

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

Pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009, Dec. 6, 2011

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 performance indicators: academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps, and postsecondary and workforce 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 comprehensive or stringent framework, provided it correlates with CDE's plan types. 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 district accreditation categories or initial school plan type assignments. If the district disagreed, they were asked to submit a request to reconsider that included:

- 1) 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 and workforce readiness);
- 2) Evidence on the extent to which the district/school effectively implemented with fidelity its improvement plan from the prior academic year.

A cross-unit CDE team consisting of staff from the offices of Accountability and Improvement, Teaching and Learning, Assessments, Research and Evaluation, Intervention Support and Field Services, 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 each district's final accreditation category and/or each school's plan type. Final district accreditation categories were determined by the Commissioner on November 15, and the State Board shall consider and adopt final plan type assignments for each school in December. Additional details on this process are described in the [Colorado District Accountability Handbook](#).

The tables that follow summarize the requests to reconsider received by the Department by October 17, 2011 and their resolution as approved by the State Board of Education on December 6, 2011. 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.

District Performance Framework (DPF)	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.
School Performance Framework (SPF)	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.
Median Growth Percentile (MGP)	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.
Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP)	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.
Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP)	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.
Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP)	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.
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)	<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"> • Phonemic Awareness is measured by Initial Sounds Fluency (ISF) and Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF). • Alphabetic Principle is measured by Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF). • Accuracy & Fluency with connected Text is measured by Oral Reading Fluency (ORF). • Vocabulary is measured by Word Use Fluency (WUF is still under development). • Comprehension is measured by ORF and Retell Fluency (RTF). <p>Source: http://www.dibels.org/dibels.html</p>

Summary of Decisions 2010-11

DISTRICT-LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER				
District	School	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	CDE Decision
PRIMERO REORGANIZED 2	-	Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited	Request APPROVED: Accredited
SCHOOL-LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER				
District	School	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	CDE Decision
CLEAR CREEK RE-1	CARLSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Improvement Plan	Performance Plan	Request DENIED: Improvement Plan
COLORADO SPRINGS 11	ACADEMY FOR ADVANCED AND CREATIVE LEARNING	Turnaround Plan	Improvement Plan	Request APPROVED: Priority Improvement Plan
DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	EDCSD: COLORADO CYBER SCHOOL	Turnaround Plan	Priority Improvement Plan	Request APPROVED: Priority Improvement Plan
GARFIELD 16	BEA UNDERWOOD ELEMENTARY	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	Request APPROVED: Improvement Plan
MAPLETON 1	WELBY MONTESSORI SCHOOL	Turnaround Plan	Priority Improvement Plan	Request DENIED: Turnaround Plan
PARK COUNTY RE-2	GUFFEY CHARTER SCHOOL	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	Request APPROVED: Improvement Plan
ROCKY FORD R-2	ROCKY FORD JUNIOR/SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	Priority Improvement Plan	Improvement Plan	Request APPROVED: Improvement Plan
WALSH RE-1	WALSH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Improvement Plan	Performance Plan	Request DENIED: Improvement Plan

DISTRICT-LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER						
District	School	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	District/School Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
Primero Reorganized 2		Accredited with Improvement Plan	Accredited		Request APPROVED: Accredited	<p>Due to a DPF reporting error in CDE's draft DPF reports, the graduation rate numerator and denominator counts were being incorrectly duplicated. Although the graduation rates were correct (since the ratio between numerator and denominator remained the same), the overcount means that there are some districts whose rates should not have been reported or counted for accountability purposes since they were based on fewer than 16 students (N<16). For Primero, the incorrect DPF was using a 100% graduation rate that was based on fewer than 16 students when it should have used an 88.4% graduation rate, the district's highest rate based on 16 or more students. Since this is just below the DPF <i>exceeds</i> cut-point of 90%, the district's graduation rate rating should have been <i>meets</i> rather than <i>exceeds</i>. Consequently, this decreases the district's overall percent of framework points earned, and results in an accreditation rating of Accredited with Improvement Plan rather than Accredited.</p> <p>Given that the change occurred as a result of CDE data errors in the draft DPF reports, and that the district may have already engaged in planning efforts around a Performance Plan rating, CDE has offered to revise the district's accreditation rating from Accredited with Improvement Plan to Accredited with Performance Plan for 2010-11. The district will need to earn this performance level next year based on the merits of the data.</p>

