



# COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF PERFORMANCE AND POLICY  
201 East Colfax Avenue • Denver, Colorado 80203-1799  
303.866.6600

## Documentation of District Requests to Reconsider District Accreditation and School Plan Type Assignments

Pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009

December 6, 2010

The Education Accountability Act of 2009 requires the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) to evaluate all districts and schools based on their level of attainment on four key State performance indicators: academic achievement, academic growth, extent of gaps between student groups and postsecondary readiness. State identified measures and metrics for each of these performance indicators are combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of a district's or a school's performance. For districts, the overall evaluation leads to their accreditation category. For schools, the overall evaluation leads to the type of improvement plan schools will implement. Districts accredit schools, and they may do so using the state's performance framework or using their own more exhaustive or stringent framework. The results of these evaluations are reported annually through customized district performance framework (DPF) reports and school performance framework (SPF) reports for each district and school.

Prior to finalizing the DPF and SPF reports, districts had the opportunity to indicate if they disagreed with any of the Department's initial accreditation categories or initial plan type assignments. If the district disagreed, they were asked to submit a request to reconsider that included:

- 1) A statement about the extent to which the district/school effectively implemented with fidelity its improvement plan from the prior academic year;
- 2) Valid and reliable data demonstrating the progress the district/school has made in improving its performance and in moving closer to meeting the statewide targets on the performance indicators (achievement, growth, growth gaps and postsecondary readiness).

A cross-unit CDE team consisting of staff from the Office of Performance and Policy, the Office of Teaching and Learning and the Office of Federal Programs, reviewed each request to reconsider. CDE staff evaluated the extent to which the requests met the conditions and data criteria outlined in the [Request to Reconsider guidance](#), as well as the extent to which they satisfied these [key questions](#). The staff then made a recommendation to the Commissioner as to the district's final accreditation category and/or school plan type. Final district accreditation categories were determined by the Commissioner on November 15, and the State Board adopted a final plan type assignment for each school in December. Additional details on this process are described in the [Colorado District Accountability Handbook](#).

The Request to Reconsider Summaries table that follows summarizes the requests to reconsider received by the Department by October 15, 2010 and their resolution as approved by the State Board of Education on December 6, 2010. It outlines CDE's initial district accreditation category or initial school plan type assignment based on the DPF and SPF results, the district's alternate requested accreditation category or school plan type assignment, and the district's rationale for the request. It then presents the final accreditation and plan type determination made by CDE, and the rationale for the decision. This final accreditation category and plan type assignment is the one reported on the district or school's performance framework report.

## Glossary of Terms used in Request to Reconsider Summaries

For additional definitions, please refer to the [Colorado District Accountability Handbook](#), Appendix A: Colorado Educational Accountability System Terminology.

<b>District Performance Framework (DPF)</b>	The framework used by the state to provide information to stakeholders about each district’s performance on four key performance indicators: student achievement, student academic growth, growth gaps, and postsecondary readiness. Districts are assigned an accreditation category based on their performance across all of the indicator areas. The district’s results on the district performance framework are summarized in the district performance framework (DPF) report.
<b>School Performance Framework (SPF)</b>	The framework used by the state to provide information to stakeholders about each school’s performance on four key performance indicators: student achievement, student academic growth, growth gaps, and postsecondary readiness. Schools are assigned to a type of improvement plan based on their performance across all of the indicator areas. The school’s results on the performance framework are summarized in the school performance framework (SPF) report.
<b>Median Growth Percentile (MGP)</b>	Summarizes student growth by district, school, grade-level, or other group of interest. It is calculated by taking the individual Student Growth Percentiles of the students in the group of interest and calculating the median.
<b>Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP)</b>	The growth (student growth percentile) sufficient for the median student in a district, school, or other group of interest to reach an achievement level of proficient or advanced in a subject area within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. In the case of the performance framework reports, for each student in a school, a growth percentile can be calculated to indicate what level of growth was needed to catch up (reach proficiency) or keep up (maintain proficiency). Taking the median of these catch up and keep up percentiles yields the growth level that would, on average, enable all students to be either catching up or keeping up, whichever they need to do.
<b>Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP)</b>	Colorado Student Assessment Program. Content areas currently tested include reading (in English and Spanish versions), writing (in English and Spanish versions), mathematics, in grades 3-10, and science in grades 5, 8, and 10.
<b>Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP)</b>	The NWEA MAP assessments are computer adaptive tests that some Colorado districts use to measure student achievement and progress in reading, language usage, mathematics and science. They are administered up to four times a year in reading, language usage and mathematics, and up to three times a year in science.
<b>Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)</b>	<p>The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) are a set of procedures and measure for assessing the acquisition of early literacy skills from kindergarten through sixth grade. They are designed to be short (one minute) fluency measures used to regularly monitor the development of early literacy and early reading skills.</p> <p>The DIBELS measures assess the 5 Big Ideas in early literacy identified by the National Reading Panel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phonemic Awareness is measured by Initial Sounds Fluency (ISF) and Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF).</li> <li>• Alphabetic Principle is measured by Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF).</li> <li>• Accuracy &amp; Fluency with connected Text is measured by Oral Reading Fluency (ORF).</li> <li>• Vocabulary is measured by Word Use Fluency (WUF is still under development).</li> <li>• Comprehension is measured by ORF and Retell Fluency (RTF).</li> </ul> <p>Source: <a href="http://www.dibels.org/dibels.html">http://www.dibels.org/dibels.html</a></p>

## Request to Reconsider Summaries

District	School	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	District/School Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Adams-Arapahoe 28J	District Level Request	Accredited with Turnaround Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district has a strong strategic plan in place, with a commendable focus on accelerating student achievement, closing gaps and preparing <i>all</i> students for college without remediation. It has made systemic changes to meet the goals outlined in its plan, and to date has implemented 93% of its benchmarks, met 56% of the interim measures and made progress towards an additional 37%. Notable changes include standards-based grading, quarterly assessments, and data teams.</li> <li>• APS has taken significant strides to address its students' postsecondary and workforce readiness, focusing on keeping students in school. Actions taken include:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Concurrent Enrollment: The district has the largest number of students in the state enrolled in the ASCENT program and has doubled the number of students who take courses at a college site. It offers four academic and career pathways, currently available in 18 schools and to be offered in all APS schools by 2015.</li> <li>2) Truancy: All middle and high schools have reduced truancy rates, with the middle school truancy rate halving from 16.2% to 8.0% and the high school rate dropping from 35.0% to 25.8%.</li> <li>3) Positive Behavior Intervention Supports: These interventions have resulted in a decrease in office referrals and out-of-school suspensions in the 23 schools where they have been implemented.</li> <li>4) Extended school year: The district offers 23 extra school days for Fifth Block participants. Results from 2008 indicate that these program participants exceed non-participants in CSAP growth (see district letter).</li> <li>5) ACT: The mean ACT composite score of APS' graduates has increased from 17.0 in 2009 to 18.3 in 2010.</li> <li>6) The district's participation rate is impacted by its focus on re-engaging students rather than withdrawing them. While participation rates are 99% in the elementary and middle school, the high school rate is just below 95% because of the district's truancy reduction program. In 2010, 90% of students marked as "absent" on the CSAP were in truancy programs where the district seeks to bring the student back to school, even if they have had more than 10 consecutive days of unexcused absences. This is part of the district's partnership with the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> judicial districts, where the district keeps students enrolled while in truancy court.</li> <li>7) APS utilizes the School Counselor Corps grant, and has reduced the number of first quarter freshman Fs in core courses by 34%. The result has been a decline in dropout rates from 8.6% in 2006-07 to 7.4% in 2008-09. The graduation rate, when including all fifth year seniors, bumps up to 59% from 48.5% in 2008-09.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• CSAP proficiency has increased 3.7% over the past four years, and APS has consistently outpaced the state in student growth in all areas over the past four years. Solid growth has also been achieved with little gaps</li> </ul>	Request approved: Accredited with Improvement Plan	<p>Aurora faces significant performance challenges. Its achievement and postsecondary and workforce readiness outcomes are among the lowest in the state. However, its growth and growth gaps outcomes are above the state average. While commendable, these growth rates must reach even higher levels for its students to be adequately prepared for postsecondary and workforce success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The percentage of the district's students who are proficient/advanced on CSAP falls below the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile across all subject areas at all school levels and below the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile in reading and writing at all school levels. The district receives a "does not meet" or "approaching" across all achievement indicators. Its elementary results are particularly low, with the district at the 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> percentile in achievement.</li> <li>• Aurora's growth percentiles in the past year generally meet the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile across all subjects. At the elementary and middle school level, median growth percentiles for some disaggregated groups in reading and math exceed the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile. At the high school level, median growth percentiles fall between the 44<sup>th</sup> and 54<sup>th</sup> percentile.</li> <li>• The district's most recent graduation rate is 48.5%, the dropout rate is 7.4%, and the mean ACT composite score is 16.8. These are all substantially below state expectations.</li> </ul> <p>To address these challenges, Aurora has implemented a strategic plan that reflects bold leadership and vision, and a clear understanding of the extent of changes needed to make dramatic improvements in these key performance areas. CDE strongly supports the district's efforts. Further, APS' efforts in the areas of dropout prevention and recovery are commendable, especially as the district has made a commitment to serving all students, providing even the most at-risk students opportunities to stay in school.</p> <p>Despite the implementation of these reforms, it is not yet clear that these efforts are having a district-wide impact on all key performance indicators. Many initiatives are program-based and school-dependent, serving a share of the district's schools and students rather than all schools. The data reveal some fluctuations across the key performance indicators over the past three years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While achievement as measured by CSAP proficiency rates has increased each year across all subjects for the district as a whole, there is not a consistent increase across individual grades in the past three years.</li> <li>• While growth, as measured by CSAP median growth percentiles in the past three years, has been consistently at/above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile across subject areas, school levels (elementary, middle, high), and disaggregated student groups (especially Free/Reduced Lunch students), the results do not show a consistent, positive direction through the three most recent years. Growth in writing increased from the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2008 to the 51<sup>st</sup> percentile in 2009 and the 52<sup>nd</sup> percentile in 2010, and did so across nearly all disaggregated groups, with the median growth percentile for students on IEPs increasing from 42<sup>nd</sup> to 45<sup>th</sup> percentile. However, growth in reading increased from the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2008 to the 3<sup>rd</sup> percentile in 2009, then</li> </ul>

