



Denver Public Schools

1860 Lincoln Street

Denver, Colorado 80203

2014 School Performance Framework Rubrics

Elementary School Level

DPS uses the School Performance Framework to determine a school's success relative to a balanced set of accreditation indicators that meet district and state requirements.

2014 School Performance Framework Rubrics

Elementary School Level

The purpose of this document is to provide detailed information about each SPF measure and the decision rules used to determine whether a school **did not meet** standards, was **approaching** standards, **met** standards, or (for some measures) **exceeded** standards.

The SPF measure calculations consist of two years' worth of data (i.e., 2012-2013 and 2013-2014). When there is only one year worth of data available, only one year is used. **Each year is evaluated separately, and then a matrix is used to combine the two years' scores into one single measure spotlight.**

I. Is the Educational Program a Success?

1. Student Progress Over Time—Growth

Are students making adequate or substantial growth over time?

Student progress over time includes measures of students' longitudinal growth using (1*) median growth percentiles, (2*) median growth percentiles compared to similar schools, (3*) catch-up growth, (4*) keep-up growth, (5*) continuously enrolled growth, (6) COALT growth, (7*) disaggregated group growth (ELL, FRL, and ethnic minority), (8*) disaggregated group growth comparison (ELL, FRL, and ethnic minority), (9*) students with disabilities group comparison, (10*) ACCESS growth, (11*) DRA2/EDL2 growth, and (12*) DRA2/EDL2 growth similar schools.

***Applicable only to schools with 16 or more SAR-included test scores. (See Glossary for definition of SAR-include).**

1.1a-c TCAP Median Growth Percentile: Was the school's TCAP median growth percentile at or above 50?	
0. Does not meet standard	The median growth percentile was less than 35.
2. Approaching standard	The median growth percentile was at or above 35 and less than 50.
4. Meets standard	The median growth percentile was at or above 50 and less than 65.
6. Exceeds standard	The median growth percentile was 65 or higher.

1.1a=Reading; 1.1b=Math; 1.1c=Writing

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets	6. Exceeds
Year 1					
0. Does not meet		0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
2. Approaching		0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets
4. Meets		2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets
6. Exceeds		2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets	6. Exceeds

1.2a-c TCAP Median Growth Percentile Compared to Similar Schools: Did the school have equal or better growth than similar schools on TCAP?	
0. Does not meet standard	The median growth percentile was more than 10 percentiles below the cluster median.
2. Approaching standard	The median growth percentile was more than 5 percentiles but less than 10 percentiles below the cluster median.
4. Meets standard	The median growth percentile was within 5 percentiles above or below the cluster median.
6. Exceeds standard	The median growth percentile was at least 5 percentiles above the cluster median.

1.2a=Reading; 1.2b=Math; 1.2c=Writing

Year 1 \ Year 2	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets	6. Exceeds
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
2. Approaching	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets
4. Meets	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets
6. Exceeds	2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets	6. Exceeds

1.3a Catch-Up Growth—Reading: Did the percentage of students moving up to a higher performance level* on TCAP meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was below 20%.
2. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was at least 20% but less than 30%.
4. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was at least 30%.
1.3b Catch-Up Growth—Math: Did the percentage of students moving up to a higher performance level* on TCAP meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was below 20%.
2. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was at least 20% but less than 30%.
4. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was at least 30%.
1.3c Catch-Up Growth—Writing: Did the percentage of students moving up to a higher performance level* on TCAP meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was below 30%.
2. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was at least 30% but less than 40%.
4. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students moving to a higher TCAP performance level was at least 40%.

*Partially Proficient is divided into Low Partially Proficient and High Partially Proficient. Moving from Low PP to High PP is considered catching up.

Year 2	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets
Year 1			
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching
2. Approaching	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
4. Meets	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets

1.4a-c Keep-Up Growth: Did the percentage of students staying in the Proficient or Advanced performance level on TCAP meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students staying at a high TCAP performance level was below 70%.
2. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students staying at a high TCAP performance level was at least 70% but less than 80%.
4. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students staying at a high TCAP performance level was at least 80%.

