## School Performance Framework 2014

## School: LAREDO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 4973

# 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 Points	Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	41.7%	( 10.4 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Approaching	42.9%	(21.5 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	45.8%	(11.5 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation <sup>3</sup> Me	ets 95% Participation R	ate		

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned	
Performance	at or above 59%	T
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	2
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	fı
Turnaround	below 37%	3

9%	TOTAL 4	3.4%	( 43.4 out of 100 points )		
9%	<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator	due to insu	ufficient numbers of students.	in these cases, the points are removed	
	from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.				

Turnaround below 37% <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 rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades). academic Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25 for

#### Test Participation Rates

Academic Growth Gaps.

	1	% of Studer	nts Teste	d		Participatio	n Rating			Studen	ts Testea	1		Total S	Students	
Content Area	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	262	-	-	262	262	-	-	262
Mathematics	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	260	-	-	260	260	-	-	260
Writing	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	260	-	-	260	260	-	-	260
Science	93.5%	-	-	93.5%	Does Not Meet	-	-	Does Not Meet	86	-	-	86	92	-	-	92
Social Studies	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	87	-	-	87	87	-	-	87
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



**COLORADO** Department of Education

#### <sup>1</sup> Data in this report is based on results from: 2013-14

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

Level: E

Performance Indicators							Lev	el: Elementary
School: LAREDO ELEMENTARY SC	CHOOL - 4973					D	District: ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 2	8J - 0180 (1 Year
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	236	48.31	14	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	234	48.72	15	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	234	36.32	20	
Science	0	0		-	_	_	-	
Total	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	156	38	50	No
Mathematics	2	4	n 11	Approaching	156	47	63	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	156	51	58	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2		Approaching	197	43	24	Yes
Total	6	14	42.9%	Approaching				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	141	35	52	No
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	144	38	53	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	_
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	90	44	51	No
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	83	35	73	No
Mathematics	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	141	44	62	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	144	44	63	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	_	-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	90	51	62	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	74	44	82	No
Writing	9	16	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	141	50	59	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	144	50	61	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	3	4		Meets	90	57	61	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	112	51	69	No
Total	22	48	45.8%	Approaching				

# Scoring Guide

Scoring Guide for Pe	erformance Indicators on the School Perform	ance Framework Report							
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide		Rating	Point Value		Point Value		Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or	e school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:							
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 percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).				2	subject 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	below 60 but at or above 45.	<ul> <li>below 70 but at or above 55.</li> </ul>	Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each subject	50		
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	<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		тс	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>	below 70 but at or above 55.			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)			

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

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		Rea			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 Lectura and Escritura.	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 – I	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