				<p>between the growth of low-performing and high-performing demographic student groups, especially among Free/Reduced Lunch students (see chart in letter).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although these daily and systemic changes have yet to be reflected in the measures used on the state’s performance framework, data on leading indicators suggest that the district has the right strategies and actions in place to ensure continuous improvements.</li> </ul>		<p>dropped to the 51<sup>st</sup> percentile in 2010. Similarly, growth in math increased from the 53<sup>rd</sup> percentile in 2008 to the 58<sup>th</sup> percentile in 2009, then dropped to the 53<sup>rd</sup> percentile in 2010. In writing, drops were observed from 2009 to 2010 across students with Free/Reduced Lunch from the 53<sup>rd</sup> to 51<sup>st</sup> percentile, students on IEPs from the 47<sup>th</sup> to 43<sup>rd</sup> percentile, and English language learners from the 55<sup>th</sup> to 53<sup>rd</sup> percentile. In math, drops were observed from 2009 to 2010 across minority students and students with Free/Reduced Lunch from the 58<sup>th</sup> to 53<sup>rd</sup> percentile, students on IEPs from the 52<sup>nd</sup> to 47<sup>th</sup> percentile, and English language learners from the 60<sup>th</sup> to 54<sup>th</sup> percentile. The district’s percentage of students catching up stays approximately the same across subjects, but the district’s percentages of students keeping up and moving up – key leading indicators of postsecondary readiness – drop in math and writing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While postsecondary and workforce readiness as measured by dropout rates and average ACT composite scores has improved, the graduation rate dropped to 48.5% in 2009 from 56.4% in 2008 and 58.4% in 2007. CDE recognizes that graduation and dropout data lag; however, the district’s graduation rate is still below the 65% needed to be “approaching” state expectations (and 80% to “meet” state expectations) even when projecting 2009-10 rates.</li> </ul> <p>CDE commends the district for its efforts to ensure proper test administration procedures while not dismissing efforts to include all students. The district made federal AYP participation and makes it across all subject areas when combining elementary, middle and high school participation results. As a result, the district meets the state’s expectations for test participation.</p> <p>Based on the encouraging academic growth evidence reviewed and CDE’s confidence in the reform direction led by Superintendent John Barry, his team and Board of Education, CDE approves the district’s request to reconsider and assigns a category of Accredited with Improvement Plan. Aurora’s progress in closing growth gaps and reengaging students provides an example for statewide consideration. Aurora can boast student growth rates for low income students, English Language Learners, and students with disabilities that are at or above the state average in reading and writing, and substantially above the state average in math. However, a great deal of work remains for Aurora to accomplish in adequately preparing students for college and career success. This is clearly revealed in their unacceptably low graduation rate and acknowledged and understood by the district’s leadership.</p>
Branson Reorganize d 82	District Level Request	Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	Accredited with Improvement Plan	<p>Branson would receive a rating of Accredited with Performance if the following areas were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 0% graduation rate of the GED Online School adversely impacts the overall graduation rate of the district and the performance rating for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness on the DPF. Graduation rates are significantly higher when factoring out the GED Online School.</li> <li>Despite low growth reflected on the SPFs for middle schools for reading ( 36<sup>th</sup> percentile) and math (28<sup>th</sup> percentile), middle school student performance has improved on a set of formative assessments used to</li> </ul>	Request denied: Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan	<p>The graduation rate of this school district still falls below state expectations even after factoring out participants of the GED program from the graduation rate, or including the GED program completers in the completion rate. The graduation rate data reported to the state in 2009 reveal that the regular Online program’s graduation rate is substantially lower than the completion rate at the Online GED school (27.5% graduation rate vs. 56% completion rate).</p> <p>In addition to concerns over the low graduation rate, the Learning Force and MAP data do not provide compelling evidence that this district’s performance, particularly in the middle school grades, should be reconsidered. Specifically:</p>

				measure both reading and math skills and knowledge (Reading and Math Force).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the Learning Force assessments align with grade level standards and expectations, the pre- and post-test data are based on small numbers (n &lt; 10 across many grades in reading and writing) of students taking these assessments. These data have value for teachers assessing an individual student's growth, but the sample sizes are inadequate for accountability purposes.</li> <li>Overall, the MAP data appear to correspond to the lower CSAP growth trend exhibited by the middle grades when comparing 1-year DPF growth data with the 3-year DPF. The median RIT scores do not show consistent patterns of improvement over time in reading, language usage and math for grades 7 and 8 students. These inconsistencies surface in the MAP growth data which highlight lower growth in those same grades. In grade 7, less than 32% of students meet MAP growth targets in math and language usage. In grade 8, less than 36% of students meet their growth targets in math and in reading. Both grades fail to meet their growth targets in areas with low individual growth percentages.</li> </ul>
Douglas County RE-1	District Level Request	Accredited with Performance Plan	Accredited with Distinction	<p>The population of English language learners and students with disabilities are not calculated correctly in the DPFs and SPFs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For English language learners, if factoring in the growth performance of Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students, the growth percentiles reflected would be higher than the percentiles reflected in the DPFs.</li> <li>For students with disabilities, if factoring in the performance of students who have exited special education programs within the last two years (as allowed under AYP), the inclusion of these students would increase the growth percentiles reflected in the DPF reports for this group.</li> </ul>	Request denied: Accredited with Performance Plan	<p>In reference to exclusion claims noted about each group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students are included in the English language learner growth calculations for both district accreditation categories and school plan type assignments.</li> <li>The DPFs and SPFs evaluate the academic progress of students who have been identified with disabilities at the time of the CSAP test administration. Confining the population of this group to students with disabilities at the time of CSAP testing ensures that the academic growth of students receiving programmatic assistance and services for disabilities is monitored. Additionally, this measure is looking at the growth of students, and not the overall proficiency (like AYP), and thus it is appropriate to narrow the focus to students who are currently on IEPs.</li> </ul> <p>The category Accredited with Distinction is intended to identify the highest performing districts in the state—those districts that receive at least 80% of framework points, which translates to approximately the top 10% of districts. While Douglas County is high-performing and in the top 15% of districts, its scores were not high enough to be in the top 10%. Only fourteen districts earned Accredited with Distinction for 2010. Several districts that were high-performing did not earn this distinction, including seven districts that received DPF scores equal to or higher than those of Douglas County.</p> <p>CDE commends Douglas County's strong results. Like the districts that did earn Accredited with Distinction, Douglas County demonstrates high achievement and growth. Where Douglas County does not show as strong results, though, is in their growth gaps; while districts Accredited with Distinction met or exceeded state expectations on this indicator, Douglas approached state expectations. Stronger performance in closing growth gaps would likely boost Douglas's overall results, moving the district closer to the Accredited with Distinction category.</p>
Manzanola 3J	District Level Request	Accredited with Priority	Accredited with	Although Manzanola's accreditation rating was lowered as result of not meeting the DPF participation criteria of 95%, the district meets AYP	Request approved: Accredited with	When combining the district's participation rate across levels:

		Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	participation. Further, the district would make participation on the DPF if aggregating the rates across levels (elementary, middle, and high school).	Improvement Plan	<p>1) The district meets the 95% participation rate expectation across subjects.</p> <p>2) The district meets AYP participation expectations for all subjects.</p> <p>Both conditions are necessary for participation reconsideration. Since Manzanola School District meets both conditions, CDE approves revising the district's accreditation from Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan to Accredited with Improvement Plan.</p>
Mapleton 1	District Level Request	Accredited with Priority Improvement	Accredited with Improvement Plan	<p><b>Improving College Readiness (ACT, PLAN, EXPLORE Trends):</b> All of Mapleton's 3-year ACT results (Total, not just Tested) show a trend toward improvement. When 2010 ACT results are compared 2008 results, Mapleton's Composite average increased from 16.6 to 17.2, its Reading average increased from 16.4 to 17.3, its English average increased from 15.6 to 16.5, its Math average increased from 16.5 to 17.0, and its Science average increased from 17.5 to 17.6.</p> <p>District data patterns from PLAN (10<sup>th</sup> grade) and EXPLORE (8<sup>th</sup> grade) are consistent with the ACT improvement trends described above. When results from the fall 2009 administration of PLAN are compared to results from fall 2007, Mapleton's Composite average increased from 14.3 to 15.4. When results from the fall 2009 administration of EXPLORE are compared to results from fall 2007, Mapleton's Composite average increased from 12.9 to 13.2.</p> <p><b>Improving College Readiness (Graduation, Completion, and Drop-Out Rate Trends):</b> When graduation rates, completion, and drop-out rates are considered from a three year perspective (e.g., 2009 data compared to data from 2007), there is significant evidence that Mapleton's reform efforts are resulting in more students staying in school. Mapleton's graduation rate increased from 48% to 59%, its completion rate increased from 53% to 62%, and its drop-out rate decreased from 11.0% to 8.2%.</p> <p><b>Improving College Readiness (Student Grades on College Coursework):</b> Mapleton high school students have a very high success rate when they take college courses during their time in high school. Mapleton high school students collectively enrolled in 336 college courses during the 2009-2010 academic year. A total of 312 of these courses were completed with a passing grade, which represents a college course success rate of 93%. Since we began tracking college course success in 2005-06, the percentage of students passing college courses has increased steadily from 66% to 93%.</p> <p><b>Improving College Readiness (Student College Plans Trends):</b> Over the past three years, Mapleton has seen a significant increase in the number of high school graduates who indicate plans to attend a two or four year college. In 2008, 68% of graduating seniors indicated that they planned to attend college. In 2010, 79% of Mapleton's graduating seniors indicated that they planned to attend college, an increase of 11 percentage points over two years.</p> <p><b>Improving Overall School Performance (School Performance Framework</b></p>	Request approved: Accredited with Improvement Plan	<p>Mapleton faces significant performance challenges. Its achievement and postsecondary and workforce readiness outcomes are among the lowest in the state. Growth and growth gaps outcomes, while above the state average and commendable, must reach even higher levels for its students to be adequately prepared for postsecondary and workforce success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The percentage of the district's students who are proficient/advanced on CSAP falls below the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile across all subject areas at all school levels. The district receives a "does not meet" across all achievement indicators. Its elementary results are particularly low, with achievement at the 1<sup>st</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> percentile. Middle school results are only marginally better.</li> <li>Mapleton's growth percentiles in the past year generally meet the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, but at the elementary and middle school level they rarely meet adequate growth and rarely exceed the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile. The only exceptions are a "meets" in select reading growth indicators at the elementary and middle school level on the 1-year DPF.</li> <li>The district's most recent graduation rate is 59.2%, the dropout rate is 8.2%, and the mean ACT composite score is 17.5. These are all substantially below the state expectations.</li> </ul> <p>Although these challenges persist, the district's evidence provides a clear case of consistent positive trends across all key performance indicators over the past three years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achievement as measured by CSAP proficiency rates has increased each year across all subjects and at nearly all grade levels.</li> <li>Growth as measured by CSAP median growth percentiles has increased each year across all subjects, with comparable rates and increases across nearly all disaggregated student groups. The 2009-10 high school growth and growth gaps outcomes are particularly strong: median growth percentiles across subjects and across disaggregated student groups exceed the 55<sup>th</sup> percentile, and in several cases, exceed the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile. The district's percentage of students catching up and keeping up – key leading indicators of postsecondary readiness – has also increased steadily over the past three years across disaggregated student groups.</li> <li>Postsecondary and workforce readiness as measured by graduation rate, dropout rates, and average ACT composite scores has increased. There are consistent increases over time in average PLAN/EXPLORE composite scores, the percentage of students reporting intentions to enroll in college, and the percentage of students passing college courses.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, while Mapleton's outcomes place it in the Accredited with Priority Improvement category and it faces significant challenges, it has demonstrated consistent improvements in student achievement, growth, growth gaps and postsecondary and workforce readiness in the past three years across all subject areas. CDE approves revising the district's accreditation from Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan to Accredited</p>

				<p><b>Trends):</b> Mapleton schools' Performance Framework results from 2010 (uncombined) show a pattern of systemic improvement when compared to trial Performance Framework results from 2009 (uncombined). Eleven schools' Improvement Plan designations improved, while only 3 schools' Improvement Plan designations declined. Significantly, 8 of the 11 schools whose Plan designations improved were in the lowest two performance categories (five Turn Around schools advanced at least one Plan category and 3 Priority Improvement schools advanced at least one Plan category). Systemically, Mapleton went from having 7 Turn Around schools in 2009 to having 3 Turn Around schools in 2010.</p> <p><b>Improving Academic Achievement (CSAP Achievement Trends):</b> When CSAP achievement data from 2010 are considered from a three year perspective (e.g., compared to data from 2008), there is significant evidence that student achievement has improved. The percentage of Mapleton students (no exclusions) achieving a proficient or advanced score on CSAP increased at 20 of 27 CSAP grade/subject levels (74%). The percentage of proficient/advanced students stayed the same from 2008 to 2010 at 5 grade levels (19%), went down at 2 grade levels (7%).</p> <p><b>Improving Academic Growth (CSAP Growth Trends):</b> When CSAP growth data from 2010 are considered from a three year perspective (e.g., compared to growth data from 2008), there is significant evidence that student growth rates have improved. Mapleton's median growth rate across all grades increased from 38 to 54 in reading, from 42 to 50 in writing, and from 42 to 50 in math. Reading median growth percentiles from 2010 are higher at all grade levels measured (4th-10th) compared with 2008 data, with the average median percentile increasing 17 points. Writing median growth percentiles from 2010 are higher at all grade levels measured (4th-10th), with the average median percentile increasing 9 points. Math median growth percentiles from 2010 are higher at 6 of 7 grade levels measured (4th-10th), with the average median percentile increasing 8 points.</p>		with Improvement Plan.
Plateau Valley 50	District Level Request	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited with Performance Plan	The district's ratings on post-secondary and CSAP high school status measures are substantially impacted by one federally sponsored Alternative Education Campus (AEC). This AEC is a residential job corps program with a large majority of students (over 90% of the total population) coming from other districts or other states. The district has one traditional high school that services in-district students. Compared to the AEC, the traditional school exhibits a substantially higher graduation rate (83.3% compared to 28.5%) and a substantially lower dropout rate (1.6% compared to 15.5%). Considering the programmatic uniqueness of the AEC as a federally sponsored residential job corps program, and the fact that the majority of students in this program are out-of-district students, the district believes that overall performance on the achievement and post-secondary indicators should be limited to performance at the traditional high school.	Request approved: Accredited with Performance Plan	CDE agrees with the rationale provided by the district. The nature of this federal job corps residency program specifically targets former dropouts coming from other school districts throughout the state and other states. Due to substantially higher enrollment at the job corps site, the performance of students at the district's traditional high school performance is eclipsed by the performance of predominantly out-of-district students attending the federal AEC program. CDE approves revising the district's accreditation from Accredited with Improvement Plan to Accredited with Performance Plan.
Adams 12	Colorado Virtual	Turnaround Plan (elementary,	Elementary: Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A misadministration error resulted in low participation rates for all school levels (elementary, middle and high) across all subject areas. The</li> </ul>	Request approved: Priority	Policies and guidelines on proper test administration procedures must be followed to ensure that the academic progress of all students in Colorado is properly monitored and

