

Documentation of 2012 Requests to Reconsider

District Accreditation and School Plan Type Assignments

Pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009

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 determined that the performance of the district or a school differed from the rating assigned by the state, 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 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 14th and the State Board considered and adopted final plan type assignments for each school on December 5th. Additional details on this process are described in the [Colorado District Accountability Handbook](#).

The tables that follow summarize the formal requests to reconsider received by the Department by October 15, 2012 and their resolution as approved by the State Board of Education on December 5, 2012. 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, as well as participation rates and financial and safety assurances. 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, as well as participation rates. 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 or maintain an achievement level of proficient or advanced A 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/district, 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.
Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP)	Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (formerly CSAP). 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 2011-12

DISTRICT LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER				
District	CDE Initial Assignment		District Request	CDE Decision
MAPLETON 1	Accredited with Priority Improvement		Accredited with Improvement	Request Denied: Accredited with Priority Improvement
JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN RE-5J	Accredited with Improvement		Accredited with Performance Plan	Request Denied: Accredited with Improvement
SAN JUAN BOCES	Accredited with Turnaround Plan		Accredited with Improvement	Approved: Accredited with Improvement
SCHOOL LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER				
District	School	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	CDE Decision
SALIDA R-32	HORIZONS EXPLORATORY ACADEMY	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan/ AEC Rating	Approved: AEC Performance
NORTH CONEJOS RE-1J	CENTAURI MIDDLE SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan	Request Denied: Priority Improvement
EDISON 54 JT	EDISON ACADEMY	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan	Approved: Improvement
JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	STEVENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Turnaround	Improvement Plan	Approved: Priority Improvement
IGNACIO 11 JT	IGNACIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Turnaround	Improvement Plan	Approved: Improvement
CREEDE SCHOOL DISTRICT	LAMB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan	Approved: Improvement
PUEBLO CITY 60	CHAVEZ/HUERTA K-12 PREPARATORY ACADEMY	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan	Approved: Improvement
NORWOOD R-2J	NORWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan	Request Denied: Priority Improvement
SUMMIT RE-1	SNOWY PEAKS	Turnaround	Improvement Plan/ New School	Approved: Improvement

	HIGH SCHOOL			
AULT-HIGHLAND RE-9	HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan	Approved: Improvement
CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	HIGH POINT ACADEMY	Performance	Performance Plan	Deny: Improvement
CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	COLORADO PROVOST ACADEMY	Turnaround	Priority Improvement Plan	Approved: Priority Improvement

DISTRICT LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER					
District	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	District Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Rationale
MAPLETON 1	Accredited with Priority Improvement	Accredited with Improvement	<p>The district requested a reconsideration of its accreditation rating based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in performance and demographics • Ongoing reforms and strategies for improvement <p>http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/Downloads/MapletonRequest2012.pdf</p>	Request Denied: Accredited with Priority Improvement	<p>The vision of the Colorado Department of Education is that “All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in a globally competitive workforce.” This vision statement drives the policies and processes created by the Department. It is the foremost criterion in reviewing Requests for Reconsideration for the district accreditation categories assigned through the District Performance Frameworks.</p> <p>Mapleton School District was assigned a rating of Accredited with Priority Improvement based on the District Performance Framework. The purpose of the performance frameworks is to measure student performance of districts/schools relative to our state goals. The performance frameworks are based on data from the four performance indicators: academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps and postsecondary and workforce readiness. These indicators and their sub-indicators represent the key information for determining the relative performance of a district in relation to CDE’s vision for students. The accreditation ratings from the performance frameworks inform CDE’s priorities, and support and resources offered to districts and schools.</p> <p>Specifically, CDE uses the results from the performance frameworks to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand the performance of schools and districts, relative to our statewide goals. - Discover which schools and districts are the furthest away for meeting the goals, in order to direct CDE’s time, attention and resources to supporting them in improving student performance.