SCHOOL-LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER

District	School	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	District/School Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Considerations/Rationale
Clear Creek RE-1	Carlson Elementary School	Improvement	Performance	<p>The demographics of the county have changed in the last 3 years. The transient population in the school has almost doubled with the Free and Reduced Lunch population increasing by 10%. NWEA MAP testing done at least 3 times a year shows growth for each individual student along with an increase in subgroups targeted by the principal in her goals for the school. The MAP assessment results show improvement in math and reading, while the DIBELS scores show consistent growth in reading for students in the strategic and intensive remediation groups.</p> <p>NWEA MAP: In 2008-09, 64.5% of students achieved their target goals in reading and 69.8% in math. In 2009-10, 65.8% of students achieved their target goals in reading and 72% in math. In 2010-11, 62.3% achieved their target goals in reading and 62.4% in math. In 2010-11, the kindergarten group achieved 100% of their target goals in reading and 95.8% in math. The MAP assessment data shows considerable growth made every year. In all three years, 60% of the students achieved their growth goals in reading and math. All students participate in the MAP assessment whereas there have been several students over the years who have opted out or been unable to complete their CSAP testing.</p> <p>DIBELS: The DIBELS results show significant progress across 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 in kindergarten through third grade. In 2008-09, three out of four grades showed growth. In 2009-10, four out of four grades showed improvement. In 2010-11, three out of four grades demonstrated improvements in reading.</p> <p>Overall: During the last three years, children have benefitted from instruction at Carlson Elementary. The gains shown on the NWEA Achievement tests and also on the DIBELS illustrate that the growth at Carlson has remained steady. CSAP reading scores also show improvement in the last three years in reading proficiency. Clear Creek School District is measuring progress with metrics not collected at a state level. Students are tested at least three times a year and their individual goals for achievement are based on these test results. The individualized instruction provides an opportunity for each child to attain their own goals in a given school year. The last three years of</p>	<p>Request DENIED: Improvement Plan</p>	<p>CDE recognizes that the school performance framework reports can be an incomplete reflection of an elementary school’s performance in that it includes only CSAP results that reflect the performance of third through sixth graders in the school. For this reason, the Department reviewed additional data submitted by the district that reflect the performance of all grade levels on the NWEA MAP and DIBELS assessments. However, while CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school’s performance, it does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results.</p> <p>Performance trends in third through sixth grade based on the CSAP are inconsistent for Carlson. This is evident in comparing the school’s 2009-10 1-year SPF to its 2010-11 1-year SPF (the 3-year is the official one for the school).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the school earned 61.5% of points on its 2009-10 1-year SPF, resulting in a Performance Plan. On its 2010-11 1-year SPF, the school earns 49.5% of points, resulting in an Improvement Plan. • On its 2009-10 SPF, the school <i>meets</i> state expectations on the Academic Achievement indicator, but on its 2010-11 SPF, the school is <i>approaching</i> state expectations. This is because while the proficiency rates increased in math (59% to 70%), they decreased in all other content areas. Reading dropped from 72% to 70%, writing from 61% to 52%, and science from 39% to 35%. All are below the 50th percentile of elementary schools. • The school’s ratings on the Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps indicators are <i>approaching</i> and <i>meeting</i> state expectations, respectively, on its 2009-10 3-year SPF, but the school’s Growth Gaps <i>do not meet</i> state expectations on its 2010-11 3-year SPF. While math growth rates increased from the 34th to the 51st percentile, reading growth rates dropped from the 57th to the 46th percentile and writing from the 50th to 37th percentile. • With students performing in the bottom half of elementary schools and growing at varying rates, the school makes adequate growth in reading and math but does not make adequate growth in writing. Across content areas, the school’s economically disadvantaged students do not make adequate growth. <p>Performance in kindergarten through sixth grade based on the NWEA</p>

data show that students are reaching their benchmarks and over 50% of the whole population in the school is meeting their target goals each year. In the data provided to CDE, Carlson shows consistent improvements in their achievement and growth trends. The school is showing consistent growth across all the disaggregated student groups, which have been a challenge due to the small size of some of these groups. The early literacy data show that the school has improved tremendously, especially in kindergarten.