	Academy (elementary, middle, and high)	middle and high)	Improvement Plan or higher  Middle: Priority Improvement Plan or higher  High: Improvement Plan	Turnaround Plan assignment applied to each level is attributed largely to this misadministration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth data from Scantron points to gains made by students across all levels. Further, these gains appear to exceed the Scantron norm group.</li> <li>For the high school, the graduation rate of 0% was due to a misidentification error. Forty-eight students who graduated in 2009 were incorrectly coded as dropouts. If adjusting for this data error, the school's graduation rate and dropout rate would improve.</li> </ul>	Improvement Plan (elementary, middle and high)	that the test results are valid. More specifically, the procedures require that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students take the tests in a standardized manner - at the same time, using the same test, and with no student interaction. Multiple grades and multiple content areas must not be tested in the same room."</li> <li>CSAP test proctors shall: "Thoroughly review the CSAP Proctor's Manual prior to testing and understand the procedures needed to administer the assessment."</li> <li>Due to the complex nature of a standardized assessment process, any practice not specifically permitted should be presumed inappropriate until and unless specifically authorized by the program sponsor (in this case, CDE).</li> <li>The CSAP is a timed, standardized assessment. It must be administered under standardized conditions to ensure the reliability and validity of results.</li> </ol> <p>The invalidation of scores for a substantial proportion of the eligible test-takers in this school makes it difficult to ascertain the actual academic performance of all students at each level.</p> <p>The Scantron data provided by the school indicates that only 70% of eligible test-takers took the reading and math tests. CDE would anticipate a considerably higher percentage of students should take this test in order to make reasonable comparisons of academic growth between these interim assessments and the CSAPs, and to reflect overall academic progress being made at this school. The participation expectation for the CSAP, for example, is 95% of students testing.</p> <p>CDE understands that the incorrect coding of dropouts leads to an incorrect graduation rate result on the SPF. As such, the department would consider supplemental evidence regarding the school's ability to prepare students for postsecondary and workforce options. However, CDE cannot change past data in its data warehouse, which has already been used to report state results (i.e., to the U.S. Department of Education's EdFacts). Instituting checks to the student data submission process is an expected standard of all districts and schools in Colorado. The 0% graduation rate and the dropout rate on the high school's SPF reflect data that should have been corrected by either the district or the school during the Student Biographical Data review or end-of-year reviews, which the state makes available to all districts each year.</p> <p>The Commissioner recommends Priority Improvement rather than Turnaround for COVA. Priority Improvement better fits the school's challenge given the errors in test administration (for which they had already been penalized through invalidation) and the errors in end of year collection that caused their Postsecondary rating to be Does Not Meet. The Priority Improvement category is also equivalent in its consequence from a state perspective because it also triggers the five-year limit on remaining at that level prior to school restructuring. Thus, CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Turnaround Plan to Priority improvement Plan.</p>
Aurora	Rangeview High School	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	A misadministration in the writing test resulted in the invalidation of scores from 61 students (a teacher provided students with scrap paper). If the participation of these students were included, the school would have a participation rate of 96.08% (for the 3 year rate).	Request approved: Improvement Plan	Policies and guidelines on proper test administration procedures must be followed to ensure that the academic progress of all students in Colorado is properly monitored and that test results are valid. More specifically, the procedures require that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students take the tests in a standardized manner - at the same time, using the same test, and with no student interaction. Multiple grades and multiple content areas must not be tested in the same room."</li> </ol>



						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. CSAP test proctors shall: “Thoroughly review the CSAP Proctor’s Manual prior to testing and understand the procedures needed to administer the assessment.”</li> <li>3. Due to the complex nature of a standardized assessment process, any practice not specifically permitted should be presumed inappropriate until and unless specifically authorized by the program sponsor (in this case, CDE).</li> <li>4. The CSAP is a timed, standardized assessment. It must be administered under standardized conditions to ensure the reliability and validity of results.</li> </ol> <p>In this case, however, no pattern of misconduct is evident in administering the CSAPs beyond this isolated error. The students still took the exam, indicating that this was not intended to exclude students (a key purpose of accountability for test participation). Additionally, upon discovering the error, the district administrator followed proper procedures, invalidated the scores and notified CDE. Absent a pattern of misadministration, CDE approves revising the school’s plan type assignment from Priority Improvement Plan to Improvement Plan.</p>
Aurora	Central High School	Turnaround Plan	Priority Improvement Plan	The district’s truancy program requires that students are not automatically withdrawn after 10 consecutive days of unexcused absence. This policy, which was created by an agreement with the court, ensures that truancy cases are not weakened as a result of withdrawing the students from the district. If accounting for students who are in the truancy program, Central High School’s participation rate exceeds the 95% threshold across all subjects on the 1-year SPF. The school should not be moved down a plan type assignment because of the 95% participation rate.	Request approved: Priority Improvement Plan	CDE commends the district for implementing truancy policies that are aligned with dropout prevention practices and the state’s goal of preparing all students for post-secondary readiness. Had these students been withdrawn from school, they would not have counted against the school’s participation rate and the school would not have been moved down a plan type assignment because of the 95% participation expectation. CDE approves revising the school’s plan type assignment from Turnaround Plan to Priority improvement Plan.
Branson	Branson Online GED Prep	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	As a GED school, a high school diploma is not offered and this is reflected in the graduation rate of 0%. The GED granting school was established separately in Branson to provide students identified as “at-risk” for dropping out with an alternative pathway for post-secondary success. Strengths to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over a three year period, the school has consistently granted GEDs to over 50% of students enrolled each year, with a completion rate average of 66% during the three most recent years.</li> <li>• Approximately 37% of students who completed their GEDs in the past 3 years are currently enrolled in post-secondary studies and 33% indicated intentions to pursue post-secondary studies.</li> </ul>	Request approved: Improvement Plan (contingent upon fulfilling requirements specified in the rationale).	CDE values the role of Second Chance programs and concerted efforts to provide overage students with credit earning opportunities. Indicators on the SPF are designed to measure student growth and achievement for traditional school settings and this school’s performance should be assessed using a similar framework as that for Alternative Education Campuses. CDE approves revising the school’s plan assignment from Priority Improvement Plan to Improvement Plan, the default designation for AECs in the current year, on the conditions that the school agrees to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Join the alternative education pilot (AEC stakeholder meetings to determine appropriate measures, metrics and expectations for alternative schools);</li> <li>• Provide additional data showing progress made by students fulfilling adequate credit hours each semester towards graduation; and</li> <li>• Based on possible expansion of the AEC criteria to include overage/under-credit students, apply for Alternative Education Campus status.</li> </ul>
Charter School Institute	Colorado Springs Early Colleges	Performance Plan	Performance Plan (requesting that the rating for the Postsecondary and Workforce	The school’s indicator rating under Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) is based on incorrect calculations for the graduation and dropout rates. These rates were adversely impacted since CDE incorrectly attributed the status of 31 students who were retained at the school as dropouts. More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If factoring out the impact of these students from the dropout rate, the dropout rate would move down from 11.2% to 2.5% if</li> </ul>	Request denied: Performance Plan with no revisions made for the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator	According to CDE’s records, the authorizing district (Charter School Institute) committed the administrative error of assigning a dropout code to each of the 31 students. CDE reported the data provided and certified by the district through end-of-year collections. Since the rating on this one indicator is a direct consequence of the district’s failure to check important data that are valued by and reported to federal, state and local constituents, CDE denies a revision the PWR indicator rating. The decision to not revise the PWR rating signals the importance of monitoring the movements of students during the school year and implementing data quality checks and proper reporting of dropout,

			<p>Readiness Indicator rating be revised from “approaching” to “meets”)</p>	<p>using the correct denominator of 444 or to 2% if using the incorrect denominator of 555 reflected on the framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If re-adjusting the graduation rate to factor out the impact of these 31 students, the graduation rate would increase from 53.5% to 83.6%.</li> </ul> <p>In both cases, the ratings for the graduation rate and dropout rate on the SPF would be elevated from “does not meet” to “meets” and this would raise the overall indicator rating for PWR from “approaching” to “meets”.</p>		<p>graduation and other end-of-year data submissions to the state.</p> <p>However, since this issue represents a data submission error committed by the district and not by the school, CDE will acknowledge this error to the public by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Including a coversheet to the SPF which will state that the dropout rates and graduation rates furnished by the district and reflected in the SPFs are incorrect.</li> <li>Noting on the first page of the SPF that the rating for the PWR indicator is based on incorrect graduation and dropout rate data.</li> </ul>
Charter School Institute	Pikes Peak Prep (elementary, middle, and high)	Turnaround Plan	Performance Plan (requesting the same rating as their middle and high school)	<p>Incorporating the performance of grades not reflected on the SPF would improve the school’s overall rating from a Turnaround Plan to a Performance Plan. The school believes the performance measures on the framework were largely and negatively impacted by one grade level (grade 5) affected by the departure of a teacher mid-year. However, consideration of the following would provide adequate grounds for revising the rating of this school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The high levels of growth exhibited by K-3 students on the DIBELS and the MAP assessments would be the equivalent of a “meets” on the SPF. Factoring the growth performance of these grades in the overall rating for academic growth would elevate this school’s “does not meet” rating on growth to “meets”.</li> <li>Considering the higher growth gains made by disaggregated groups in grades K-3 on the MAP and the DIBELS would warrant enough points to move the current overall rating on growth gaps from a “does not meet” to an “approaching”.</li> </ul>	Request denied: Improvement Plan (reflects the combined rating with the middle and high schools)	<p>CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school’s performance, but it does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results. In addition, supplementary evidence cannot be used to recalculate points on the existing framework.</p> <p>Although the school has shown impressive gains by K-3 students on the MAP assessment and DIBELS assessments, these large gains do not correspond to the trends and direction reflected in the SPF reports. The gains shown on these interim assessments are only reflective of a one-year period and are not indicative of a trend. Between the 1-year and 3-year frameworks, the SPFs show that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth is relatively flat across years with growth percentiles located no higher than the 35th percentile in most content areas and by disaggregated groups.</li> <li>Although the school has made some gains in reading growth over time, the lack of improvement in writing and math points to instructional weaknesses in these subjects.</li> </ul> <p>Again, although CDE acknowledges that the MAP and DIBELS data suggest that the school (particularly the lower grades) is moving in the right direction, this school needs to demonstrate considerable progress on state measures. CDE denies the request for a Performance Plan, but approves a combined rating of Improvement Plan for all levels in the school. The combined rating of Improvement Plan places enough tension on the school to ensure that elementary performance continues to be monitored and evaluated next year.</p>
Charter School Institute	Scholars to Leaders (elementary, middle)	Turnaround Plan	Improvement (requesting that the elementary school plan be upgraded to a Priority Improvement Plan and then combined with the middle school performance to form a new	<p>Incorporating the performance of grades not reflected on the SPF would improve the school’s overall rating from a Turnaround Plan to a Priority Improvement Plan. More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAP RIT scores for grade 2 students show that approximately 65% would be characterized as “proficient” in reading. Using the same cut-scores in the SPF, reading would earn a rating of “approaching”.</li> <li>Grades K and 1 students tested by the DIBELS assessment have a median percentile composite score which exceeds the 50th percentile. Considering that their median scores meets state expectations, this would suggest that the overall performance of these students would be rated as “meets”.</li> </ul>	Request denied: Priority Improvement Plan (reflects the combined rating with the middle school)	<p>CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school’s performance, but it does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results. In addition, supplementary evidence cannot be used to recalculate points on the existing framework. The trends and direction captured on the SPFs suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although reading by overall growth and disaggregated groups have shown improvement, this same trend and direction is not shown in both writing and math. For writing and math, the growth percentiles overall and by disaggregated groups are below the 35th percentile for the state.</li> <li>Achievement drops in all subjects from the 3-year SPF report to the 1-year SPF report, with the school remaining at the 6<sup>th</sup> percentile for math achievement across years.</li> </ul>

