# Annotated School Performance Framework Report (High School)

The four key performance indicators for which schools are held accountable.

The percentage of points earned out of the points for which the school was eligible. See page 2 for data used to calculate this percentage. This percentage determines the school's rating on this indicator.

Different indicators are worth different amounts of total framework points. For schools with data on all indicators, the total eligible points across all indicators is 100. For schools with incomplete data (because of small numbers of students), the total eligible points may be less than 100.

# School Performance Framework 2013 - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

Level: F

School: REAL SCHOOL-H - 0003

District: REAL DISTRICTS - 0001 (1 Year<sup>1</sup>)

					1	١						
his	is	the	plan	type	t	ne	sch	noo	lis	re	quired	to
nnl	em	ent	hase	ed o	'n	+1	10	1	Vea	r	School	D

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

Improvement

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned
Performance	at or above 60%
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 60%
Priority Improvement	at or above 33% - below 47%
Turnaround	below 33%

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: 15 points for Academic Achievement, 35 for Academic Growth, 15 for Academic Growth Gaps, and 35 for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points Fai	rned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	50.0%	( 7.5 out of 15 points)	
Academic Growth	Approaching	60.7%	( 21.2 out of 35 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	56.7%	( 8,5 out of 15 points )	
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Approaching	60.9%	( 21.3 out of 35 points )	

Test Participation<sup>3</sup>

·

TOTAL

58.5% ( 58.5 out of 100 points )

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 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 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

											$\overline{}$		_			
		% of	Students Tested	1		Pa	rticipation Rating			Studen	nts Tested			Total .	Students	
Content Area	Elem	Middl	e High	Overall	Elem	Midd	le High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	-	-	95.3%	95.3%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	1103	1103	-	-	1158	1158
Mathematics	-	-	95.5%	95.5%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	1106	1106	-	-	1158	1158
Writing	-	-	96.6%	96.6%	-	+	Meets	Meets	-	-	1119	1119	-	-	1158	1158
Science	-	-	96.7%	96.7%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	555	555	-	7	574	574
Colorado ACT	-	-	99.0%	99.0%			Meets	Meets		-	474	474			479	479
												1				

↑ Meets 95% Participation Rate

The type of plan the state has assigned to the school to implement, based on the data presented in this report.

Schools that do not meet the 95% test participation rate for more than one subject area are assigned a plan one category lower than what they would have earned.

The framework is based on either the 1 or 3 year report. Refer to page 5.

The sum of the total framework points earned across all indicators.

The sum of the total framework points earned out of points for which the school was eligible is converted to a percentage. This help determine the final plan assignment.

# Annotated SPF Report(High School) ACCESS is the new

English Language

replacing CELApro.

The school's points are

Proficiency Assessment,

The school can earn between 1 and 4 points for each metric depending on its rating. Schools with too few students may have fewer points eligible.

Performance Indicators - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

This is the school's data for each metric on this performance indicator. The data are used to determine the number of points and the indicator ratings the school earned. How performance relates to points is described on page 4.