Supplemental assessments suggest that student performance has increased each year and may be more successful than the CSAP results illustrate. Participation rates in all testing are high at Carlson but the student interest in the NWEA and the highly visible, understood results may be more important to these students. They know what the scores mean on their normative testing and they also are given the standards or benchmarks that they need to learn so that they can reach their own personal goal. All students are vested in their own success along with their families. This has helped drive instruction and also make students aware of what standards they need to focus on.

MAPS results from the most recent year, demonstrates mostly solid growth.

- Overall, per NWEA growth targets, nearly two-thirds of the students met growth targets (average growth). In reading, 62% of students met the MAPs growth target. In math, 62% of students met the MAPs growth target.
- However, growth was inconsistent across grade levels and declines across some grade levels. Kindergarteners showed the most growth in both reading and math, with 100% of students meeting growth targets in reading and 96% in math. The percent of students meeting growth targets in other grades ranges from 25% to 75% in reading, with all grades showing at least 50% of students meeting targets except for grade 2, and from 33% to 83% in math, with all grades showing at least 50% of students meeting targets except for in grades 1 and 2. In reading, only a quarter of students in grade 2 and 50% of students in grade 6 met growth targets, and in math only a third of students in grade 2 and 42% of students in grade 1 met growth targets.

Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target
MAP math	K	175.5%	95.8%
MAP math	1	92.3%	41.7%
MAP math	2	81.8%	33.3%
MAP math	3	134.1%	72.4%
MAP math	4	107.3%	53.8%
MAP math	5	163.2%	82.8%
MAP reading	K	195.3%	100.0%
MAP reading	1	124.3%	75.0%
MAP reading	2	56.5%	25.0%
MAP reading	3	113.2%	60.0%
MAP reading	4	172.2%	69.0%
MAP reading	5	64.2%	50%

The DIBELS data presented suggests that, overall, grades 2 and 3 showed generally positive trends in catching up students, while kindergarten and first grade showed generally negative trends.

- Kindergarten: The most difficult and critical skill assessed in kindergarten is whether children can connect letters and sounds and blend those sounds together to read whole words, tested through Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF). The data for Carlson reveals a negative trend across three years. The percentage of students at benchmark decreased from fall to spring from 69% to 58% in 2008-09, 40% to 38% in 2009-10, and 64% to 39% in 2010-11. The expectation is that the percentage of benchmark students increases rather than decreases.

- Grade 1: The expectation is that students can read extended text by the end of the year, tested through Oral Reading Fluency (ORF). One of three years reveals a positive trend. The percentage of students at benchmark increased from 55% to 60% in 2009-10, but decreased in 2008-09 and 2010-11.
- Grade 2: The data reveals positive trends for two of three years, as tested through ORF. The percentage of students at benchmark from fall to spring increased by 6% points in 2008-09, 16% points in 2009-10, but decreased in 2010-11.
- Grade 3: The data reveals positive trends for two of three years, as tested through ORF. The percentage of students at benchmark from fall to spring increased by 19% points in 2008-09, 10% points in 2009-10, but decreased in 2010-11.

Measure	Grade	Result (2010-11)
DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF)	K	64% to 39% on NWF benchmark 22% to 36% students strategic 14% to 25% students intensive
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	1	61% to 57% on ORF benchmark 22% to 23% students strategic 17% to 20% students intensive
DIBELS ORF	2	58% to 52% on ORF benchmark 20% to 26% students strategic 22% to 22% students intensive
DIBELS ORF	3	68% to 64% on ORF benchmark 18% to 29% students strategic 17% to 7% students intensive

Thus, the school makes average growth for about two-thirds of its students overall based on the NWEA MAP assessments, which is consistent with the mostly average reading and math CSAP growth results. However, the CSAP growth results *do not meet* expectations in writing and for its economically disadvantaged students, and the school does not provide supplemental writing data or data on economically disadvantaged students that would counter low CSAP writing growth. DIBELS data also does not warrant an increased performance level, given inconsistencies in growth, with positive trends in grades 2 and 3 but negative trends in kindergarten and grade 1.