				<p>The accreditation ratings are designed to objectively measure how each district and school performs relative to the proficiency goal.</p> <p>It is well understood that factors such as poverty, level of English acquisition, mobility and homelessness can create additional challenges for student learning. These factors can impact the academic level at which students enter school as well as their ability to learn new content and skills. Generally, students with these challenges enter school further away from our state goals.</p> <p>For schools and districts with more at-risk students enrolled, the challenge and work required to meet the statewide goals can be greater. Students may need more time in school, more explicit instruction, more focused interventions, and more-intensive English language instruction. Schools with these challenges have further to take their students.</p> <p>CDE is committed to the vision that all students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in a globally competitive workforce. In order to make this vision a reality, all schools and districts must work toward academic success for each and every student. Adjusting our expectations and standards for different schools and districts, based on their student populations, would compromise the state's expectations for students. Thus, a consistent, objective performance framework is needed to describe performance in comparison to goals, in order to focus our attention to where it is most needed. As such, we kept our review for the request to reconsider focused on the actual district/school student performance outcome data.</p> <p>Review of DPF Performance Data Looking at the district's overall performance ratings from the past several years, performance has remained low and has dropped slightly for the 1-year results.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

	1-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating
2009-10	50.7% - Priority Improvement*	41.5% - Priority Improvement *
2010-11	47.7% - Priority Improvement**	47.1% - Priority Improvement
2011-12	47.4% - Priority Improvement**	45.9% - Priority Improvement

* Indicates that a request for reconsideration was granted to give the district an official rating of Improvement, as compared to the Priority Improvement rating given based on the percent of points earned.

** Indicates official performance framework rating

Comparing results on the 1-year DPFs for the most recent three years, the following trends become apparent:

- **Academic Achievement.** The achievement results for the elementary level have stayed at *Does Not Meet* state expectations, but the actual percent of students scoring proficient and advanced has increased slightly over the years (going from 1st-6th percentiles up to 6th-12th percentiles). Middle school achievement results have also improved slightly within the *Does Not Meet* range, going from 4th-6th percentiles up to 9th-13th percentiles. For high schools, the percent scoring Proficient or Advanced has increased from 7th-9th percentiles in 2009-10 to 9th-18th percentiles in 2011-12, which has bumped two content areas out of *Does Not Meet* and into *Approaching*.
- **Academic Growth.** In 2012, academic growth at the elementary level was lower than previous years, with MGPs between 43 and 52 compared to the 2009-10 values between 48 and 53. At the middle school level, MGPs have hovered around 50 (*Approaching* and *Meets* ratings) but the spread has increased slightly over the years 46-53 in 2009-10 compared to 43-53 in 2011-12. High school growth results for the academic content areas have dropped slightly but are still strong (MGPs between 60 and 62 in 2009-10 and 55-60 in 2011-12). Across all grade levels, Mapleton schools are making adequate growth in Reading, but not in Math or Writing. For English language proficiency, the district made AGP only at the elementary level in 2011-12.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Growth Gaps. Growth gaps also saw a decline in points at the elementary level from 2009-10 to 2010-11 and 2011-12. Middle and high schools both saw consistent growth gap point totals between 2009-10 and 2011-12. Median growth percentiles for high school students have been consistently above 50 across the years, except for students with disabilities which were at or below 50 for Reading and Math in 2009-10 and 2010-11. • Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness. Graduation rates for all students have remained very low, hovering around 60% and earning <i>Does Not Meet</i> ratings. Dropout rates have increased over time, going from 8.2% in 2009-10 to 14.6% in 2011-12. The average composite Colorado ACT score for Mapleton fluctuated in 2010-11 but was the same in 2009-10 and 2011-12, 17.5, earning an <i>Approaching</i> rating. <p>Additional Performance Data Giving a second look to the TCAP achievement data as presented by the district, positive trends are seen in almost all grades and content areas from 2008-2012. The district made greater improvements in most areas, compared to the state. However, while the gap with the state average is closing, the actual proficiency rate is still far from minimum state expectations.</p> <p>The NWEA MAP data submitted by the district also corroborates the TCAP trend of increasing achievement, as do the ACT, PLAN and EXPLORE results.</p> <p>As noted in the performance framework analysis, and shown in the additional data submitted by Mapleton, the median growth percentiles are not increasing consistently. In 2012, growth was mainly flat or declining. However, English language proficiency growth, as measured by the CELApro, is showing solid, average growth.</p> <p>The pre-school data submitted shows mixed results. Students</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					<p>who attended pre-school in 2009, 2010, and 2011 showed higher proficiency in 3rd grade compared to students who did not. But with the 2012 3rd grade reading and writing TCAP results, there was little or no difference in 3rd grade scores.</p> <p>It seems that students who are staying in the district for high school are showing more positive achievement outcomes. The district shared data that showed a 90% passing rate for college coursework, and increasing percentages of students planning to attend college. These are hopeful trends. However, with the extremely high dropout rate, many students are not included.</p> <p>Mapleton’s trends in achievement, along with ongoing reform strategies, and next steps for continued improvement have the potential to take the district to the next performance level with time.</p> <p>As described above, CDE does not see sufficient evidence in student performance to warrant a different plan rating.</p>												
JOHNSTOWN -MILLIKEN RE-5J	Accredited with Improvement	Accredited	<p>The district requested a reconsideration of its accreditation rating based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to curriculum and learning environment • DIBELS data • Acuity data • Higher education data <p>The request is posted here: http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/Downl</p>	Request Denied: Accredited with Improvement	<p>CDE reviewed the district’s DPF and the additional performance data submitted in order to provide a summary of our analysis of Weld RE-5J’s performance.</p> <p>Review of DPF Performance Data</p> <p>Looking at the district’s overall performance ratings from the past several years, it is clear that the total points earned on the one-year District Performance Framework have been gradually improving.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> <th>3-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>58.8% - Improvement*</td> <td>57.3% - Improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>61.2% - Improvement*</td> <td>60.1% - Improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>63.1% - Improvement*</td> <td>56.9% - Improvement</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Indicates official performance framework rating</p>		1-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating	2009-10	58.8% - Improvement*	57.3% - Improvement	2010-11	61.2% - Improvement*	60.1% - Improvement	2011-12	63.1% - Improvement*	56.9% - Improvement
	1-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year DPF Percent of Points & Rating															
2009-10	58.8% - Improvement*	57.3% - Improvement															
2010-11	61.2% - Improvement*	60.1% - Improvement															
2011-12	63.1% - Improvement*	56.9% - Improvement															

