's 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.

Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

		Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
		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
L	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 Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregate (2008-10 baseline)

							- y					
	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
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