## School Performance Framework 2014

# School: CHALLENGE TO EXCELLENCE CHARTER SCHOOL - 1512

District: DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1 - 0900 (3 Year')

Level: EM

# Performance

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 Earne						
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.

#### **Test Participation Rates**

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
Academic Achievement	Exceeds	87.5%	( 21.9 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Meets	79.2%	( 39.6 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Meets	71.9%	( 18.0 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 indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points 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).

rest i al delpation nat																
		% of Studer	nts 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	100.0%	99.6%	-	99.8%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	488	479	-	967	488	481	-	969
Mathematics	100.0%	99.2%	-	99.6%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	487	477	-	964	487	481	-	968
Writing	100.0%	99.6%	-	99.8%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	487	479	-	966	487	481	-	968
Science	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	176	140	-	316	176	140	-	316
Social Studies	100.0%	100.0%	-	100.0%	Meets	Meets	-	Meets	42	70	-	112	42	70	-	112
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	Performance Indicators									
School: CHALLENGE TO EXCELLE	NCE CHARTER	SCHOOL - 1512	2			D	istrict: DOUGLAS COUNTY RE	1 - 0900 (3 Year)		
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile			
Reading	3	4		Meets	485	85.57	84			
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	484	88.43	91			
Writing	3	4		Meets	484	68.18	77			
Science	0	0		-	-	-	-			
Total	10	12	83.3%	Meets						
							Madian Adaguata Crowth	Made Adequate		
Acadamic Crowth	Doints Formed	Dointe Flisible	4 Deinte	Dating		Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?		
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% POINTS	Rating	N 308					
Reading	3	4		Meets		48	22	Yes		
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	308	<u>48</u> 54	37 32	Yes		
Writing English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0	40		Meets		-	32	Yes		
	9	12	75%	-	11<20	-	-	-		
Total	9	12	/576	Meets						
					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	16	56.3%	Approaching						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	24	45	28	Yes		
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	65	55	24	Yes		
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	33	33	62	No		
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-		
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	39	45	61	No		
Mathematics	9	16	56.3%	Approaching						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	24	41	42	No		
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	65	54	34	Yes		
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	33	40	68	No		
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-		
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	33	54	72	No		
Writing	11	16	68.8%	Meets						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	24	36	34	Yes		
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	65	63	35	Yes		
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	33	41	69	No		
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-		
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	93	55	55	Yes		
Total	29	48	60.4%	Approaching						

Performance Indicators								Level: Middle
School: CHALLENGE TO EXCELLE	NCE CHARTER	SCHOOL - 1512	2				District: DOUGLAS COUNTY R	E 1 - 0900 (3 Year)
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	4	4		Exceeds	478	88.28	91	
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	476	84.45	95	
Writing	3	4		Meets	478	77.62	87	
Science	0	0		-	-	-	-	
Total	11	12	91.7%	Exceeds				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	3	4	<i>x</i> i oints	Meets	465	50	20	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	460	69	45	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	465	53	32	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Total	10	12	83.3%	Meets				
			00.070	meet				
					Subgroup	Subgroup Median Growth	Subgroup Median Adequate	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible		Rating	N	Percentile	Growth Percentile	Growth?
Reading	12	16	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	43	62	21	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	106	62	20	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	28	54	64	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	49	50	61	No
Mathematics	16	16	100%	Exceeds				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	4	4		Exceeds	43	75	56	Yes
Minority Students	4	4		Exceeds	106	72	37	Yes
Students with Disabilities	4	4		Exceeds	22	75	93	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	73	76	82	No
Writing	12	16	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	43	45	33	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	106	58	31	Yes
Students with Disabilities	3	4		Meets	28	61	82	No
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	97	63	68	No
Total	40	48	83.3%	Meets				

Scoring Guide for Pe	Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance 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 or	he school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:								
Academic	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 20	<ul> <li>at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).</li> </ul>				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 per	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>	below 70 but at or above 55.	Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each subject	50			
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>	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		T	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.	Meets			(4 for each of 5	25			
	<ul> <li>below 45 but at or above 30.</li> </ul>	below 55 but at or above 40.	Approaching			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 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	<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 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 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 includes results from TCAP and CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from	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
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