CDE commends the school for setting student-level goals and expectations to invest them and their families in their own education. Since 2008-09, performance has mostly improved. However, there are some declines in performance in 2010-11 compared to 2009-10 and sustained improvements must be demonstrated to move the school's overall performance to a Performance Plan.

						Given the above, CDE denies the district's request to revise the school's plan type from Improvement to Performance Plan.																
Colorado Springs 11	Academy for Advanced and Creative Learning	Turnaround	Improvement	<p>Overall, District 11's administration and the Board of Education believe the school performance framework calculations are valid and clear indicators of how our schools are performing.</p> <p>However, we recognize that these frameworks have limitations. This may be particularly true when a school is small and new. Academy ACL is both a small school (only 75 students tested in grades 3-8) and was open for the first time in 2010-11. The resulting SPF outcome was based on only 5 of 23 elements (3 of 4 in academic performance, 1 of 3 in academic growth, 0 of 15 in academic growth gaps and 1 out of 1 in percent tested.) We base our request for review on two key data elements described below:</p> <p>1) Percent of students tested Academy ACL would have earned a Priority Improvement Plan based on the 41.7% of total points, but the school was downgraded by one performance level due to fewer than 95% of students being tested. We agree with the premise that all students should be tested and that the 95% requirement usually allows for consideration of a few unusual student/family circumstances. Due to extraordinary circumstances for two students in the middle school, the application of the participation rules seems inappropriate. SPF calculations generally mitigate the above "small size" factors by using three years of data, but this is not possible for ACL which has only been in operation for one year. Within the middle school grades in which the two extraordinary circumstances occurred, it is not possible for more than one student in either grade to not participate and still make the 95% requirement required by AYP rules. The school's efforts to assure all students be tested were met to the best of their ability.</p> <p>2) NWEA MAP assessment results MAP assessment results suggest higher growth than that on the CDE SPF, and more student results are available from fall to spring assessments on MAP than on CSAP. More than half of ACL's students met or exceeded the growth targets.</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 math</td> <td>4 and 5</td> <td>Not reported</td> <td>57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP math</td> <td>6, 7, and 8</td> <td>Not reported</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP math</td> <td>4-8 average</td> <td>Not reported</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target	MAP math	4 and 5	Not reported	57%	MAP math	6, 7, and 8	Not reported	61%	MAP math	4-8 average	Not reported	58%	<p>Request APPROVED: Priority Improvement Plan</p>	<p>1) Percent of students tested CDE recognizes that schools generally have the benefit of three years of data to control for variances that can affect small systems. Multi-level schools also have the benefit of aggregating participation across the different levels (in this case, elementary and middle) and if they meet the state 95% participation requirements across grade levels and make NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), the penalty for the 95% participation rule would not apply. In this school's case, they would meet the participation requirements aggregated across grade levels under the state requirements, but they do not meet the participation requirements under AYP. Given the minimum student count of 30 required for AYP, the requirement that it apply by grade level, and the new school's student counts, CDE will not apply the 95% participation penalty, which brings the school's plan type to Priority Improvement.</p> <p>2) NWEA MAP assessment results While proficiency rates on CSAP <i>meet</i> state expectations (and <i>exceed</i> state expectations in middle school math), the only available growth rate indicates an MGP of 28 for elementary reading. This growth percentile <i>does not meet</i> state expectations. Although it is adequate for the school's typical student to reach proficiency, it indicates that students in math are growing in the bottom third of their academic peers. However, since CSAP growth data is only available for elementary reading (and not elementary math or writing or middle school reading, math or writing), the Department reviewed additional data submitted by the district that reflect the performance of elementary and middle school grades on the NWEA MAP assessment. 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 case, though, where there is a lack of CSAP growth data in all but one area, the supplemental data is critical.</p> <p>The NWEA MAPS data show that over half of the students met their growth targets in reading and math in grades 4 and 5 and grades 6, 7 and 8. Even in not supplanting the elementary reading growth on MAPS for CSAP reading growth, the school would at least <i>approach</i> state expectations in elementary math and middle school reading and math. While this does suggest stronger growth performance than CSAP would, it does not suggest growth that <i>meets</i> or <i>exceeds</i> state expectations and would not compel an increase in performance level.</p>
Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target																			
MAP math	4 and 5	Not reported	57%																			
MAP math	6, 7, and 8	Not reported	61%																			
MAP math	4-8 average	Not reported	58%																			