1.4.a=Reading; 1.4.b=Math; 1.4.c=Writing

Year 2	0. Did not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets
Year 1			
0. Did not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching
2. Approaching	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
4. Meets	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets

1.5a-c Continuously Enrolled Growth: Was the TCAP median growth percentile of continuously enrolled students higher than the median growth percentile of students who were not continuously enrolled*?	
0. Does not meet standard	The median growth percentile was more than 5 percentiles below the district median.
2. Approaching standard	The school's continuously enrolled students' median growth percentile was within 5 percentiles above or below the district median.
4. Meets standard	The school's continuously enrolled students' median growth percentile was more than 5 percentiles above the district median.

*Note: The comparison group is the students in the district who were not continuously enrolled in any one school.

1.5a=Reading; 1.5b=Math; 1.5c=Writing

Year 2	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets
Year 1			
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching
2. Approaching	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
4. Meets	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets

1.6 COALT Growth: Did the percentage of students who improved (if below Developing) or maintained (if at or above Developing) COALT performance levels meet the standard?*	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students who improved or maintained COALT performance levels was less than 20%.
2. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students who improved or maintained COALT performance levels was at least 20% but less than 50%.
4. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students who improved or maintained COALT performance levels was at least 50%.

*Note: All COALT subject areas are combined in this measure. Students moving from COALT to TCAP tests are considered improving.

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets
Year 1				
0. Does not meet		0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching
2. Approaching		0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
4. Meets		2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets

1.7a-c Disaggregated Group Growth: Was the school's median growth percentile on TCAP for free/reduced-lunch, minority, and English language learner students at or above 50?

In each school, only focus groups with 16 or more SAR-include students are included. (For definition of focus groups, please refer to the glossary.) Disaggregated group growth is calculated by first calculating the MGP of the disaggregated group and then using the same criteria as 1.1a-c in determining points earned. Each subject – Reading, Writing, and Math – is worth 3 points for a maximum of 9 points.

0 points	The median growth percentile was less than 35.
1 point	The median growth percentile was at or above 35 and less than 50.
2 points	The median growth percentile was at or above 50 and less than 65.
3 points	The median growth percentile was 65 or higher.

The school is evaluated based on its total percentage of points earned out of all possible points.

1.7a-c Disaggregated Group Growth Continued: How well did the school's disaggregated group perform?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school earned less than 33% of disaggregated group growth points.
1. Approaching standard	The school earned at least 33% but less than 65% of its disaggregated group growth points.
2. Meets standard	The school earned at least 65% but less than 80% of its disaggregated group growth points.
3. Exceeds standard	The school earned at least 80% of its disaggregated group growth points.

1.7a=ELL; 1.7b=FRL; 1.7c=Minority

Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets	3. Exceeds
Year 1				
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets
3. Exceeds	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets	3. Exceeds

1.8 a-c Disaggregated Group Growth Comparison: Did the school’s focus groups have equal or better growth than the school’s reference group?

In each school, only focus and reference groups with 16 or more SAR-include students are included. (For definition of focus groups and reference groups, please refer to the glossary.) Disaggregated group growth comparison is calculated by first calculating the MGP of the disaggregated groups and the reference groups and then using the criteria below to determine points earned. Each subject – Reading, Writing, and Math – is worth 2 points for a maximum of 6 points.

0 points	If the focus group’s MGP is less than the reference group by more than 10 percentiles.
1 points	If the focus group’s MGP is within 10 percentiles below the reference group.
2 points	If the focus group’s MGP is equal to or better than the reference group’s.

The school is evaluated based on its total percentage of points earned out of all possible points.

1.8 a-c Disaggregated Group Growth Continued: How well did the school’s focus groups perform relative to the reference group?

0. Does not meet standard	The school earned less than 50% of disaggregated group growth comparison points.
1. Approaching standard	The school earned at least 50% but less than 74% of its disaggregated group growth points.
2. Meets	The school earned at least 74% of its disaggregated group growth points.

1.8a=ELL; 1.8b=FRL; 1.8c=Minority

Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets
Year 1			
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets

1.9 Students with Disabilities Growth Comparison: Did the school’s students with disabilities have equal or better growth than the students with disabilities state-wide?

In each school, only 16 or more SAR-include students are included. Disaggregated group growth comparison is calculated by first calculating the MGP of the students with disabilities in the school and then comparing to the state’s MGP. Each subject – Reading, Writing, and Math – is worth 2 points for a maximum of 6 points.

