# School Performance Framework 2014

# School: LOUISVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 5302

### Level: E

District: BOULDER VALLEY RE 2 - 0480 (3 Year')

P	erf	fo	rm	an	ce

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%	TOTAL
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicate
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	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, se

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.

#### % of Points Earned out of Points Eligible<sup>2</sup> Performance Indicators Rating Academic Achievement 75.0% (18.8 out of 25 points) Meets Academic Growth 82.1% (41.1 out of 50 points) Meets Academic Growth Gaps Meets 78.3% (19.6 out of 25 points) Test Participation<sup>3</sup> **Meets 95% Participation Rate**

TOTAL	79.5%	( 79.5 out of 100 points )	
<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicat	tor due to in	sufficient numbers of students.	In these cases, the points are removed

<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).

Test Participation Rates																
		% of Studer	ts Tested			Participati	ion 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	99.8%	-	-	99.8%	Meets	-	-	Meets	821	-	-	821	823	-	-	823
Mathematics	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	822	-	-	822	822	-	-	822
Writing	99.9%	-	-	99.9%	Meets	-	-	Meets	821	-	-	821	822	-	-	822
Science	99.2%	-	-	99.2%	Meets	-	-	Meets	260	-	-	260	262	-	-	262
Social Studies	98.1%	-	-	98.1%	Meets	-	-	Meets	104	-	-	104	106	-	-	106
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



COLORADO **Department of Education**  <sup>1</sup> Data in this report is based on results from: 2011-12.2012-13.2013-14

Performance Indicators							Le	vel: Elementary
School: LOUISVILLE ELEMENTARY	SCHOOL - 53	02					District: BOULDER VALLEY R	E 2 - 0480 (3 Year
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	805	87.2	88	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	805	85.96	87	
Writing	3	4		Meets	804	76.24	89	
Science	0	0		-	_	-	-	
Total	9	12	75%	Meets				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	500	56	18	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	504	63	33	Yes
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	502	62	28	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0.5	2		Does Not Meet	22	26	22	Yes
Total	11.5	14	82.1%	Meets				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	75	52	36	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	97	51	24	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	42	41	44	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	23	52	46	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	54	46	57	No
Mathematics	18	20	90%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	78	62	54	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	98	63	49	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	42	53	60	No
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	24	64	54	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	71	72	79	No
Writing	16	20	80%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	76	58	53	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	97	58	40	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	42	47	57	No
English Learners	4	4		Exceeds	23	73	49	Yes
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	139	60	56	Yes
Total	47	60	78.3%	Meets				

Scoring Guide for Pe	Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report							
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide	Scoring Guide			t Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points	
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or	advanced was:		T	CAP			
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	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	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					
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