			rating of an Improvement Plan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the growth data outcomes on the MAP and DIBELS are mixed for grades K-2, acknowledging areas where growth could be considered as “approaching” could help raise the overall points contributing to the assessment of growth in the framework.</li> </ul> <p>If re-calculating the SPF points based on the performance of students in K-2, the school would be rated as a Priority Improvement Plan school. Further, when combining this new rating with the middle school’s Improvement Plan rating, the school would be re-designated as an “Improvement School”.</p>		Although trend data are not provided in the one-year data summaries provided by the school, the mixed growth performance shown by the MAP and DIBELS data highlight similar inconsistent growth patterns reflected across time in the SPFs. Based on the low performance trends exhibited across frameworks by the elementary school, CDE denies the request for an Improvement Plan, but approves a combined rating of Priority Improvement Plan. The combined rating of Priority Improvement Plan ensures that adequate levels of state oversight and support are provided to continue efforts to improve the performance of elementary students at this school.																																																																
Colorado Springs District 11	Taylor Elementary School	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	<p>Since the MAP assessment data show considerable growth made by students at Taylor and the school is only 0.3 points away from being an Improvement Plan school, the MAP growth data should be factored into CDE’s evaluation of the school’s academic progress.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two-thirds of Taylor students met or exceeded the MAP growth targets for Fall 2009 to Spring 2010.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>% of students meeting target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Average of 4 &amp; 5</b></td> <td><b>67%</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	% of students meeting target	4	69%	5	64%	<b>Average of 4 &amp; 5</b>	<b>67%</b>	Request approved: Improvement Plan	<p>Overall, student growth, as measured by median student growth percentiles on the CSAP, show mixed results. There is consistent or improved performance in CSAP reading and writing, though CSAP math results suggest an instructional weakness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three-year median growth percentiles (MGPs) were 44<sup>th</sup>, 40<sup>th</sup>, and 38<sup>th</sup> percentiles in reading, math and writing, respectively, and 1-year MGPs were 43<sup>rd</sup>, 38<sup>th</sup>, and 44<sup>th</sup> percentile.</li> <li>In reading and writing, there were improvements in CSAP growth gaps from the 3-year to the 1-year SPF report. In reading, MGPs for disaggregated student groups fell between the 52<sup>nd</sup> and 53<sup>rd</sup> percentile in the 1-year report, compared to the 40<sup>th</sup> to 52<sup>nd</sup> percentile in the 3-year report. In writing, MGPs for disaggregated student groups fell between the 42<sup>nd</sup> and 48<sup>th</sup> percentile in the 1-year report, compared to the 29<sup>th</sup> to 37<sup>th</sup> percentile in the 3-year report.</li> <li>In math, CSAP growth was notably lower and gaps remained at the same levels in the 3-year vs. 1-year SPF reports. In math, MGPs for disaggregated student groups fell between the 31<sup>st</sup> and 38<sup>th</sup> percentile in the 1-year report, compared to the 29<sup>th</sup> to 40<sup>th</sup> percentile in the 3-year report.</li> </ul> <p>CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school’s performance, but it does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results. The MAP results for this school show inconsistent patterns of growth in early grades: Grades 2 and 3 failed to meet their targets in language usage; grades 1 and 2 failed to meet growth targets in reading; and grade 2 failed to meet growth targets in math.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Measure</th> <th>Grade</th> <th>% of target</th> <th>% of students meeting target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MAP language usage</td> <td>2</td> <td>92.1%</td> <td>46.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP language usage</td> <td>3</td> <td>88.8%</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP language usage</td> <td>4</td> <td>147.5%</td> <td>63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP language usage</td> <td>5</td> <td>135.1%</td> <td>65.9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP math</td> <td>1</td> <td>112.1%</td> <td>56.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP math</td> <td>2</td> <td>72.3%</td> <td>34.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP math</td> <td>3</td> <td>118.7%</td> <td>65.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP math</td> <td>4</td> <td>135.6%</td> <td>71.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP math</td> <td>5</td> <td>122%</td> <td>59.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>1</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>52.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>2</td> <td>83.8%</td> <td>44.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>3</td> <td>102.4%</td> <td>54.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>4</td> <td>147.5%</td> <td>71.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target	MAP language usage	2	92.1%	46.8%	MAP language usage	3	88.8%	45.5%	MAP language usage	4	147.5%	63%	MAP language usage	5	135.1%	65.9%	MAP math	1	112.1%	56.3%	MAP math	2	72.3%	34.8%	MAP math	3	118.7%	65.1%	MAP math	4	135.6%	71.7%	MAP math	5	122%	59.1%	MAP reading	1	98.9%	52.1%	MAP reading	2	83.8%	44.7%	MAP reading	3	102.4%	54.5%	MAP reading	4	147.5%	71.7%
Grade	% of students meeting target																																																																					
4	69%																																																																					
5	64%																																																																					
<b>Average of 4 &amp; 5</b>	<b>67%</b>																																																																					
Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target																																																																			
MAP language usage	2	92.1%	46.8%																																																																			
MAP language usage	3	88.8%	45.5%																																																																			
MAP language usage	4	147.5%	63%																																																																			
MAP language usage	5	135.1%	65.9%																																																																			
MAP math	1	112.1%	56.3%																																																																			
MAP math	2	72.3%	34.8%																																																																			
MAP math	3	118.7%	65.1%																																																																			
MAP math	4	135.6%	71.7%																																																																			
MAP math	5	122%	59.1%																																																																			
MAP reading	1	98.9%	52.1%																																																																			
MAP reading	2	83.8%	44.7%																																																																			
MAP reading	3	102.4%	54.5%																																																																			
MAP reading	4	147.5%	71.7%																																																																			