				<table border="1"> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>4 and 5</td> <td>Not reported</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>6, 7, and 8</td> <td>Not reported</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAP reading</td> <td>4-8 average</td> <td>Not reported</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> </table>	MAP reading	4 and 5	Not reported	53%	MAP reading	6, 7, and 8	Not reported	64%	MAP reading	4-8 average	Not reported	58%		Given the above, CDE denies the district's request to revise the school's plan type from Turnaround Plan to Improvement Plan, but approves the request to revise the school's plan type assignment from Turnaround to Priority Improvement Plan.
MAP reading	4 and 5	Not reported	53%															
MAP reading	6, 7, and 8	Not reported	64%															
MAP reading	4-8 average	Not reported	58%															
DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	EDCSD: COLORADO CYBER SCHOOL	Turnaround Plan	Priority Improvement Plan		Request APPROVED: Priority Improvement Plan	<p>Due to a SPF reporting error in CDE's draft SPF reports, the 4-year graduation rate was not being reported on EDCSD's 3-year SPF, even though it should have been. When the graduation rate is not included/reported, EDCSD receives no graduation rating (N/A) and receives an overall Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness rating of <i>meets</i>; this results in an overall plan type of Priority Improvement Plan. When the correct 4-year graduation rate is included/reported, however, EDCSD receives a <i>does not meet</i> rating, as its 16.3% rate falls below the 65% cut for <i>approaching</i> and an overall Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness rating of <i>approaching</i>; this results in an overall plan type of Turnaround Plan.</p> <p>Given that the incorrect reporting occurred as a result of CDE data errors in the draft SPF reports, and that the school may have already engaged in planning efforts around a Priority Improvement Plan rating, CDE has offered to revise the school's plan type rating from Turnaround Plan to Priority Improvement Plan for 2010-11. The school will need to earn this performance level next year based on the merits of the data.</p>												
Garfield 16	Bea Underwood Elementary	Priority Improvement	Improvement	<p>Bea Underwood Elementary serves students in grades 1-3, limiting the school's performance framework to 3rd grade CSAP performance and making calculations other than academic achievement and test participation impossible. Other, local data should be used in making the plan determination. The school's 3-year SPF still includes 4th and 5th grade students who now attend a different school since Bea Underwood became a K-3 school.)</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"> • First grade students grew 9 RIT points, closing the gap between the school group and the national group by 3 points. • 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 	Request APPROVED: Improvement Plan	<p>Since the school consisted only of grades K-3 in 2010-11, the 1-year SPF more accurately reflects its current performance than its 3-year SPF, which includes students in upper grades who attended other schools last year. On the 1-year SPF, only proficiency results are available, given that CSAP growth rates will not be available for grades 3 and below. As such, the school's most accurate SPF (the 1-year SPF) is based only on Academic Achievement. On this Achievement indicator, Bea Underwood receives an <i>approaching</i> overall, with its percentage of students proficient/advanced in reading and math <i>approaching</i> state expectations at the 29th and 23rd percentile respectively, and its percentage of students proficient/advanced in writing <i>not meeting</i> state expectations at the 10th percentile. Compared to 2009-10, math proficiency in 2010-11 dropped from 63% to 57%, while reading stayed the same/increased slightly from 60% to 61% and science increased slightly from 26.5% to 28.4%. Significant improvements in achievement are needed for this group of students.</p> <p>Given the lack of CSAP growth data, it is important to consider growth on other local assessments. While CDE does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results, it does value other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school's performance. Due to the lack of</p>												

cut score for 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 13 points and closing the achievement gap by 5 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 7 RIT points during the year. 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.

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.

CSAP growth data for this school, the Department considered NWEA MAPS and DIBELS assessment results.

NWEA results suggest consistent increases in RIT scores from fall to spring, with most grades and subjects meeting or exceeding average growth. In reviewing the NWEA MAP Student Growth Summary Report for Fall 2010 to Spring 2011, Bea Underwood met or exceeded the mean growth target across all grades and subjects except for 2nd grade math. Approximately two-thirds of students met growth targets across all grades and subjects, improving slightly upon 2009-10 growth.

Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target
MAP language usage	3	123.9%	65.4%
MAP math	2	94.7%	45.5%
MAP math	3	128.1%	64.6%
MAP reading	2	129.1%	65.3%
MAP reading	3	115.3%	61.8%

Conversely, DIBELS results suggest that growth is not meeting expected growth for one year.

- In first grade, there was no change in the percentage of students at benchmark from fall to spring (55%). Although the percentage of students for Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF) increased from 84% to 100% (a positive trend), the skill of phonemic segmentation is a very basic early literacy skill which should have been mastered by the end of kindergarten. More growth is also expected on the Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF) assessment, as this test demonstrates students’ knowledge of reading very basic consonant-vowel-consonant patterned words. The school demonstrated an increase of 15% on the NWF from fall to spring.
- In second grade, the percentage of students meeting benchmark increased 4% points from fall to spring (54% to 59%), which is below the 10-20% growth expected.
- In third grade, there was no change in the percentage of students meeting benchmark, which is also below the 10-20% growth expected.

Measure	Grade	Result
DIBELS PSF, NWF, ORF	1	84% to 100% on PSF 51% to 66% on NWF 39% to 55% on ORF
DIBELS ORF	2	54% to 59% on ORF
DIBELS ORF	3	51% to 51% on ORF

						<p>These determinations are based on guidelines from a DIBELS technical adequacy report which indicates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>CDE is concerned about the lack of progress demonstrated on DIBELS, as being off track in the early years has implications for the upper grades. However, NWEA data does suggest that some gains are made, and this growth would mostly meet expectations. CDE cautions the district and school to carefully monitor the correlation of MAPS and DIBELS results to CSAP results in later grades, especially given that some of these early literacy successes seem to fade on 3rd grade CSAP results. Overall, though, given limited CSAP data on the state's SPF, and some indication of above average growth on MAPS, CDE approves the district's request to revise the school's plan type assignment from Priority Improvement to Improvement Plan.</p>
Mapleton 1	Welby Montessori School	Turnaround	Priority Improvement	<p>On Mapleton's local accreditation framework for schools, Welby Montessori receives one accreditation category higher than the plan type provided by CDE. Welby fared better on Mapleton's accreditation system than on CDE's SPF in part because Mapleton's system awards accreditation points to schools for K-2 academic achievement, academic growth and academic growth parity. The CDE accountability system recognizes these dimensions of accountability for grades 3-10, but does not have any way of addressing them at younger grades. Welby received more accreditation points in this area than any other district school serving students in grades K-6. Welby also benefitted from the fact that Mapleton's accreditation model awards elementary schools with points for factors known to influence student graduation and drop-out rates at later grades (i.e, course success, attendance and school behavior). Graduation rate and dropout rate are significant parts of the State's accountability system for high schools. Mapleton's school accreditation system holds its schools accountable for precursors of these important indicators of student success before they reach high school. Welby's point totals earned in this area placed it 4th out of 16 district schools.</p>	<p>Request DENIED: Turnaround Plan</p>	<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).</p> <p>In comparison to the state's framework, Mapleton's elementary school framework gives 10 points for achievement, 30 points for growth, 10 points for growth gaps, 30 points for college readiness, and 20 points for school effectiveness. Within college readiness for elementary schools, Mapleton considers course grades, attendance and discipline. Although attendance and discipline are useful measures, the Department has some concerns about their use as college readiness indicators (rather than, for example, school climate measure) and that they receive nearly equal weight to academic growth. The Department also has some concerns with the use of course grades for state accountability, given the lack of standardization statewide.</p> <p>Within effectiveness, Mapleton considers indicators such as school</p>