added together and	chool: REAL SCHOOL-H - 0003	7	7		7		V	District: REAL DISTRICT	S - 0001 (1 Year)
converted to a	cademic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advance	red School's Percentile	
	Reading	2	4		Approaching	1053	61.35	24	
percentage for this	Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	1058	23.72	28	
indicator. This	Writing	2	4		Approaching	1067	39.64	29	
percentage is shown on	Science	2	4		Approaching	522	34.1	23	
	otal	8	16	50%	Approaching				
overall rating on this								Median Adequate Growth	Made Adequate
indicator.	cademic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Perce	-	Growth?
	Reading	3	4	76 TOITIG	Meets	991	55	31	Yes
-	Mathematics		4		Approaching	994	40	96	No
	Writing	2	4		Approaching	1002	51	70	No
Growth gaps are	English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2	$\overline{}$	Meets	97	61 🤘	1 -	-
calculated for five	otal	8.5	14	60.7%	Approaching			/	
different subgroups in						<i>-</i>		n Subgroup Median Adequate	
= -	1 - 1 - 0 - 11 - 0 - 11	0:15	0.1.4.511.11	~ ~	6	Subgroup	Subgroup Media		Made Adequate
three subject areas. Each	cademic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Growth Percent	The English language	Growth?
	eading	13	20	65%	Meets			proficiency growth rating is	
growth percentile and	Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	582	54	determined only by the	Yes
the adequate median	Minority Students	3	4		Meets	739	55	median growth percentile for	Yes
growth percentile	Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	84	52	2013.	No
needed for students to	English Learners	3	4		Meets	188	57	90	No
reach or maintain	Students needing to catch up	10	20	50%	Approaching	412	54	80	No
proficiency.	fathematics Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4	30%	Approaching	583	41	99	No
<u>'</u>	Minority Students	7 2	4		Approaching Approaching	741	40	98	No
_	Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	84	45	99	No
The ratings for the	English Learners	2	4		Approaching	188	44	99	No
Growth and Growth Gaps	Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	609	41	99	No
indicators are	Vriting	11	20	55%	Approaching				
determined by the	Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	587	51	81	No
median growth	Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	748	52	78	No
percentile and the	Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	85	48	99	No
•	English Learners	3	4		Meets	198	58	94	No
median adequate growth	Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	555	53	94	No
percentile. See page 3 for	otal	34	60	56.7%	Approaching				
details regarding how	ostsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating		N	Rate/Score	Expectation
these metrics result in	Graduation Rate: 4yr/5yr/6yr/7yr	3	4	No FOIITES	Meets	5	10/511/512/525	78.6/ <i>81.4</i> /77.1/76.4%	80%
different ratings.	Disaggregated Graduation Rate	2.75	4	68.8%	Meets		10/3/1/312/323	70.0701.477.1770.48	00%
<u></u>	Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0.75	<u> </u>	00.070	Meets	31	13/ <i>268</i> /246/230	79.9/ <i>83.6</i> /78.5/73%	80%
	Minority Students	0.75	1		Meets		74/ <i>340</i> /332/331	78.6/ <i>80.9</i> /76.8/76.1%	80%
N refers to the number	Students with Disabilities	0.5	1		Approaching		58/53/52/ <i>56</i>	60.3/50.9/69.2/ <i>71.4</i> %	80%
of students included in	English Learners	0.75	1		Meets		39/ <i>55</i> /48/56	74.4/ <i>85.5</i> /75/64.3%	80%
	Dropout Rate	2	4		Approaching		2688	4.1%	3.6%
each sub-indicator.	Colorado ACT Composite Score	2	4		Approaching		474	18.2	20
T	otal	9.75	16	60.9%	Approaching				
_					11				

# Annotated SPF Report (High School)

### Graduation Rates - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

This page has been moved to follow the Performance Indicators page in order to keep all pages with district data together.

## Graduation and Disaggregated Graduation Rates

The School Performance Framework reports use the 4-, 5-, 6- and 7-year graduation rates for the school and disaggregated student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities and English learners).

This School's Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate:

Overall Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	2009	68.1	74.2	75.1	76.4
Anticipated Year	2010	69	74.4	77.1	
of Graduation	2011	75.6	81.4		
	2012	78.6			

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	2009	61	69	71	73
Anticipated Year	2010	66.1	74.4	78.5	
of Graduation	2011	75.9	83.6		
	2012	79.9		/	

Minority Student Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	2009	66.2	73.7	75.3	76.1
<b>Anticipated Year</b>	2010	67.5	74.3	76.8	
of Graduation	2011	74.5	80 <del>.9</del>		
	2012	78.6			

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (1-year)

						_
		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-yı	R
	2009	39.3	56.1	62.5	71	"b
Anticipated Year	2010	42.3	52.8	69.2		th
of Graduation	2011	32.7	50.9			
	2012	60.3				

### English Learners Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	2009	55.2	64.3	64.3	64.3
<b>Anticipated Year</b>	2010	60.4	72.9	75	
of Graduation	2011	75.9	85.5		
	2012	74.4			