						<table border="1"> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>5</td> <td>130.6%</td> <td>68.2%</td> </tr> </table> <p>However, there is solid growth performance by grades 4 and 5 students on the MAP assessment. In particular, the data suggests that math instruction may have been more effective than the SPF report reveals. In CSAP-test grades (grades 3, 4, 5), Taylor exceeded MAP growth targets, and 65% or more of students met the MAP target in grades 3 and 4.</p> <p>While CDE reserves concerns about CSAP growth performance for Taylor, it agrees with the district's recommendation that other evidence be more carefully considered in cases where performance is borderline. Based on countervailing MAP results, CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Priority improvement Plan to Improvement Plan.</p>	MAP reading	5	130.6%	68.2%
MAP reading	5	130.6%	68.2%							
Del Norte	Del Norte (Underwood Elementary School)	Turnaround Plan	Priority Improvement Plan	<p>Del Norte Elementary school was rated as "Accredited Exemplary" by the district's accreditation framework. Despite low growth attained on the CSAPs, additional measures of student performance show that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The percentage of students meeting growth targets on the MAP have increased in most grades in both reading and math.</li> <li>The percentage of students considered to be "at-risk" by DIBELS decreased in the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade levels.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the following actions have been taken to improve instructional delivery and academic outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Administering common grade level assessments quarterly in all content areas. Students not meeting the minimum gains of 40% receive interventions in the classroom which may include scaffolding, grouping, re-teaching and/or individual instruction.</li> <li>An instituted focus on standards 1 and 6 on the math assessments and grammar/convention piece added to writing instruction.</li> <li>Implementing professional development to focus on improved instructional strategies for diverse learners.</li> </ul>	Request approved: Priority Improvement Plan	<p>By statute, a district's framework should be aligned with or more rigorous than the framework used by the state. The state's framework must consider the key performance indicators (achievement, growth and growth gaps for elementary schools). It must also give the greatest weight to growth (and postsecondary readiness for high schools). In comparison to the state's framework, Del Norte's accreditation framework does not consider growth gaps, nor does it give growth the greatest weight. The district's framework considers performance, school safety, parental involvement and staff development, and the latter three make up 56% of the accreditation score. Safety, parental involvement and staff development are important factors in the evaluation of effective schools, as they are crucial conditions for improving student achievement. However, when student achievement and growth are unsatisfactory, input measures should not compensate for the lack of performance. The school's higher performance on input measures should show commensurate increases in output performance measures. Within performance measures, the school's MAP and CSAP growth results receive fewer points than all other measures. CDE welcomes conversations with the district and school to discuss discrepancies between performance frameworks and to collaborate in its ongoing efforts to evaluate academic achievement and growth.</p> <p>Overall, student achievement, as measured by the percentage of students proficient/advanced on the CSAP, and student growth, as measured by median student growth percentiles on the CSAP, show mixed results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school's percentage of students proficient/advanced remains about the same between the 3-year and 1-year SPF report. Reading and writing drop slightly (58.2% to 56.7%; 41.3% to 40.1%), while math and science increase slightly (57.8% to 58.4%; 26.1% to 27.7%).</li> <li>In reading and writing, the school's median growth percentiles (MGPs) remain about the same (38<sup>th</sup> to 36<sup>th</sup> percentile; 32<sup>nd</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> percentile) between the 3-year and 1-year report. All are below state expectations, with all disaggregated groups receiving "does not meet" across both reports, except for one group that receives "approaching."</li> <li>In math, MGPs are substantially lower and decrease between the 3-year and 1-year report (28<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> percentile). Similar drops are seen for disaggregated student groups. All are below state expectations, with all groups receiving "does not meet" across both reports.</li> </ul>				

CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school's performance, but it does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results. In this school's case, MAP data point to mixed gains in the percentage of students making growth targets between the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years in each grade level. In particular:

Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target
MAP language usage	2	114%	65%
MAP language usage	3	124.5%	62.3%
MAP language usage	4	147.9%	66.7%
MAP language usage	5	107.3%	57.4%
MAP math	2	134.2%	76.9%
MAP math	3	123.7%	63.5%
MAP math	4	110.1%	59.0%
MAP math	5	118.9%	59.6%
MAP reading	2	100.8%	55%
MAP reading	3	111.3%	62.3%
MAP reading	4	148.6%	68.4%
MAP reading	5	120.6%	60.9%

- The school exceeds MAP growth targets across language usage, math and reading across all grade levels.
- In language usage, 65% or less of students in grades 2, 3 and 5 met the mean MAP growth targets.
- In math, 76.9% of grade 2 students met MAP mean growth targets, but the percentage of grades 3, 4 and 5 students reaching their growth targets were at 63.5%, 59% and 59.6% respectively.
- In reading, 65% or less of students in grades 2, 3 and 5 met the mean MAP growth targets.

In reviewing the DIBELS beginning and end-of-year histograms, the school meets expectations for 2 out of 4 grades. Data presented below are based on students deemed "at risk" or the lowest "intensive" levels on DIBELS. It should also include students in the "some risk" or "strategic" category, as they are also not reaching expected benchmark goals on DIBELS and are at similar risk for not becoming proficient readers.

Measure	Grade	Result
DIBELS ORF	1	Beginning of year not provided
DIBELS ORF	2	57% to 67% on ORF 20% to 17% students strategic 24% to 15% students intensive
DIBELS ORF	3	49% to 61% on ORF 28% to 13% students strategic 23% to 27% students intensive
DIBELS ORF	4	57% to 52% on ORF 18% to 27.5% students strategic 25% to 20% students intensive
DIBELS ORF	5	55% to 55% on ORF

						<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>21.5% to 29% students strategic 23.5% to 16% students intensive</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grades 2 and 3 meet expectations for growth in one year, and the percentage of students at strategic and intensive decreases from the beginning to the end of the year.</li> <li>Grades 4 and 5 do not meet expectations for growth in one year, and the percentage of students at strategic and intensive decreases for grade 4.</li> </ul> <p>These determinations are based on guidelines from a DIBELS technical adequacy report which indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approximately 95% of students at benchmark should remain benchmark, approximately 80% of students at strategic should move to benchmark, and approximately 80% of students at intensive should move to strategic or benchmark.</li> <li>Although the ultimate goal is to have all students achieving literacy goals, data on a large number of schools and districts indicates that it is not uncommon to see a 10-20% growth in the number of students at benchmark in kindergarten and first grade over the first two years of collecting data.</li> </ul> <p>The strategies highlighted to address lagging performance by disaggregated groups (scaffolding, re-teaching, grouping, individual instruction) represent common and good instructional practices employed by most schools regardless of performance challenges faced.</p> <p>While CDE reserves concerns about CSAP and DIBELS performance for Del Norte, it is compelled by countervailing MAP results that suggest that the school exceeds growth targets across language usage, math and reading across all grade levels. This is a commendable result, though the school must make progress to ensure that a higher percentage of students reach the target. This school's performance still warrants priority attention and support from the state, but based on this evidence, CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Turnaround Plan to Priority improvement Plan.</p>			21.5% to 29% students strategic 23.5% to 16% students intensive
		21.5% to 29% students strategic 23.5% to 16% students intensive							
Denver	Gust Elementary	Improvement Plan	Performance Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gust has had CSAP growth percentiles above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in the past two years.</li> <li>It has met DPS' catch-up and keep-up standards, and moved more students up a CELA proficiency level (46% in 2009 to 60% in 2010).</li> <li>DRA status measures indicate that over half of students are at grade level or above, increasing from 51% of students in 2009 to 63% of students in 2010.</li> <li>DIBELS data show that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% of Gust students made improvements from the beginning of year to the end of the year, higher than the district average of 48%.</li> <li>82.25 percent of students at benchmark remained at benchmark in 2010, compared to 75.86 percent in 2009, a 6.39 percent increase.</li> <li>31.87 percent of students at strategic moved to benchmark in 2010, compared to 13.04 percent in 2010, an 18.83 percent increase.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Request approved: Performance Plan	<p>Districts may request plan type reconsiderations to move from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has submitted a recommendation regarding the type of plan the school should implement.</li> <li>The district's recommendation to move the school assignment from an Improvement Plan to a Performance Plan is based on evidence from a district accreditation framework that either meets or exceeds the rigor of the state's framework.</li> </ul> <p>In evaluating the Denver school performance framework, the key differences between CDE and DPS' frameworks are that the DPS framework:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>includes metrics not collected by the state;</li> <li>evaluates growth using a broader definition, including measures that evaluate the growth of advanced students; and</li> <li>rates each metric based on two consecutive years of performance as compared</li> </ol>			

						<p>to CDE’s approach of using either one or three years of data.</p> <p>This results in a higher number of the district’s schools rated in the bottom two performance categories, but also still meets statutory requirements by placing the greatest weight on growth and postsecondary readiness.</p> <p>A more complete analysis of the differences between CDE’s performance framework and DPS’ performance framework can be accessed at: [insert link].</p> <p>Based on the above, CDE approves revising the school’s plan type assignment from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan.</p>
Denver	Marrama Elementary	Improvement Plan	Performance Plan	<p>Marrama shows strong growth across all indicators on the DPS framework. Its percentage of students proficient/advanced on the CSAP has increased consistently across all subject areas. Marrama also meets the DPS DRA performance standards, with 63% of students at grade level in 2009 and 52% in 2010.</p>	Request approved: Performance Plan	<p>Districts may request plan type reconsiderations to move from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district has submitted a recommendation regarding the type of plan the school should implement.</li> <li>• The district’s recommendation to move the school assignment from an Improvement Plan to a Performance Plan is based on evidence from a district accreditation framework that either meets or exceeds the rigor of the state’s framework.</li> </ul> <p>In evaluating the Denver school performance framework, the key differences between CDE and DPS’ frameworks are that the DPS framework:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) includes metrics not collected by the state;</li> <li>2) evaluates growth using a broader definition, including measures that evaluate the growth of advanced students; and</li> <li>3) rates each metric based on two consecutive years of performance as compared to CDE’s approach of using either one or three years of data.</li> </ol> <p>This results in a higher number of the district’s schools rated in the bottom two performance categories, but also still meets statutory requirements by placing the greatest weight on growth and postsecondary readiness.</p> <p>A more complete analysis of the differences between CDE’s performance framework and DPS’ performance framework can be accessed at: [insert link].</p> <p>Based on the above, CDE approves revising the school’s plan type assignment from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan.</p>
Denver	Newlon Elementary	Improvement Plan	Performance Plan	<p>Newlon outperforms similar district schools. It has demonstrated improved achievement and growth results on CSAP and improved achievement and growth results on DRA.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth percentiles above the 50<sup>th</sup>, with increases across subjects from 2009 to 2010</li> <li>• Percentage of students making improvement in DRA reading text levels</li> </ul>	Request approved: Performance Plan	<p>Districts may request plan type reconsiderations to move from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district has submitted a recommendation regarding the type of plan the school should implement.</li> <li>• The district’s recommendation to move the school assignment from an Improvement Plan to a Performance Plan is based on evidence from a district accreditation framework that either meets or exceeds the rigor of the state’s</li> </ul>

