**Emily Griffith High School – State SPF Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF Rating** | **DPS SPF Rating** |
| **AEC Priority Improvement** | **Accredited on Watch** |

On the State’s 2018 AEC SPF framework, Emily Griffith High School earned a rating of AEC: Priority Improvement and earned 29.37 out of 85 points possible. This rating is based on the school’s performance on 4 indicators:

* Academic Achievement (Status) – worth 15 points
* Academic Growth (Growth) – worth 35 points
* Student Engagement (Family and Student Engagement & Satisfaction) – worth 20 points
* Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness (PSR) – worth 30 points

Emily Griffith didn’t meet the State’s eligibility requirements for the Academic Growth and as such that entire indicator was dropped from their CDE SPF. On the remaining three indicators, EGHS earned Meets on Academic Achievement and Approaching on Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness and Does Not Meet on Student Engagement. As their rating was based on fewer overall points than most AECs, the Red rating for Student Engagement was enough to drop Emily Griffith below the Approaching threshold and into Priority Improvement (Orange).

**Academic Achievement Indicator**

**CMAS Science**

Methodology: CMAS Science is rated using the mean scale score for all eligible students pooled across the most recent 3 years of data. This includes both regular CMAS and CoAlt. In order to be eligible for the measure a student must have a valid test score from at least one year in the pool, be continuously enrolled at the school between October Count and the testing window, and be in a tested grade as of the testing window (i.e. in grade 11 when CMAS Science was given).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF CMAS Science Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | <503 |
| Approaching | <515 and >=503 |
| Meets | <577 and >=515 |
| Exceeds | >=577 |

EGHS Results: On this year’s CDE SPF, EGHS had 59 eligible students in this measure with a mean scale score of 541.5. This was smack in the middle of the State’s Meets rating band.

**COPSAT EBRW and Math**

Methodology: COPSAT EBRW and Math are calculated similarly. These measures are also based on a 3 year pool of data and utilize a mean scale score of all eligible students which is also defined the same way as CMAS Science. Starting this year, there are two COPSAT tests: PSAT9 and PSAT10. The CDE combines these two tests into a single dataset when calculating a school’s mean scale score. It is also worth noting that while the measure is designed to use 3 years of data, PSAT9 is a brand new test. As a result there is only one year of PSAT9 data to include in the measure. PSAT10 has the full 3 years of data available and included in this measure’s results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF PSAT9/10 EBRW Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | <383.8 |
| Approaching | <394.5 and >=383.8 |
| Meets | <425.3 and >=394.5 |
| Exceeds | >=425.3 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF PSAT9/10 Math Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | <378.2 |
| Approaching | <385.3 and >=378.2 |
| Meets | <412.6 and >=385.3 |
| Exceeds | >=412.6 |

EGHS Results: For the 2018 CDE SPF, Emily Griffith had 22 eligible students who had mean scale scores of 400.9 and 385.9 for EBRW and Math respectively. For both content areas, these mean scale scores were sufficient to earn them Meets.

For all Academic Achievement measures, cut points are set based on the distribution of performance for AECs across the state. The cuts were set using the 40th, 60th, and 90th percentile scores.

**Academic Growth Indicator**

**State MGP ELA and Math**

Methodology: Both measures are based on the same growth percentile data as the DPS SPF and contain all available assessment data for all available grades. For the 2018 SPF, the Academic Growth indicator measures consolidate 8th to 9th grade, 9th to 10th grade, and 10th to 11th grade growth into content-area specific measures just like the DPS SPF. Measure results are based on the median growth percentile of that data pooled across the three most recent years. However, due to assessment transitions, this year’s SPF has 2 years of 8th to 9th and 9th to 10th grade growth data and 1 year of 10th to 11th grade growth. Similar to Academic Achievement, a student is eligible for the State’s growth indicator if they have a valid growth percentile for two consecutive years, were enrolled in the school from October 1st through the testing window, and have regular grade-progression.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF Growth Cut Points – ELA and Math** | |
| Does Not Meet | <35 |
| Approaching | <50 and >=35 |
| Meets | <65 and >=50 |
| Exceeds | >=65 |

EGHS Results: The school had fewer than 20 eligible students for this measure so it was dropped from their SPF.

For all Academic Growth measures, the cut points used are identical to those used on the DPS SPF.

**Student Engagement Indicator**

**Attendance**

Methodology: Both of these measures use the exact same data and definitions as the DPS SPF, but are based on a three year pool of data. All students regardless of the length of time they were enrolled are eligible for these measures.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF Attendance Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | <80.2% |
| Approaching | <86.5% and >=80.2% |
| Meets | <94.8% and >=86.5% |
| Exceeds | >=94.8% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF Truancy Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | >11.91% |
| Approaching | >7.81% and <=11.91% |
| Meets | >0.1% and <=7.81% |
| Exceeds | <=0.1% |

EGHS Results: When subject to the measure cut points shown below, Emily Griffith earned Does Not Meet for both measures. EGHS had an average daily attendance of 75.9% which was roughly 5% short of Approaching. The school also had a truancy rate of 19.7% which is well beyond the 11.91% required to earn an Approaching.