Overall Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year	
	2009	68.1	74.2	75.1	76.4	-
<b>Anticipated Year</b>	2010	69	74.4	77.1		Γ
of Graduation	2011	75.6	81.4			Ι
	2012	78.6				Ι
	Aggregated	72.8	76.7	76.1	76.4	I

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

				4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
			2009	61	69	71	73
	Anticipated Year		2010	66.1	74.4	78.5	
	of Graduation		2011	75.9	83.6		
The	The gray boxes refer		2012	79.9			
to the 4,5,6, and 7-			gregated	71.6	76	74.8	73
to ti	16 4,5,0, and 7-						

vear grad rates used mation Rate (3-year aggregate) to det "best

etermine the tof" rate.		addon nace of year apprehance									
			4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year					
t or rute.		2009	66.2	73.7	75.3	76.1					
Anticipated Year		2010	67.5	74.3	76.8						
of Graduation		2011	74.5	80.9							
		2012	78.6								
		gregated	71.9	76.3	76.1	76.1					

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

			1 .				
Red ita	ilics designate t	he		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
"best o	f" grad rate am	9	39.3	56.1	62.5	71.4	
the 4, 5	i, 6, and 7-year	0	42.3	52.8	69.2		
Т	of Graduation	201	1	32.7	50.9		
$\neg$	2012		2	60.3			
Aggrega		gated	44.2	53.4	65.7	71.4	

### English Learners Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	2009	55.2	64.3	64.3	64.3
Anticipated Year	2010	60.4	72.9	75	
of Graduation	2011	75.9	85.5		
	2012	74.4			
	Aggregated	66	74.2	69.2	64.3

These tables show the 4, 5, 6, and 7-year graduation rates for the district overall and for disaggregated student groups. This page provides more detailed trend data than included in the PWR section.

> Colorado calculates "on-time" graduation as the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. A student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. The formula anticipates, for example, that a student who entered ninth grade in fall 2006 would

graduate with the Class of 2010.

For the 1-year SPF, schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: 2012 4year graduation rate, 2011 5-year graduation rate, 2010 6-year graduation rate and 2009 7year graduation rate (the shaded cells in the tables on the left). For the 3-year SPF, schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: aggregated 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 4-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009, 2010 and 2011 5-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009 and 2010 6-year graduation rate, or 2009 7-year graduation rate. For each of these rates, the aggregation is the result of adding the graduation totals for all available years and dividing by the sum of the graduation bases across all available years. For both 1-year and 3-year SPFs, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized here and on the Performance Indicators detail page.

# Annotated SPF Report (High School)

The "No AGP" section refers only to English language proficiency growth for the 2013 DPF

rformance Indicator	Scoring Guide			Rating	Point	Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points
	The school's percentage of studen	ts scoring proficient or advanced was	C .		TO	:AP		
	at or above the 90th percentile	of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline	2).	Exceeds		4	16	
Academic	below the 90th percentile but a	t or above the 50th percentile of all s	schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets		3	(4 for each	15
Achievement	below the 50th percentile but a	t or above the 15th percentile of all s	chools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching		2	subject area)	
	below the 15th percentile of all	schools (using 2009-10 baseline).		Does Not Meet		1	1	
	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP	No AGP		TCAP	ACCESS		
Academic	at or above 60.	at or above 70.	at or above 65.	Exceeds	4	2	14	
Growth	below 60 but at or above 45.	below 70 but at or above 55.	<ul> <li>below 65 but at or above 50.</li> </ul>	Meets	3	1.5	(4 for each subject	35
	below 45 but at or above 30.	below 55 but at or above 40.	<ul> <li>below 50 but at or above 35.</li> </ul>	Approaching	2	1	area and 2 for English	
	• below 30.	• below 40.	<ul> <li>below 35.</li> </ul>	Does Not Meet	1	0.5	language proficiency)	
	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP			TO	AP		
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	15	
·	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)	
	Graduation Rate and Disaggregated rate was:	d Graduation Rate: The school's grad	uation rate/disaggregated graduati	on	Overall	Disaggr.		
	at or above 90%.			Exceeds	4	1	]	
	<ul> <li>at or above 80% but below 90%.</li> </ul>			Meets	3	0.75	]	
	at or above 65% but below 80%.			Approaching	2	0.5	]	
	• below 65%.			Does Not Meet	1	0.25	1	
	Dropout Rate: The school's dropou	ut rate was:					16	
Postsecondary and	at or below 1%.			Exceeds		4	(4 for each sub-	35
Workforce Readiness	at or below the state average by	ut above 1% (using 2009-10 baseline).		Meets		3	indicator)	
	at or below 10% but above the s	state average (using 2009-10 baseline	).	Approaching		2		
	above 10%.			Does Not Meet		1	Elementary and middle so	hools have a
	Colorado ACT Composite Score: Ti	he school's average Colorado ACT co	mposite score was:				different scoring guide the	an high schoo
	at or above 22.	Exceeds		4	since high schools include			
	at or above the state average but	Meets		3	Postsecondary and Workf			
		ate average (using 2009-10 baseline).		Approaching		2	indicator.	orec negatifics
	• below 17.			Does Not Meet	1	1	mulcator.	