[oads/Johnstown-MillikenRequest2012.pdf](#)

Comparing results on the 1-year DPFs for the most recent three years, the following trends can be seen:

Academic Achievement. When rolled-up across grade levels in Weld RE-5J, the academic achievement rating has stayed consistently at *Meets* from 2010 to 2012. Elementary results have been mostly meeting expectations; in 2010 percentile rankings were between 45 and 68 and in 2012 between 44 and 66. Achievement results have also stayed consistent at the middle school level, with the range of percentile ranks between 45 and 57 in 2010 compared to a range of 39-62 in 2012. High school achievement results are lower in comparison to the state than the earlier grades, and earned mostly *Approaching* ratings. The actual proficiency scores have decreased in math and science since 2010, and increased in reading and writing. Percentile rankings for high schools in Weld RE-5J were between 38 and 52 in 2010 and between 31 and 56 in 2012.

Academic Growth. Growth results at the elementary level have declined over time, with MGPs ranging from 46-50 in 2010 dropping down to 33-52 in 2012. At the middle school level, the growth rating has continued to meet expectations across the last three years, although declines in math can be seen. In 2010, MGPs were between 48 and 54 while in 2012 they fell between 41 and 51. High school growth has improved, from an *Approaching* rating to a *Meets* rating. In 2010, MGPs were between 43 and 49 while in 2012 they were between 36 and 58. At all grade levels, the introduction of English language proficiency growth resulted in a noticeably low outlying MGP and an *Approaching* or *Does Not Meet* rating, which had a slight negative effect on each of the grade levels overall growth outcomes. Given its generally high performance, the district made its Adequate Growth targets for Reading and Writing but not Math or English language proficiency.

Academic Growth Gaps. At the elementary level, growth gaps ratings have fluctuated by student group over the years but consistently resulted in an *Approaching* rating. Similar results can