						<p>culture, curriculum and professional development. Like attendance and discipline, these effectiveness indicators are important factors in the evaluation of 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.</p> <p>Within performance measures, the school falls significantly below state expectations. Although its CSAP proficiency rates increased slightly last year, they were still in the state's bottom tenth for elementary schools across all subjects (at the 4th percentile for math). The school's CSAP growth is low overall, with MGPs at 38 for reading, 26 for math and 31 for writing, as well as for most disaggregated student groups (with exceptions in math MGPs nearing 50 and English language learners with an MGP of 56 in writing). These are significantly below what would have been adequate to get students to proficiency, where growth in the 60th through 80th percentile would have been needed. The school's 3-year SPF suggests this low growth has been low for at least the past three years.</p> <p>The district indicates that this low performance is countered by stronger performance in the K-2 grades for which the state does not have data. The school does receive the highest percentage of points on the Mapleton framework in its K-2 achievement, grades 1-3 growth and grades 1-3 growth gaps. Yet even on the district's framework, this accounts for only 11 points of the total framework points. Looking at the district's cut-points, it also translate to less than 70% of students at grade level and less than 30% of students catching up in reading and 20% in math.</p> <p>Finally, 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, exceptional achievement and growth outcomes in the early grades could have balanced out poor outcomes in the upper grades, but this was not the case. There are also concerns that higher performance in the lower grades has not translated into sustained higher performance in the upper grades.</p> <p>Overall, this school's performance still warrants priority attention and support from the state. Although the district's efforts are critical and commendable, CDE denies the district's request to revise the school's plan type assignment from Turnaround to Priority improvement Plan.</p>
PARK COUNTY RE-2	GUFFEY CHARTER SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improvement	Guffey Charter School is a school with a total combined enrollment of 24 elementary and middle school students. The school received a Priority Improvement plan type because it did not meet the 95% test	Request APPROVED: Improvement	CDE recognizes that schools generally have the benefit of three years of data to control for variances that can affect small systems. In this school's case, they are so small that even over three years, two students not

				<p>participation requirement.</p> <p>Further investigation into the missed participation rate reveals that Guffey had 2 "no scores" over the past three years, both in the 2011 assessment window. One student withdrew due to extreme frustration as a result of bullying. The other student completed the assessment, but did not complete a sufficient number of items to receive a score in reading or writing.</p> <p>Because of the incredibly small number of students being assessed, the participation criteria only allows for one student every three years to miss test participation. Due to the small size of the school, this presents an extremely high standard. It is probably that each year one student may miss the test participation requirement for any number of reasons. Consequently, we believe that the penalty for test participation is too severe for such a small school and request that the state plan type for this small school be revised to Improvement Plan.</p>	Plan	<p>testing can mean that the school does not make the 95% participation requirement. Given the circumstances, CDE will not apply the 95% participation penalty, which brings the school's plan type to Improvement Plan. CDE will continue to monitor the school's participation results next year, but for this year approves the district's request to revise the school's plan type from Priority Improvement to Improvement Plan.</p>
Rocky Ford	Rocky Ford Junior-Senior High School	Priority Improvement	Improvement	<p>Participation - 7th and 8th grade students who are a part of the school now were not included in the school's 3-year SPF since they were previously associated with the district's middle school, which has since closed (so they were associated with a defunct school code for the 2008-09 and 2009-10 results). When these students are included in the school's 3-year SPF, they make participation. This is evident from the district's 3-year DPF which includes all middle school students. As a result, the school should not be marked as missing participation and should remain at Improvement rather than get bumped down. OFPA approved the AYP appeal.</p>	Request APPROVED: Improvement Plan	<p>The district is requesting a change from Priority Improvement to Improvement Plan. The school was bumped down a plan type because it did not meet the 95% participation requirement. However, the 95% participation rate in their 3-year SPF (their official one) is not a true 3-year participation rate. The school recently became a 7-12 school when it had previously been a 9-12; it took in students from a closed middle school when the district consolidated the schools. The students from the middle school are not included in the Junior/Senior High School's results since their prior years' results are associated with a closed school. When you include the 7th and 8th graders in the participation rate, the school meets the 95% participation rule, as evidenced by the 3-year DPF results for their middle school grades, which is inclusive of all students in the district regardless of school.</p> <p>CDE also considered the performance of these 7th and 8th graders and their impact on the school's overall performance. Adjusting for the 7th and 8th graders in the school, for both participation and performance, the school would have made participation and the school would perform well enough still (though not as well) to earn an Improvement rating.</p> <p>Based on the above, CDE approves the district's request to revise the school's plan type from Priority Improvement to Improvement Plan.</p>
Walsh RE-1	Walsh Elementary School	Improvement	Performance	<p>This request is based on our NWEA fall to spring growth data from the past three years. The yearly NWEA fall and spring testing schedule more accurately reflects academic growth in the district than the CSAP test administered once a year.</p>	Request DENIED: Improvement Plan	<p>In reviewing Walsh's performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the Academic Achievement indicator, the school <i>exceeds</i> state expectations overall. The percentage of the school's students who are proficient/advanced on CSAP falls into the top quarter of the state