Cut-Points for Each Perfor	mance Indicator	Cut-Points for Plan Type Assignment					
	Cut Point: The school earned of the points eligible on this Indica		Cut Point: The school earned of the total framework points eligible.				
Achievement;	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds	Total	at or above 60%	Performance		
Growth; Growth Gaps;	<ul> <li>at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%</li> </ul>	Meets	Framework	<ul> <li>at or above 47% - below 60%</li> </ul>	Improvement		
Postsecondary Readiness	<ul> <li>at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%</li> </ul>	Approaching	Points	<ul> <li>at or above 33% - below 47%</li> </ul>	Priority Improvement		
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 33%	Turnaround		

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 District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five							
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.	consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the							
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.	school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.							

# Annotated SPF Report (High School)

### Reference - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

# 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

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.

Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

		Reauiiig		iviatii				AALICILI	5	Science			
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middl	e High	Elem	Middle	High	
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	27.5	
50th percentile	71.65	71.43	73.33	70.89	52.48	33.52	53.52	57.77	Use this		•		
90th percentile	89.10	88.24	87.23	89.34	75.00	54.79	76.83	79.67	Academi				
Persont of Ctudents Profisiont or Advanced by Persontile Cut Points 2 year aggreg										Juide, co	mparing	your	

refeelt of students Proficient of Advanced by			y refeelitite cut-rollits - 5-year aggrega				881684	district's percent proficient/advanced					
			Reading			Math			Writii	to Colora	do's per	cent prof	icient/
		Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Midd	advanced, to understand the ratin			he ratings
	N of Schools	1032	507	362	1032	507	361	1032	507	assigned			
	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

This is a visual representation of the rubric the Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps section of the Scoring Guide. Use the column that matches with whether your district met or did not meet adequate growth.

median growth percentile.

res academic progress ademic progress of th ency (CSAP/TCAP) sco

The No AGP column has been added for the 2013 DPF for English Language proficiency (ACCESS) growth.

ator reflects 1) other students ency (ACCESS) score equate) growth: whether this level of growth was sufficient for the typical (median) student

cified level of proficiency within a given length of time. For CSAP/TCAP, students are d within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. The median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth (AGP). For 2012-13, Adequate Growth cannot be calculated for English language proficiency therefore English language proficiency growth is determined only by the

Made AGP Did Not Make AGP No AGP Exceeds 60-99 70-99 65-99 55-69 Meets 45-59 50-64 Approaching 30-44 40-54 35-49 1-29 1-39 1 - 34Does Not Meet

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-vear (2007-0		

State Mean COAC

1-year (2010 3-year (2008Use this data in conjunction with the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness section of the Scoring Guide, comparing your district's results to the Colorado dropout rate and average ACT composite score, to understand the ratings assigned.

Science

30.95 19.67 23.85 27.50

Use this data in conjunction with the

Academic Achievement section of the

High