				<p>be seen for middle schools earning <i>Approaching</i> ratings. High school growth results have noticeably improved, earning a rating of <i>Approaching</i> in 2010 and 2011 and a <i>Meets</i> rating in 2012.</p> <p>Post-Secondary and Workforce Readiness. The district graduation rate has improved modestly over the years, from 77.4% and an <i>Approaching</i> rating on the 2010 DPF to 81.2% and a <i>Meets</i> rating on the 2012 DPF. Disaggregated graduation rates are lower than the traditional students' graduation rate, but generally earn <i>Approaching</i> ratings. The dropout rate for the district has fluctuated over time, but stayed low enough to earn consistent <i>Meets</i> ratings. The average composite Colorado ACT score has increased over the years, from 18.5 to 19.1, but the district has maintained a rating of <i>Approaching</i>.</p> <p>Overall, Weld RE-5J has demonstrated relatively consistent performance on the district performance framework over the past three years, with some indicators and grades improving slightly and others declining slightly. The percent of points earned on the one-year DPF has increased over time. Academic Growth is a relative challenge for the district, especially growth in English language proficiency.</p> <p>ACUITY</p> <p>The Acuity average gains in scale scores submitted with the district's request to reconsider show some upward movement from the beginning of the academic year to the end, for all grades included. However, this evidence is not grounded in any comparison information, and thus difficult to consider. CDE was not able to obtain a context for understanding how much growth these average levels represent. It was not clear if this was an above-average amount of growth on Acuity. Through our research, CDE learned that CTB actually calculates growth on Acuity using the Colorado Growth Model method for all students, specifically because a simple gain calculation is inadequate. The district may want to contact the test vendor to obtain this data.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Also, the content areas and grades included in this analysis coincide with the data already available from Colorado Growth Model results for these students on the regular state assessments. The provision of Acuity average gain score information does not provide additional evidence, for example, from grades or subjects that are not already available from state assessments. This data does not supplement the information in the performance frameworks.</p> <p>DIBELS</p> <p>The district presented additional early literacy data from the DIBELS assessment. The most appropriate comparison is between the beginning and end of year composite scores for the same students (as shown in the table below compiled from the supplementary reports provided by the district). The percent of students scoring at or above benchmark requiring core support should increase over the course of instruction, while the percent of students significantly below benchmark requiring intensive support should decrease. In general, CDE interprets changes of 10-20% as districts providing successful instruction for students. While Johnstown-Milliken does show positive trends in the students at benchmark for grades first through fifth, the magnitude of the gains varies greatly by grade. Students in grades 1 and 2 are making enough growth to meet CDE's threshold, but those in grades 3-5 are making less growth than would typically be expected. Similarly, the decline in students requiring intensive support in grades 1 and 2 is adequate. But only minimal growth is being shown in grades 3 and 4 while grade 5 students show no decrease in students requiring intensive instruction from the beginning to end of year. Additionally, the trends shown by kindergarteners are actually the reverse of what is desired. There were considerably more students requiring intensive support at the end of the year than at the beginning. While some of this may be due to the different constructs being compared- First Sound Fluency at the beginning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

of the year and Nonsense Word Fluency at the end of the year- this is still a significant cause for concern and warrants further investigation by the district. For grades 4 and 5, where TCAP growth data are available, the DIBELS results cannot supplant the DPF data.

DIBELS Composite Scores Beginning to End of Year 2011-2012

Kindergarten	22.5% at benchmark	decreasing to	15.4% at benchmark
	50.9% requiring intensive support	increasing to	67.8% requiring intensive support
1st Grade	10.8% at benchmark	increasing to	41.1% at benchmark
	73.5% requiring intensive support	decreasing to	26.5% requiring intensive support
2nd Grade	23.1% at benchmark	increasing to	33.7% at benchmark
	49.7% requiring intensive support	decreasing to	32.5% requiring intensive support
3rd Grade	29.1% at benchmark	increasing to	36.0% at benchmark
	48.8% requiring intensive support	decreasing to	43.8% requiring intensive support
4th Grade	29.9% at benchmark	increasing to	37.9% at benchmark
	54.5% requiring intensive support	decreasing to	47.7% requiring intensive support
5th Grade	32.5% at benchmark	increasing to	33.3% at benchmark
	47.3% requiring intensive support	maintaining	47.3% requiring intensive support

College Attendance and Remediation Rates

The district submitted additional data showing the college going rates and remediation rates. The district reports 52.08% of 2012 graduates enrolled in a 2 or 4 year college. This is an increase from the almost 47% of students in the 2010 class, but a decrease from the 58% in 2011.

Of students who attended an institute of higher education in Colorado, 31.37% needed remediation, almost exactly the state average of 31.8% of students needing remedial coursework.

Summary

Weld RE-5J clearly shows some positive results in student performance. However, the district has not quite reached the performance needed for an Accredited with Performance plan. DIBELS data, while mostly positive, shows some concerning results. The Acuity data does not provide any conclusive or supplementary information on the district's performance. Postsecondary data submitted does not provide overwhelming evidence that the rating should be changed. Thus, CDE was unable to approve the district's request to reconsider.