0 points	The school's students with disabilities' MGP is below the state's MGP by 5 percentiles.
1 points	The school's students with disabilities' MGP is 5 percentiles above or below the state's MGP.
2 points	The school's students with disabilities' MGP is greater than the state's MGP by 5 percentiles.

The school is evaluated based on its total percentage of points earned out of all possible points.

1.9 Students with Disabilities Growth Continued: How well did the school's students with disabilities perform relative to the state?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school earned less than 50% of disaggregated group growth comparison points.
2. Approaching standard	The school earned at least 50% but less than 74% of its disaggregated group growth points.
4. Meets	The school earned at least 74% of its disaggregated group growth points.

Year 2 \ Year 1	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching
2. Approaching	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
4. Meets	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets

1.10 ACCESS Median Growth Percentile: Was the school's ACCESS median growth percentile at or above 50?	
0. Does not meet standard	The median growth percentile was less than 35.
2. Approaching standard	The median growth percentile was at or above 35 and less than 50.
4. Meets standard	The median growth percentile was at or above 50 and less than 65.
6. Exceeds standard	The median growth percentile was 65 or higher.

Year 2 \ Year 1	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets	6. Exceeds
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
2. Approaching	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets
4. Meets	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets
6. Exceeds	2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets	6. Exceeds

1.11 DRA2/EDL2 Growth: Did the percentage of students making adequate improvement on DRA/EDL text levels meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students who made adequate improvement on DRA2/EDL2 was less than 50%.
2. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students who made adequate improvement on DRA2/EDL2 was at least 50% but less than 75%.
4. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students who made adequate improvement on DRA2/EDL2 was at least 75%.

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets
Year 1				
0. Does not meet		0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching
2. Approaching		0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
4. Meets		2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets

1.12 DRA2/EDL2 Growth Compared to Similar Schools: Did the school have equal or more students making adequate growth on DRA2/EDL2 than similar schools?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students who made adequate improvement on DRA2/EDL2 was more than 5 percentage points below the cluster's percentage.
4. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students who made adequate improvement on DRA2/EDL2 was equal to or greater than the cluster's percentage minus 5 percentage points.

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	4. Meets
Year 1			
0. Does not meet		0. Does not meet	2. Approaching
4. Meets		2. Approaching	4. Meets

1.13a-d 10th Grade TCAP to 11th Grade COACT Growth (HS Only) : This measure does not apply to the elementary school level.

2. Student Achievement Level—Status

Is the achievement level of the school high?

Student achievement status includes the following state measures: (1*) the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on TCAP, (2*) TCAP status similar schools, (3*) achievement for specific student disaggregated groups (ELL, SPED, FRL, and minority), (4) early literacy indicated by DRA2/EDL2, (5*) percentage of students scoring advanced in TCAP, and (6) percentage of students scoring above proficient on the ACCESS assessment.

***Applicable only to schools with 16 or more SAR-included test scores.**

2.1a TCAP % Proficient—Reading: Did the percentage of students proficient or advanced meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was less than 35%.
1. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 35% but less than 50%.
2. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 50%.

2.1b TCAP % Proficient—Math: Did the percentage of students proficient or advanced meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was less than 35%.
1. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 35% but less than 50%.
2. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 50%.
2.1c TCAP % Proficient—Writing: Did the percentage of students proficient or advanced meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was less than 25%.
1. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 25% but less than 40%.
2. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 40%.

Year 2 \ Year 1	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets

2.2a-c TCAP % Proficient Compared to Similar Schools: Did the school have equal or better achievement than similar schools on TCAP?	
0. Does not meet standard	The percentage of students proficient or advanced was more than 10 percentage points below the cluster percentage.
1. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was more than 5 but less than 10 percentage points below the cluster percentage.
2. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was within 5 percentage points above or below the cluster percentage.
3. Exceeds standard	The school's percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 5 percentage points above the cluster percentage.

2.2a=Reading; 2.2b=Math; 2.2c=Writing

Year 2 \ Year 1	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets	3. Exceeds
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets
3. Exceeds	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets	3. Exceeds

2.3a-c Disaggregated Group Status

In each school, only focus groups with 16 or more SAR-include students are included. (For definition of focus groups, please refer to the glossary.) Disaggregated group status is calculated by first calculating the percentage of students in each disaggregated group who are Proficient or Advanced on TCAP and then using the same criteria as 2.1a-c in determining points earned. Each subject – Reading, Writing, and Math– is worth 2 points for a maximum of 6 points. **(On the 2014 SPF, Science is included in the 2012-2013 Prior Year portion of the matrix, for a maximum of 8 points)**

TCAP % Proficient—Reading	
0 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was less than 35%.
1 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 35% but less than 50%.
2 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 50%.
TCAP % Proficient—Math	
0 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was less than 35%.
1 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 35% but less than 50%.
2 points	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 50%.
TCAP % Proficient—Writing	
0 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was less than 25%.
1 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 25% but less than 40%.
2 points	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 40%.

