School Performance Framework 2014

School: LAKE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL - 5255

Level: M

District: DENVER COUNTY 1 - 0880 (3 Year¹)

	Т	urn	arc	ound	(Revised)
--	---	-----	-----	------	-----------

Will enter Year 2* 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%	Т
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%	² S
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%	fro
Turnaround	below 37%	³ S

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	s Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
Academic Achievement	Does Not Meet	33.3%	(8.3 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	50.0%	(25.0 out of 50 points)	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	46.7%	(11.7 out of 25 points)	
Test Participation ³	Meets 95% Participation Rate			

<u>eu</u> 9%	TOTAL 45.0%	(45.0 out of 100 points)		
9%	² Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to	insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are re	moved	
7%	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).

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.

* on July 1, 2015

Test Participation Rates

		% of Stud	ents Teste	d		Participa	tion Rating	g		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	-	99.2%	-	99.2%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	1019	-	1019	-	1027	-	1027
Mathematics	-	99.4%	-	99.4%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	1022	-	1022	-	1028	-	1028
Writing	-	99.4%	-	99.4%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	1021	-	1021	-	1027	-	1027
Science	-	100.0%	-	100.0%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	256	-	256	-	256	-	256
Social Studies	-	99.3%	-	99.3%	-	Meets	-	Meets	-	134	-	134	-	135	-	135
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



COLORADO Department of Education ¹ Data in this report is based on results from: 2011-12,2012-13,2013-14

Performance Indicators								Level: Middle
School: LAKE INTERNATIONAL Se	CHOOL - 5255						District: DENVER COUNTY	[°] 1 - 0880 (3 Year
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	956	36.09	4	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	958	30.06	15	
Writing	1	4		Does Not Meet	957	28.11	7	
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	888	41	60	No
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	891	46	86	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	889	44	75	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2		Approaching	113	49	57	No
Total	7	14	50%	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	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	••••••	Approaching	847	41	61	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	847	40	61	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	112	38	90	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	476	43	63	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	539	41	75	No
Mathematics	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	850	46	86	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	852	45	86	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	110	40	99	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	478	46	86	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	559	48	96	No
Writing	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	848	44	75	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	848	44	75	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	111	37	93	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	476	50	74	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	596	45	85	No
Total	28	60	46.7%	Approaching				

Scoring Guide for Pe	erformance Indicators on the School Perform	ance Framework Report					
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide	-			t Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points
	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or		T	CAP			
Academic	 at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 20 	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	content area)	
below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			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		Т	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 Assign	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	Proficien	t or Adv	anced b	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 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	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		Rea			ding 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 Crowth and Academic Crowth Conc									a dam can	1			

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