SAN JUAN BOCES	Accredited with Turnaround Plan	Accredited with Improvement	The district requested that CDE apply Rule 4.02 of the State Board Rules for Administration of Statewide Accountability Measures (http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/Downloads/1CCR301-1-June2012.pdf). This rule allows districts with a single school to be accredited per the school performance framework rating.	Approved: Accredited with Improvement	CDE applied this state board rule to accredit San Juan BOCES, which runs a single school, the Southwest Colorado e-School, with the school's rating of Improvement.
-------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---	--	---

SCHOOL LEVEL REQUESTS TO RECONSIDER																		
District	School	CDE Initial Assignment	District Request	District/School Rationale	CDE Decision	CDE Considerations/ Rationale												
SALIDA R-32	HORIZONS EXPLORATORY ACADEMY	Priority Improvement	Improve-ment Plan*	Request to be approved as an AEC.	Approve: AEC Performance	We agree that the AEC framework is most appropriate for this school. As such, Horizons Exploratory Academy receives an AEC: Performance Plan assignment.												
NORTH CONEJOS RE-1J	CENTAURI MIDDLE SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improve-ment Plan*	Provided NWEA data.	Deny: Priority Improvement	<p>Review of SPF Performance Data</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> <th>3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>44.7% - Priority Improvement*</td> <td>38.6% - Priority Improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>53.8% - Improvement*</td> <td>45.4% - Priority Improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>42.0% - Priority Improvement</td> <td>44.9% - Priority Improvement*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Indicates official performance framework rating</p> <p>Looking at the school’s overall performance ratings from the past several years, the data show trend inconsistencies: a low rating in 2010, improving in 2011 and declining in 2012.</p> <p>Comparing results on the 1-year SPFs for the most recent three years, the following trends become apparent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Achievement. In 2010, the school received three <i>Approaching</i> ratings and one <i>Meets</i> rating with percent proficient and advanced ranges between 41st and 51st percentiles. In 2011, the school improved with an additional <i>Meets</i> rating bumping the school’s overall Achievement rating from <i>Approaching</i> to <i>Meets</i>. The range of percentile ranks in 2011 fell between the 45th and 61st percentiles. 2012 sustained the achievement gains of 2011 with percentile ranks between 45th and 69th percentiles. • Academic Growth. Growth results in 2010 were low, earning one <i>Does Not Meet</i> and two <i>Approaching</i> ratings based on MGPs 		1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	2009-10	44.7% - Priority Improvement*	38.6% - Priority Improvement	2010-11	53.8% - Improvement*	45.4% - Priority Improvement	2011-12	42.0% - Priority Improvement	44.9% - Priority Improvement*
	1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating																
2009-10	44.7% - Priority Improvement*	38.6% - Priority Improvement																
2010-11	53.8% - Improvement*	45.4% - Priority Improvement																
2011-12	42.0% - Priority Improvement	44.9% - Priority Improvement*																

						<p>between 33 and 38. 2011 results varied considerably more, with one <i>Does Not Meet</i>, one <i>Approaching</i>, and one <i>Meets</i> rating, MGPs ranging between 38 and 54. In 2012, Centauri Middle School saw a decline in growth results earning two <i>Does Not Meet</i> and one <i>Approaching</i> rating with MGPs between 26 and 38.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Growth Gaps. Results for the growth gaps indicator have stayed consistently low over time, earning mostly <i>Approaching</i> ratings, with the exception of two <i>Meets</i> ratings in 2011. <p>Additional Data Submitted</p> <p>CDE conducted an analysis of the NWEA MAPs data and did see an increase in growth performance. Unfortunately, NWEA MAPs data cannot be used to supplant CSAP/TCAP results, as the tests cover similar material and the same grade ranges. The NWEA results conflicted with the review of Centauri Middle School's SPF growth data, which showed downward trends.</p>
EDISON 54 JT	EDISON ACADEMY	Priority Improvement	Improve- ment Plan*	Due to a small student population, the school requested CDE use the participation rate from the 1 year report instead of the 3 year report.	Approve: Improvement	Edison Academy's official SPF rating is based on their 3-year report. With such a small student population, the 3-year report includes more indicators on the SPF, and thus, becomes the official rating. However, due to previous testing policies in the district, the participation rate was not met for the 3-year report, dropping the plan type assignment from Improvement to Priority Improvement. Due to the small number of students the school enrolls, and since the 1-year participation rate was met, CDE is approving the request to change Edison Academy's plan type from Priority Improvement to Improvement.
JEFFERSON COUNTY	STEVENS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Turnaround	Improve- ment Plan*	The school submitted additional	Approve: Priority Improvement	CDE reviewed the limited SPF data and the additional data submitted by the district in making our determination.

R-1

growth data: BEAR (Basic Early Assessment of Reading) DIBELS, and Acuity.

Review of SPF Performance Data

Stevens Elementary received a new school code for 2011-12 and currently serves grades K-4. TCAP/CSAP assessments are only available for 3rd through 10th grades, and therefore, Academic Achievement on the SPF represents only 40% of the total enrolled students. Additionally Academic Growth and Growth Gaps can only be calculated for students in grades 4 through 10, therefore less than 20% of Stevens' students contribute to these indicators.