TCAP % Proficient—Science (On the 2014 SPF, Science in 2012-2013 Prior Year Only)	
0 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was less than 15%.
1 point	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 15% but less than 30%.
2 points	The school’s percentage of students proficient or advanced was at least 30%.

The school is evaluated based on its total percentage of points earned out of all possible points.

2.3a-c Disaggregated Group Status: How well did the school’s disaggregated group perform?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school earned less than 40% of disaggregated group status points.
1. Approaching standard	The school earned at least 40% but less than 65% of its disaggregated group status points.
2. Meets standard	The school earned at least 65% of its disaggregated group status points.

2.3a=ELL; 2.3b=FRL; 2.3c=Minority

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets
Year 1				
	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching
	1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
	2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets

2.4 Students with Disabilities Disaggregated Group Status Comparison: How well did the school's students with disabilities perform in comparison to the state?

In each school, only 16 or more SAR-include students are included. Students with disabilities disaggregated group status comparison is calculated by first calculating the percentage of students of disabilities Proficient or Advanced on TCAP and then comparing to the state's percentage of Proficient or Advanced. Each subject – Reading, Writing, and Math – is worth 2 points for a maximum of 6 points. **(On the 2014 SPF, Science is included in the 2012-2013 Prior Year portion of the matrix, for a maximum of 8 points)**

0 points	The school's percentage of students with disabilities at Proficient or Advanced is 5% points below the state's percentage.
1 points	The school's percentage of students with disabilities at Proficient or Advanced is equal to or 5% points above or below the state's percentage.
2 points	The school's percentage of students with disabilities at Proficient or Advanced is at least 5% points above the state's percentage.

The school is evaluated based on its total percentage of points earned out of all possible points.

2.4 Students with Disabilities Status Continued: How well did the school's students with disabilities perform relative to the state?

0. Does not meet standard	The school earned less than 40% of disaggregated group status comparison points.
1. Approaching standard	The school earned at least 40% but less than 65% of its disaggregated group status comparison points.
2. Meets	The school earned at least 65% of its disaggregated group status comparison points.

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets
Year 1				
0. Does not meet		0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching
1. Approaching		0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
2. Meets		1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets

2.5 TCAP % Advanced: Did the percentage of students scoring advanced on TCAP tests meet the standard (combining all subject areas)? **(On the 2014 SPF, Science in 2012-2013 Prior Year Only)**

0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students at the advanced level was below 5%.
1. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students at the advanced level was at least 5% but less than 10%.
2. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students at the advanced level was at least 10%

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets
Year 1				
0. Does not meet		0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching
1. Approaching		0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
2. Meets		1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets

2.6 ACCESS % at Expectations: Did the percentage of students who scored at or above the grade level expectation on the Overall and Literacy Composites meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's percentage of students who were at the grade level expectation was less than 30%.
1. Approaching standard	The school's percentage of students who were at the grade level expectation was at least 30% but less than 45%.
2. Meets standard	The school's percentage of students who were at the grade level expectation was at least 45% but less than 65%.
3. Exceeds Standard	The school's percentage of students who were at the grade level expectation was greater than or equal to 65%.

Year 2 \ Year 1	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets	3. Exceeds
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets
3. Exceeds	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets	3. Exceeds

2.7 DRA2/EDL2: Did the percentage of students reading at or above grade level meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The percentage of students at or above grade level was below 30%.
1. Approaching standard	The percentage of students at or above grade level was at least 30% but less than 50%.
2. Meets standard	The percentage of students at or above grade level was at least 50%.

3. Post Secondary Readiness—Growth

This indicator does not apply to the elementary school level.

4. Post Secondary Readiness—Status

This indicator does not apply to the elementary school level.

5. Student Engagement

Are the school's students engaged?