				<p>increased from 63% in 2009 to 81% in 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of students proficient/advanced increased across CSAP subjects from 2009 to 2010.</li> <li>Percentage of students at grade level increased in DRA from 53% to 69% from 2009 to 2010.</li> </ul>		<p>framework.</p> <p>In evaluating the Denver school performance framework, the key differences between CDE and DPS' frameworks are that the DPS framework:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>includes metrics not collected by the state;</li> <li>evaluates growth using a broader definition, including measures that evaluate the growth of advanced students; and</li> <li>rates each metric based on two consecutive years of performance as compared to CDE's approach of using either one or three years of data.</li> </ol> <p>This results in a higher number of the district's schools rated in the bottom two performance categories, but also still meets statutory requirements by placing the greatest weight on growth and postsecondary readiness.</p> <p>A more complete analysis of the differences between CDE's performance framework and DPS' performance framework can be accessed at: [insert link].</p> <p>Based on the above, CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan.</p>
Douglas County	Daniel C. Oakes High School	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	<p>The school's Performance Plan rating dropped from Improvement to Priority Improvement as a result of not meeting the 95% test participation rules. This was due to six students who submitted refusals to take the grade 10 CSAPs. These refusals lowered the school's participation rate and subsequently impacted the school's overall plan rating. In addition, although these students are considered to be grade 10 students based on credit accumulation, these students should be classified as juniors or seniors based on graduation cohort designation and should not have taken the CSAPs.</p>	Request denied: Priority Improvement Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy of treating parent/student refusals as "no scores" is consistently applied across schools and impacts the participation rating of all schools. Districts and schools are accountable for ensuring test participation. The participation of all students on state assessments is critical in building a complete body of evidence that the state uses to determine expectations for quality achievement and growth.</li> <li>Identifying students for the purpose of calculating graduation rates serves a different purpose than evaluating how well students meet state standards in a grade level being tested by the CSAPs. State law "Requires every student enrolled in a public school to take the assessments in the grade level in which the student is enrolled (1.2)(d)(I)... excepting those students taking the grade level assessment available in the alternative test - CSAPA." C.R.S. 22-7-409 (1.2) (d) (I) (A)."</li> </ul>
Elizabeth	Frontier High School	Turnaround Plan	Improvement Plan	<p>Frontier High School's broader mission is to serve students who have not succeeded in traditional high school settings. The traditional SPFs fail to adequately evaluate the school's success with this population. Strengths to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although 84% of the students at Frontier meet the "high-risk" student definitions required for Alternative Education Campus status, if credit deficiency were a criteria, most, if not all, of Frontier's students would be considered "high-risk."</li> <li>At Frontier, students who were previously academically unsuccessful in their traditional schools successfully accumulate academic credits. Many students ultimately graduate, earn GEDs, or transition to their traditional high school, job corps programs, home-based schooling, or other Colorado or out-of-state schools.</li> <li>Although the SPF reflects low graduation rates, the school's completion rate has increased over time from XX% in 2006-2007 to XX% in 2008-</li> </ul>	Request approved: Improvement Plan (contingent upon fulfilling requirements specified in the rationale).	<p>CDE values the role of Second Chance programs and concerted efforts to provide overage students with credit earning opportunities. Indicators on the SPF are designed to measure student growth and achievement for traditional school settings and this school's performance should be assessed using a similar framework as that for Alternative Education Campuses. CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Priority Improvement Plan to Improvement Plan, the default designation for AECs in the current year, on the conditions that the school agrees to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Join the alternative education pilot (AEC stakeholder meetings to determine appropriate measures, metrics and expectations for alternative schools);</li> <li>Provide additional data showing progress made by students fulfilling adequate credit hours each semester towards graduation; and</li> <li>Based on possible expansion of the AEC criteria to include overage/under-credit students, apply for Alternative Education Campus status.</li> </ul>



				<p>2009.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school has a track record of transitioning students to maintain a dropout rate that is lower than most alternative settings. The dropout rate of this school has decreased over time from X% in 2007-2008 to X% in 2009-2010.</li> </ul>		
Fountain 8	Lorraine High School (middle, high)	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	<p>Lorraine High School's broader mission is to serve students who have not succeeded in traditional high school settings. The traditional SPFs fail to adequately evaluate the school's success with this population. Strengths to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school actively recruits under-credit/overage, dropouts and expelled students, and a third of all students in the school participate in the "Second Chance" program (a program dedicated to providing services to former dropout and expelled students). These students successfully accumulate academic credits, including postsecondary coursework through concurrent enrollment in colleges. Many students ultimately graduate, earn GEDs, or transition to their traditional high school, job corps programs, home-based schooling, or other Colorado or out-of-state schools.</li> <li>Although the SPF reflects low graduation rates, the school's completion rate has increased over time from 47.2% in 2006-2007 to 68% in 2008-2009.</li> <li>The school has a track record of transitioning students to maintain a dropout rate that is lower than most alternative settings. The dropout rate of this school has decreased over time from 9.3% in 2007-2008 to 8.7% in 2009-2010.</li> </ul>	Request approved: Improvement Plan (contingent upon fulfilling requirements specified in the rationale).	<p>CDE values the role of Second Chance programs and concerted efforts to provide overage students with credit earning opportunities. Indicators on the SPF are designed to measure student growth and achievement for traditional school settings and this school's performance should be assessed using a similar framework as that for Alternative Education Campuses. CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Priority Improvement Plan to Improvement Plan, the default designation for AECs in the current year, on the conditions that the school agrees to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Join the alternative education pilot (AEC stakeholder meetings to determine appropriate measures, metrics and expectations for alternative schools);</li> <li>Provide additional data showing progress made by students fulfilling adequate credit hours each semester towards graduation; and</li> <li>Based on possible expansion of the AEC criteria to include overage/under-credit students, apply for Alternative Education Campus status.</li> </ul>
Garfield County School District No. 16	Bea Underwood Elementary School	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	<p>Bea Underwood Elementary serves students in grades 1-3, limiting the school's performance framework to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade performance and making calculations other than academic achievement and test participation impossible. Other, local data should be used in making the plan determination.</p> <p>The primary source of the data to be considered is the NWEA MAP tests, which Bea Underwood's students take three times per year in grades K-12. MAP aligns closely with CSAP and offers some insight into how early grades (which are excluded on the state's SPF) are progressing towards proficiency. The MAP data for grades 1 -3 reading shows that the students at Bea Underwood are showing statistically significant growth over the course of the school year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First grade students are growing 9 RIT points, closing the gap between the school group and the national group by 3 points.</li> <li>The second grade students grew 17 RIT points during the year and closed the gap by 6 points. The average (mean) score for the second grade class in the spring of 2010 is above the performance cut score for</li> </ul>	Request approved: Improvement Plan	<p>Bea Underwood's school performance framework only includes data for the Academic Achievement indicator. On this indicator, it receives an "approaching" overall, with its percentage of students proficient/advanced in reading and math approaching state standards at the 27<sup>th</sup> and 34<sup>th</sup> percentile respectively, and its percentage of students proficient/advanced in writing not meeting state standards at the 9<sup>th</sup> percentile. Significant improvements in achievement are needed for this group of students.</p> <p>CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school's performance, but it does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results. However, as a school that only serves students up to grade 3, this school's SPF data only reflects one grade of students and it does not include any Colorado Growth Model data. As such, CDE agrees it is important to review the outcomes of its 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> graders, including growth outcomes on other available assessments. Growth gaps data should also be considered, but none was provided by the district.</p> <p>In reviewing the NWEA MAP Student Growth Summary Report for Fall 2009 to Spring 2010, Bea Underwood met or exceeded the mean growth target across all grades and subjects except for 2<sup>nd</sup> grade math. However, as indicated below, 65% or less of students</p>

Fall of third grade, showing that students are entering, on average, at a level that should equate to the majority of the students at proficiency within three years of entering Bea Underwood Elementary, one of the major criteria for establishing catch up/keep up performance on the Colorado Growth Model.

- The third grade students at Bea Underwood showed tremendous growth as well, growing 14 points and closing the achievement gap by 6 points. The third grade class ended the year with a mean four points above the cut score prediction, as determined by NWEA.

Bea Underwood Elementary’s math program tells a very similar story.