	1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating
2011-12	36.7% - Turnaround*	36.7% - Turnaround

* Indicates official performance framework rating

In addition to the limited representation of students, the new school code assigned to Stevens Elementary in 2011-12 means there is no historical trend data available for comparison. Therefore, the following summaries are limited to only the most recent year of results:

- **Academic Achievement.** In 2011-12 Stevens earned consistent *Approaching* ratings across the three available content areas of reading, mathematics and writing. Percentile ranks ranged between the 16th and 33rd percentiles.
- **Academic Growth.** The school earned two *Does Not Meet* and two *Approaching* ratings on growth, with MGPs ranging between the 18th and 41st percentiles. Although growth results represent only 1/5 of the student population, the extremely low MGPs in the content areas of Mathematics and Writing are still cause for concern.
- **Academic Growth Gaps.** Growth Gap ratings have earned *Does Not Meet* ratings across all content areas for the available student groups- free or reduced price lunch eligible and minority students.

Additional Performance Data

The district provided several additional pieces of performance data from the following assessments: Acuity, BEAR, DIBELS, and McREL Success in Sight fractals.

Status results were provided for Riverside’s BEAR (Basic Early Assessment of Reading) showing between 54% and 75% of students scoring at benchmark in grades K through 2. Given that on the elementary reading indicator of the performance frameworks, the benchmark for meeting state expectations is 72% proficient or advanced, Stevens’ BEAR results align with the *Approaching* range.

The district also provided data on the DIBELS assessment for 2011-12. Tracking student scores for a cohort of students from the fall to spring test administrations allows the school to calculate a quasi-growth measure for early literacy. The results of these analyses are presented in the tables below, broken out by grade level.

2011-12 DIBELS

1st Grade	68% at or above target	increasing to	70% at or above target
	8% well below target	increasing to	13% well below target
2nd Grade	57% at or above target	decreasing to	53% at or above target
	25% well below target	increasing to	32% well below target
3rd Grade	55% at or above target	increasing to	59% at or above target
	26% well below target	decreasing to	18% well below target

					<p>These results show that for roughly half of tested grades, Stevens' Elementary is having a positive impact on student performance. Fewer students are scoring below target and more students are scoring at or above benchmark by the end of the year. The areas of most concern and which CDE would recommend the school and district investigate further are first and second grade (highlighted in red) where the trends are the inverse of what is desired.</p> <p>Data on CTB/McGraw-Hill's Acuity assessment for grade 3 in the content areas of Language Arts and Mathematics were also submitted to CDE. The status predictions from Acuity cannot be included in the request for reconsideration decision as they would be supplanting the available TCAP data. However, the growth information from the fall to spring Acuity administrations provides useful information about the school's impact on student progress. In Language Arts, at the beginning of the year, the percent of students scoring at benchmark (i.e. achieving Tiers 3 or 4) was 24% for Stevens Elementary School and 46% for the district as a whole. By the end of the year, 47% of Stevens' students and 59% of district students were at benchmark. Stevens saw an increase of 23% compared to the district increase of 13%. These values indicate that Stevens achievement results are below the district average, but growth results are above average for Language Arts. In Mathematics, the percent of students at benchmark started the year at 21% for the school and 37% for the district. By the end of the year 63% of students at Stevens were at benchmark compared to 67% for the district. The percent of students at benchmark increased by 41% for the school and 32% for the district. This again shows the pattern of below-average status and above-average growth for the school when compared to the district. Additional analyses were provided showing that the school's subgroups of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch programs and minority students were also making good growth over time</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>and actually out-performed (on both end-of-year status and growth measures) the district FRL-eligible and minority populations. While these comparisons are compelling, we must remember they represent only third graders (approximately 20% of the school population). It is important to remember that the grade 4 results earn <i>Does Not Meet</i> and <i>Approaching</i> ratings for all TCAP and CELApro growth and growth gaps indicators.</p> <p>The final piece of supplementary data provided by the district was a series of school-developed student goals in the content areas of math and writing: the Success in Sight fractals. These fractal experiences provided teachers with a structured rubric of performance tasks on which students could be scored in grades K to 2. Over the course of the school year, the number of students considered proficient on these fractals increased across all grades and content areas. The magnitude of these increases varied by grade, but was generally higher for writing than mathematics. While these fractals provide useful diagnostic information at the individual student level it is difficult to gauge whether the observed school level increases are meaningful since there is no district or comparison group.</p> <p>The additional data provided by the district indicate that Stevens Elementary is performing above the level of a Turnaround school, but not quite at the level of an Improvement school. There are enough performance concerns on both the traditional and supplemental data to warrant a Priority Improvement plan rating and targeted support from the state.</p>
IGNACIO 11 JT	IGNACIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Turnaround	Improvement Plan*	School serves only grades K-3, so academic achievement is available for	Approve: Improvement	<p>Review of SPF Performance Data</p> <p>Ignacio Elementary serves grades K through 3. Only students in grades 3-10 are assessed with the TCAP/CSAP, and therefore, Academic Achievement on the SPF represents just 25% of the total enrolled students in the school. Additionally, it is not possible for the school to receive a growth rating for any of the core content areas, as content area growth cannot be calculated</p>