			<p>Walsh Elementary consistently receives high marks on the school accreditation framework. According to the framework our growth and gap scores were below the median. We have only one reportable subgroup, Free/Reduced Lunch, which shows up in the gap scores. This subgroup makes up roughly half of our student population. When our overall growth is low it is inevitable that our subgroup growth will be low as well, as they are largely the same groups of students. Growth rates for our economically disadvantaged students are very similar to our student population as a whole. What the framework refers to as a gap score really just applies our growth score twice. This makes the growth factor worth 75% of our framework score.</p> <p>Using, what we believe to be, the more accurate NWEA growth data would show a school of above average growth. This growth along with our high achievement scores would result in a plan type of Performance for Walsh Elementary. As is to be expected with small schools and data consisting of small sample sizes, there are examples of unimpressive growth in our NWEA results. When the NWEA results are summarized over three years to match the timeframe our SPF is based on and across all CSAP tested grades and NWEA tested content areas, a clear pattern of consistent growth is evident. The data for the measured content areas and grade levels over a 3-year period shows percent of target growth levels over 100 for 10 of 12 areas. If the framework scoring were based on the overall level of growth demonstrated by our NWEA scores we would easily have achieved a Performance rating. Based on this growth, we request a changed in our category from Improvement to Performance.</p>		<p>across all subject areas. Reading results for the 1-year and 3-year SPF are at the 90th and 91st percentiles statewide; math at the 90th and 87th percentiles; writing at the 97th and 94th percentiles, and science at n<20 and 76th percentile. The school earns an <i>exceeds</i> rating across all contents on the 1-year SPF, improving in 2010-11 from 2009-10, and 2 of the 4 content areas on the 3-year SPF. The remaining two content areas of the 3-year SPF both receive a <i>meets</i> rating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school is not in the state’s top performance despite high achievement because of its growth results. On the Academic Growth and Growth Gaps indicators, the school is <i>approaching</i> but not <i>meeting</i> minimum state expectations. • The school's median growth percentiles have fluctuated across content areas between the 1 and 3-year SPFs but have stayed relatively low: Reading MGPs are 41 and 49, math 30 and 34, and writing 35 and 43. • Despite making adequate growth in reading and writing, the school’s median growth percentiles fall at 41 in reading (<i>approaching</i>), 30 in math (<i>does not meet</i>), and 43 in writing (<i>approaching</i>). Although Adequate growth percentiles for this school are between the 15th and 31st percentiles, and they are making their AGPs in all content areas on the 1-year SPF on reading and writing but not math on the 3-year SPF. The school’s growth rates place it in the bottom 30-40 percent of elementary schools. The state expectation is that even where students are demonstrating proficiency, they demonstrate at least 45th percentile growth (close to a year’s growth in a year’s time). • Growth is especially low for the school’s economically disadvantaged students, with MGPs at the 36th, 26th and 39th percentile for reading, math and writing, respectively. While it is true that many of these students comprise of the school’s total students and therefore its total growth rates, these lower rates suggest that the typical student on Free and Reduced Lunch grew at lower rates than non-Free and Reduced Lunch students. <p>In making a case for a higher performance level, the district has presented the school’s growth results on NWEA MAPS assessments. While CDE does not supplant CSAP results with other assessment results, it does value other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school’s performance. The review of the MAPS data suggests solid average and above-average growth for grades 1 and 2 across content areas. For grades 3-6, there is more inconsistency across grades, but the data also suggests mostly average or above-average growth. These growth results would suggest stronger growth than on the CSAP.</p> <p>However, in comparing the school’s 2009-10 SPF to its 2010-11 SPF, the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>prior year's SPF resulted in a rating of Performance largely because the high CSAP proficiency rates were supported by solid CSAP growth. This is especially true in writing and for economically disadvantaged students in writing. Since then, the school's median growth percentiles have declined, resulting in a drop in the school's overall plan type from Performance to Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Thus, while CDE commends the school's high achievement, for the reasons above, it denies the district's request to revise the school's plan type from Improvement to Performance Plan.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---