- The first grade students at Bea Underwood gained 10 RIT points during the year, closing the gap by 3 points. Note that the first grade only tested in the winter and spring due to technology issues.
- The second grade grew 12 points during the year.
- The third grade grew 15 points, closing the gap by 4 points, ending the year with the average being one point higher than the predicted cut point.

On a CSAP related note, when comparing Bea’s average gains from 2009 to 2010 in reading to other schools, only one other school in the region did as well as Bea Underwood. Data also indicates that Bea would be at the top of all the schools in the region in math as well.

The school also shows a significant level of growth on the DIBELS assessment used for CBLA determination, representing strong and sustained academic growth.

This evidence is a substantial reason to upgrade the assigned plan from Priority Improvement Plan to Improvement Plan. It is critical to fill the void that exists for non-CSAP or limited CSAP schools, so there is a real view of how each school is performing and improving. High stakes decisions for schools on the school performance framework should not be based on a single data point, but instead on a body of evidence that supports a true version of the work that each school is committed to on a yearly basis.

McLain Community High School is a program within McLain High School that serves as an adult education center. McLain High School has been designated as an Alternative Education Campus and will default to an Improvement Plan as other AECs will this year. McLain Community should

met growth targets across all grades and subjects.

Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target
MAP language usage	3	118.4%	61.2%
MAP math	1	102.6%	59.5%
MAP math	2	85.9%	41.9%
MAP math	3	133.5%	59.7%
MAP reading	2	107.2%	63.8%
MAP reading	3	120.5%	60.9%

In reviewing the DIBELS beginning and end-of-year histograms, Bea Underwood meets expectations for 2 out of 3 grades.

- The second grade does not meet expectations for growth in one year. With the percentage of students at benchmark on ORF increasing from 48% to only 51%, the box plot reveals that the average score for 2<sup>nd</sup> grade only minimally increases across the school year, remaining just barely at benchmark levels at the end of the year. The gap between the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile and the lowest student increases from the beginning of the year to the end of the year.

Measure	Grade	Result
DIBELS SPF, NWF, ORF	1	59% to 98% on PSF 47% to 70% on NWF 49% to 56% on ORF
DIBELS ORF	2	48% to 51% on ORF
DIBELS ORF	3	42% to 52% on ORF

These determinations are based on guidelines from a DIBELS technical adequacy report which indicates that:

- Approximately 95% of students at benchmark should remain benchmark, approximately 80% of students at strategic should move to benchmark, and approximately 80% of students at intensive should move to strategic or benchmark.
- Although the ultimate goal is to have all students achieving literacy goals, data on a large number of schools and districts indicates that it is not uncommon to see a 10-20% growth in the number of students at benchmark in kindergarten and first grade over the first two years of collecting data.

This supplemental data suggests that Bea Underwood is, on the whole, approaching or meeting growth expectations. CDE cautions the district and school to carefully monitor the correlation of MAP and DIBELS results to CSAP results in later grades, especially given that some of these early literacy successes seem to fade on 3<sup>rd</sup> grade CSAP results. Overall, though, CDE approves revising the school’s plan type assignment from Priority Improvement Plan to Improvement Plan.

CDE agrees with the district’s rationale. The Department and the district will collaborate to resolve the issues around the duplicative school codes. CDE approves revising the school’s plan type assignment from Turnaround Plan to Improvement Plan.

Jefferson County  
McLain Community High School  
Turnaround Plan  
Improvement Plan

Request approved: Improvement Plan

				receive this same designation and plan type.		
Monte Vista	Online Learning Academy (middle, high)	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	The school was initially looked at as a separate middle and high school. With separate middle and high school SPFs, the high school's rating dropped from an Improvement Plan to a Priority Improvement because it did not make the 95% participation rate. However, when combining the middle and high school frameworks, the school meets the 95% participation rate overall, resulting in a rating of Improvement.	Request approved: Improvement Plan	CDE agrees with the district's rationale. It is appropriate to combine the participation rate results for multi-level schools (K-8, 6-12, and K-12) to create a single, combined participation rate.  When combining the school's participation rate results into a single rate: 1) The school makes the 95% participation rate across subjects. 2) The school makes AYP participation.  Both conditions are necessary for participation reconsiderations. Since Monte Vista Online Learning Academy meets both conditions, CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Priority Improvement Plan to Improvement Plan.
Silverton	Silverton High School	Priority Improvement Plan	Performance Plan	Silverton High School's plan rating consists of only two indicators: achievement and postsecondary and workforce readiness (PWR). The school's PWR rating is based solely on one metric (dropout rate), which was largely influenced by a fee-charging private program (Mountain Adventure Academy) that enrolled its students in the Silverton district to gain educational credits. When this institution disbanded mid-year in 2007-2008, students returned to their families and were counted against the school as dropouts or students who failed to graduate. Considering that Silverton High School was used to supplement the Academy's program, and that the 3-year dropout rate was adversely impacted by the departure of all students during the 2007-2008 year, the school's post-secondary rating should be revised to "meets," and the overall plan rating should be revised from Priority Improvement Plan to Performance Plan.	Request approved: Performance Plan	The school's plan type should not be largely influenced by this singular event, and the school demonstrates higher performance over time.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The school's dropout rate (19%) for that one year during the private school's closure relative to the school's four-year average dropout rate of 1.8% (factoring out the 2007 spike) supports the district's contention that the spike represents a unique event that is not reflective of the school's dropout rate over time.</li> <li>The graduation rate for this district was adversely impacted due to the adventure school's closure mid-year in 2007-2008. The district successfully appealed their graduation rate (reflecting the 2007-2008 year) to meet AYP on the grounds that when factoring out the impact of students who left mid-year, an insufficient number of students is available to evaluate their one-year graduation rate.</li> </ul> CDE approves revising this school's plan type assignment from Priority Improvement Plan to Performance Plan.
Walsh School District Re-1	Walsh School District Junior High School	Improvement Plan	Performance Plan	Academic progress made with students at this school is not adequately measured by the CSAP tests. In contrast to academic growth reflected by performance on the CSAPs, MAP growth data reveal that students are making above average growth relative to nationally set NWEA norms. This information should be factored into CDE's evaluation of the school's academic progress.	Request approved: Performance Plan	Districts may request plan type reconsiderations to move from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan on the following basis:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district has submitted a recommendation regarding the type of plan the school should implement.</li> <li>The district's recommendation to move the school assignment from an Improvement Plan to a Performance Plan is based on evidence from a district accreditation framework that either meets or exceeds the rigor of the state's framework.</li> </ul> Since the district uses the CDE performance framework supplanted with MAP assessment data to evaluate its schools, CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Improvement Plan to Performance Plan.
Widefield 3	Discovery High School	Turnaround Plan	Improvement Plan	Discovery High School serves as an alternative school with a credit recovery focus. Due to the alternative nature of this school, the school consistently fails to meet AYP graduation targets and will consistently underperform on	Request approved: Improvement Plan (contingent upon	CDE values the role of credit recovery programs and concerted efforts to provide overage students with credit earning opportunities. Indicators on the SPF are designed to measure student growth and achievement for traditional school settings and this school's

				the SPF ratings. The plan rating should be reconsidered based on the school's mission to provide opportunities for credit recovery to students in this district.	fulfilling requirements specified in the rationale).	performance (based on evidence provided under the first condition) should be assessed using a similar framework as that for Alternative Education Campuses. CDE approves revising the school's plan type assignment from Turnaround Plan to Improvement Plan, the default designation for AECs in the current year, on the condition that the school agrees to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide evidence showing the percentage of students enrolled in the school who meet the overage/under credit profile. If a substantial proportion of students meet the overage/under credit profile, this school should be considered as an alternative education campus;</li> <li>• Join the alternative education pilot (AEC stakeholder meetings to determine appropriate measures, metrics and expectations for alternative schools);</li> <li>• Provide additional data showing progress made by students fulfilling adequate credit hours each semester towards graduation; and</li> <li>• Based on possible expansion of the AEC criteria to include overage/under-credit students, apply for Alternative Education Campus status.</li> </ul>
Woodlin School District R-104	Woodlin Elementary	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	In contrast to the data presented in the SPFs, the school's overall performance on interim assessments (MAP and Scantron) indicates that students, particularly unsatisfactory students, have demonstrated growth and that the school meets national norms set by NWEA. Considering the highly predictive relationship between the MAP and CSAPs, students predicted to score at the proficient level on the MAP assessments should be factored into CDE's evaluation of the school's achievement.	Request denied: Priority Improvement Plan	CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school's performance, but it does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results. The MAP status data and the limited Scantron data provided by the district are insufficient for understanding the performance of the school for accountability purposes. More specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scantron data marking the progress made by unsatisfactory students last year are provided with no other data demonstrating progress made by other students and for past years.</li> <li>• Due to the school's recent migration from Scantron to MAP assessments, only MAP status data were provided. The MAP status data are insufficient for understanding the progress made by students over the school year.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the low growth percentiles exhibited on the 3-year SPF for writing and math (32 and 30) warrant priority attention and support from the state.</p>