only 3rd graders and growth was only available for English language proficiency. NWEA MAP and DIBELS data were submitted.

until the 4th grade. In 2012, with the addition of English language proficiency growth to the SPF, Ignacio Elementary received a growth rating based solely on English language proficiency growth, on the 3-year SPF. The inclusion of this data dropped the school's overall rating to Turnaround.

	1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating
2009-10	41.6% - Priority Improvement	50.0% - Improvement*
2010-11	50.0% - Improvement	50.0% - Improvement*
2011-12	50.0% - Improvement	33.3% - Turnaround*

* Indicates official performance framework rating

Although the representation of students is limited, the state's performance frameworks do provide an interesting picture of the school's performance shifts. Comparing results on the 1-year and 3-year SPFs for the most recent three years, the following trends can be seen:

- Academic Achievement.** Although achievement improved slightly, it has continued to earn an *Approaching* rating. On the 1-year SPF, the 2010 percentile ranks for this school ranged between the 13th and 38th percentiles. In 2011, results were between the 22nd and 35th percentiles and in 2012 between the 26th and 33rd percentiles. Achievement results for the 3-year SPF in 2010 ranged between the 17th and 32nd percentiles, in 2011, between 18th and 32nd percentiles and in 2012 between 20th and 50th percentiles.
- Academic Growth.** Growth results cannot be provided for the core content areas because this school serves only up to 3rd grade. For the first time in 2012, growth was reported based exclusively on English language proficiency, as measured by the CELApro assessment. In comparison to the 173 third grade students taking a content-area assessment on the 3-year SPF, 32 ELLs across grades K-3 took the CELApro. Using the traditional framework scoring, this would result in 2/3 of the total points coming from less than 20% of