For both measures, the cut points were set based off the distribution of the data for all AECs across the state as of 2016. The values seen in these cuts align to the 40th, 60th, and 90th percentile scores just like the Academic Achievement measures.

**Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness Indicator**

**COSAT EBRW and Math**

Methodology: The COSAT EBRW and Math measures are almost identical to their PSAT9/10 counterparts in the Academic Achievement indicator. These measures combine DLM data with SAT data and look at a school’s mean scale score across multiple years. In 2018, this measure pooled 2 years of data as this was the maximum available, but in the future it will also transition to be based on 3 years. Student eligibility criteria are identical to those used for CMAS Science and COPSAT EBRW and Math.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF COSAT EBRW Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | <420.9 |
| Approaching | <435.1 and >=420.9 |
| Meets | <458.3 and >=435.1 |
| Exceeds | >=458.3 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF COSAT Math Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | <399.8 |
| Approaching | <406.5 and >=399.8 |
| Meets | <424.3 and >=406.5 |
| Exceeds | >=424.3 |

EGHS Results: Based on these cut points below, EGHS earned Approaching for both EBRW and Math based on a sample of 56 students. For EBRW, the school’s mean scale score for COSAT was 428.6 which place EGHS in the middle of the Approaching band. For Math, their mean scale score was 406.4. That result missed earning Meets by only .1%.

For the COSAT measures, cut points are set based on the distribution of performance for AECs across the state. The cuts were set using the 40th, 60th, and 90th percentile scores.

**Completion Rate**

Methodology: The CDE’s completion rate measure, much like the DPS version, is based on the school’s “Best-Of” completion rate for their 4 year, 5 year, 6 year, and 7 year cohorts. It is important to note however, that like their other measures described above, this measure uses a pool of the three most recent years’ worth of completers to determine an aggregated completion rate. For example, if a school had 75/100 students complete in 6 years in 2015, and 80/100 students complete in 6 years in 2016, and 85/100 students complete in 6 years in 2017, their aggregated 6 year cohort rate for the CDE’s measure would be 240/300 or 80%. Whichever pooled cohort has the highest completion rate is the one that is used for the CDE’s measure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF Completion Rate Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | <40% |
| Approaching | <49.5% and >=40% |
| Meets | <69.4% and >=49.5% |
| Exceeds | >=69.4% |

EGHS Results: Completion Rate was based on the large sample of over 1,300 students. The completion rate of this student group was 41.1% which was just enough to push EGHS into the Approaching rating band. The State’s report does not indicate which cohort year this result is based upon.

**Dropout Rate**

Methodology: The last measure of the State’s AEC framework is Dropout Rate. Similar to previous measures, the data source used for the CDE’s dropout rate measure is identical to that used on the DPS SPF with the exception of data pooling. The CDE uses a three year data pool for this measure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **State SPF Dropout Rate Cut Points** | |
| Does Not Meet | >18.20% |
| Approaching | >12.80% and <=18.20% |
| Meets | <4.60% and <=12.80% |
| Exceeds | <=4.60% |

EGHS Results: When rated based on this pooled data, Emily Griffith earned a Does Not Meet rating for this measure with a dropout rate of 43.8%. This is significantly higher than the minimum rate needed to earn Approaching of 18.20%

For both measures, the cut points were set based off the distribution of the data for all AECs across Colorado as of 2016. The values seen in these cuts align to the 40th, 60th, and 90th percentile scores just like the Academic Achievement measures.

**Summary of Why There’s a Difference in Ratings**

The discrepancy between how the State and how DPS have rated Emily Griffith High School is largely driven by four factors. First, the CDE’s framework uses much more restrictive eligibility requirements. In order to be in most of the school’s measure on the State’s SPF, a student has to be continuously enrolled at the school from October through April. This omits significantly more students form the measure than the DPS SPF’s 40 instructional days which requires roughly two months of enrollment to be a part of a measure. Second, the State SPF only has 11 measures compared to the DPS framework’s 19. With optional measures the DPS SPF could have as many as 24 possible measures. This gives school’s more variety in their measures and more opportunities to demonstrate progress. Third, the relative weight of indicators of the State SPF is very different. The DPS SPF is heavily focused on Growth with it being weighted 2.7 times more heavily than Status and 2.3 times more heavily than PSR data in a school’s final rating. By comparison, CDE weights Academic Growth 2.3 times more heavily than Academic Achievement, but weights Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness almost equally. Fourth, the State’s methodology uses three years of pooled data for all measures whereas the DPS only does so for assessment-based measures like MAP, PSAT, and SAT. Adding additional years of data to the other measures shared between frameworks can fundamentally shift schools’ results and introduce variation into ratings. A final, more minor, difference in the two frameworks is that the CDE has already dropped all CMAS data from their 3 year data pool, while the DPS SPF continues to include those data points.