Student Engagement is measured by (1) attendance rate, (2) the student satisfaction survey results, and (3) center-based program offerings. Measure 5.3, center-based program offerings, is included in the overall framework scoring, but not in the scoring of the Student Engagement Indicator.

5.1 Attendance Rate: Did the school's average attendance rate meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The school's average student attendance rate was below 93%.
1. Approaching standard	The school's average student attendance rate was at least 93% but less than 94%.
2. Meets standard	The school's average student attendance rate was at least 94% but less than 95%.
3. Exceeds Standard	The school's average student attendance rate was at least 95%.

Year 1 \ Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets	3. Exceeds
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets
3. Exceeds	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets	3. Exceeds

5.2 Student Satisfaction: Did the positive response rate meet the standard?*	
0. Does not meet standard	The positive response rate was below 80%.
1. Approaching standard	The positive response rate was at least 80%, but below 85%.
2. Meets standard	The positive response rate was at least 85%, but below 90%.
3. Exceeds standard	The positive response rate was at least 90%.

*a minimum response rate of 50% is required to be eligible to earn points on this measure

Year 1 \ Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets	3. Exceeds
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets
3. Exceeds	1. Approaching	2. Meets	2. Meets	3. Exceeds

5.3 Center-based program offerings: Did the school offer center-based programs?	
0 points	The school did not offer any center-based programs in the previous 2 years.
1 point	The school offered a total of 1 or 2 center-based programs in the previous 2 years.
2 points	The school offered a total of 3 or 4 center-based programs in the previous 2 years.
3 points	The school offered 5 or more center-based programs in the previous 2 years.

II. Is the organization effective and well-run?

6. Enrollment

Enrollment is measured by (1) re-enrollment rate compared to similar schools and (2) percentage of students enrolled the entire year compared to similar schools. Measure 6.4, enrollment change, is included in the overall framework scoring but not in the scoring of the Enrollment Indicator.

6.1 Re-Enrollment Rate Compared to Similar Schools: Did the school have equal or better re-enrollment compared to similar schools?	
0. Does not meet standard	The re-enrollment rate was more than 5% points below the cluster.
1. Approaching standard	The re-enrollment rate was within 5% points above or below the cluster.
2. Meets standard	The re-enrollment rate was more than 5% points above the cluster.

Only current year data is used on this measure.

6.2 % Enrolled Entire Year Compared to Similar Schools: Did the school have an equal or better percentage of students enrolled entire year compared to similar schools?	
0. Does not meet standard	The percent enrolled entire rate was more than 5% points below the cluster.
1. Approaching standard	The percent enrolled entire year was within 5% points above or below the cluster.
2. Meets standard	The percent enrolled entire year was more than 5% points above the cluster or the current percent enrolled year was 95% or above.

	Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets
Year 1				
0. Does not meet		0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching
1. Approaching		0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
2. Meets		1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets

6.3 CDE Dropout Rate: This measure does not apply to the elementary school level.
--

6.4 Enrollment Change: Did the school experience a positive net change in enrollment?	
0 points	The school had a less than 2 percentage point net gain.
1 point	The school had a net gain between 2 and 3 percentage points.
2 points	The school had a net gain of 4 percentage points or more.

7. Parent Satisfaction

Are the parents satisfied with the school?

The Parent Satisfaction indicator is measured by 1) parent satisfaction survey results and 2) parent satisfaction survey response rate.

7.1 Parent Satisfaction: Did the positive response rate meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The positive response rate was below 78%.
2. Approaching standard	The positive response rate was at least 78%, but below 82%.
4. Meets standard	The positive response rate was at least 82%, but below 90%.
6. Exceeds standard	The positive response rate was at least 90%.

Year 1 \ Year 2	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	4. Meets	6. Exceeds
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching
2. Approaching	0. Does not meet	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets
4. Meets	2. Approaching	2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets
6. Exceeds	2. Approaching	4. Meets	4. Meets	6. Exceeds

7.2 Parent Response Rate: Did the parent response rate meet the standard?	
0. Does not meet standard	The response rate was below 20%
1. Approaching standard	The response rate was at least 20%, but below 50%.
2. Meets standard	The response rate was at least 50%.

Year 1 \ Year 2	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	2. Meets
0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching
1. Approaching	0. Does not meet	1. Approaching	1. Approaching
2. Meets	1. Approaching	1. Approaching	2. Meets