#### School Performance Framework 2014

# School: LEO WILLIAM BUTLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - 5050

# Improvement

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement, based on the 1 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.

## **Test Participation Rates**

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points	Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	50.0%	(12.5 out of 25 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	53.6%	( 26.8 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	52.1%	(13.0 out of 25 points)	

Test Participation <sup>3</sup> Meets 95% Participation Rate

TOTAL	52.3%	( 52.3 out of 100 points )	
<sup>2</sup> Schools may not be eligible for all po	ssible points on an indicator due to ir	sufficient numbers of students	In these cases, the points are removed

<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).

-																
		% of Studen	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	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	313	-	-	313	314	-	-	314
Mathematics	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	313	-	-	313	313	-	-	313
Writing	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	313	-	-	313	313	-	-	313
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	95	-	-	95	95	-	-	95
Social Studies	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	113	-	-	113	113	-	-	113
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1



**COLORADO** Department of Education

## District: WELD COUNTY S/D RE-8 - 3140 (1 Year<sup>1</sup>)

Performance Indicators							Lev	el: Elementary
School: LEO WILLIAM BUTLER EL	EMENTARY SCI	HOOL - 5050				Di	strict: WELD COUNTY S/D RE	-8 - 3140 (1 Year)
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile	
Reading	2	4		Approaching	307	60.26	27	
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	307	65.47	38	
Writing	2	4		Approaching	307	40.39	26	
Science	0	0		-	-	-	-	
Total	6	12	50%	Approaching				
							Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Percentile	Growth?
Reading	1	4		Does Not Meet	196	39	40	No
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	197	57	56	Yes
Writing	2	4		Approaching	197	46	52	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2		Meets	146	51	31	Yes
Total	7.5	14	53.6%	Approaching				
					Cubaroun	Cubaroun Median	Cubarous Median Adequate	Mada Adaguata
Acadamic Crouth Canc	Points Fornad	Pointe Eligible	& Doints	Pating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible		Rating	/v	Growin Percentile	Growin Percentile	Growth?
Reading	5	16	31.3%	Does Not Meet	122		42	
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	132	32	43	No
Minority Students Students with Disabilities	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Does Not Meet	145 N<20	36	41	No
English Learners	1	4		- Does Not Meet	73		- 48	 No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	73	40	67	No
Mathematics	12	16	75%	Meets	75	40	67	INU
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4	13/0	Meets	132	57	63	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	145	57	61	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	3	4		Meets	73	67	73	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	77	63	85	No
Writing	8	16	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	132	43	58	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	145	44	55	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20		-	-
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	73	45	61	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	131	46	65	No
Total	25	48	52.1%	Approaching				

# Scoring Guide

Scoring Guide for Pe	erformance Indicators on the School Perform	ance 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	advanced was:		TCAP			
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 per	centile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching		2	subject area)	
	• below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10	<ul> <li>below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).</li> </ul>			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.	<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>	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	nments	
	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	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	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 I	Proficien	t or Adv	anced by	y Percen	tile Cut-	Points - 2	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