					<p>the school's student population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Growth Gaps. Growth Gaps cannot be calculated for this school since they only serve K-3 students. <p>As CDE's data provides a limited view of performance for Ignacio Elementary including achievement for the 3rd graders and growth just on English language proficiency, CDE reviewed the additional performance data submitted by the district.</p> <p>Additional Performance Data</p> <p>The district provided NWEA MAP growth data for students in grades 2 and 3, for the subject areas of language use, mathematics, and reading over the past two years for Ignacio Elementary School. Each of the grade/content area/year combinations met the minimum state N-count, and thus, was included in CDE's analyses. In 2010-11, 66% of both 2nd and 3rd graders were making their growth targets for Language Usage, this number declined to 57% and 51% respectively in 2011-12. Mathematics results for this school showed 68% of 2nd graders and 63% of 3rd graders meeting growth targets in 2010-11 and 63% and 58% in 2011-12. In 2010-11, 70% of 2nd graders and 50% of 3rd graders met reading growth targets, by 2011-12 65% of 2nd graders and only 36% of 3rd graders were meeting targets. Although results have declined between 2011 and 2012, for most content areas and grade levels between 50 and 65% of students are meeting their growth targets. This result is comparable to an <i>Approaching</i> rating and would improve the school's overall ranking.</p> <p>The district also provided K-2 CBLA data on the DIBELS assessment for 2009-10 and 2010-11 and DIBELS Next assessment for 2011-12. Tracking student scores for a cohort of students from the fall to spring test administrations allows the school to calculate a quasi-growth measure for early literacy. The results of these analyses are presented in the tables below, broken out by year and grade level.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>2009-10 DIBELS</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Kinder-garten</td> <td>98% below target</td> <td>decreasing to</td> <td>37% below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st Grade</td> <td>70% below target</td> <td>decreasing to</td> <td>35% below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd Grade</td> <td>75% below target</td> <td>decreasing to</td> <td>63% below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd Grade</td> <td>67% below target</td> <td>staying same at</td> <td>67% below target</td> </tr> </table> <p>2010-11 DIBELS</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Kinder-garten</td> <td>79% below target</td> <td>decreasing to</td> <td>17% below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st Grade</td> <td>16% below target</td> <td>increasing to</td> <td>28% below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd Grade</td> <td>72% below target</td> <td>decreasing to</td> <td>45% below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd Grade</td> <td>66% below target</td> <td>increasing to</td> <td>68% below target</td> </tr> </table> <p>2011-12 DIBELS Next</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Kinder-garten</td> <td>55% at or above target</td> <td>increasing to</td> <td>88% at or above target</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>31% well below target</td> <td>decreasing to</td> <td>4% well below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1st Grade</td> <td>66% at or above target</td> <td>decreasing to</td> <td>62% at or above target</td> </tr> </table>	Kinder-garten	98% below target	decreasing to	37% below target	1st Grade	70% below target	decreasing to	35% below target	2nd Grade	75% below target	decreasing to	63% below target	3rd Grade	67% below target	staying same at	67% below target	Kinder-garten	79% below target	decreasing to	17% below target	1st Grade	16% below target	increasing to	28% below target	2nd Grade	72% below target	decreasing to	45% below target	3rd Grade	66% below target	increasing to	68% below target	Kinder-garten	55% at or above target	increasing to	88% at or above target		31% well below target	decreasing to	4% well below target	1st Grade	66% at or above target	decreasing to	62% at or above target
Kinder-garten	98% below target	decreasing to	37% below target																																															
1st Grade	70% below target	decreasing to	35% below target																																															
2nd Grade	75% below target	decreasing to	63% below target																																															
3rd Grade	67% below target	staying same at	67% below target																																															
Kinder-garten	79% below target	decreasing to	17% below target																																															
1st Grade	16% below target	increasing to	28% below target																																															
2nd Grade	72% below target	decreasing to	45% below target																																															
3rd Grade	66% below target	increasing to	68% below target																																															
Kinder-garten	55% at or above target	increasing to	88% at or above target																																															
	31% well below target	decreasing to	4% well below target																																															
1st Grade	66% at or above target	decreasing to	62% at or above target																																															

						<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>22% well below target</td> <td>increasing to</td> <td>26% well below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd Grade</td> <td>53% at or above target 24% well below target</td> <td>increasing to decreasing to</td> <td>72% at or above target 11% well below target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd Grade</td> <td>40% at or above target 34% well below target</td> <td>increasing to decreasing to</td> <td>72% at or above target 20% well below target</td> </tr> </table>		22% well below target	increasing to	26% well below target	2nd Grade	53% at or above target 24% well below target	increasing to decreasing to	72% at or above target 11% well below target	3rd Grade	40% at or above target 34% well below target	increasing to decreasing to	72% at or above target 20% well below target
	22% well below target	increasing to	26% well below target															
2nd Grade	53% at or above target 24% well below target	increasing to decreasing to	72% at or above target 11% well below target															
3rd Grade	40% at or above target 34% well below target	increasing to decreasing to	72% at or above target 20% well below target															
						<p>These results show that for most grades, Ignacio Elementary is having a positive impact on student performance. Fewer students are scoring below target and more students are scoring at or above benchmark by the end of the year. The area of most concern and which CDE would recommend the school and district investigate further is the first grade where the trends are in 2011 and 2012 are the reverse of what is desired.</p> <p>Overall, when adjusting the weighting of the English language proficiency growth metric (25% of growth points instead of 100% of growth points) and reviewing the additional performance data, Ignacio Elementary School is making enough positive growth to merit the approval of the school's plan type from Turnaround to Improvement. CDE recognizes the limited information we have on small, K-3 schools such as Ignacio Elementary, and appreciates that your district shared additional performance information about the school to provide a more robust picture of performance.</p>												
CREEDE SCHOOL DISTRICT	LAMB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan*	Provided NWEA MAP data for all grades.	Approve: Improvement	<p>Review of SPF Performance Data</p> <p>Lamb Elementary, with only 38 students enrolled in the K-5 school in 2011-12, has limited state data to review. For each of the years presented, the</p>												

school's 1-year SPF included only Academic Achievement information. The 3-year SPF included both Achievement and Growth (and for 2012 Growth Gaps for economically disadvantaged students). Although the school would have earned a Performance rating based on the 1-year SPF results, the addition of growth data in the 3-year SPF provides results on more indicators and is thus used as the official rating.

	1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating
2009-10	91.6% - Performance	77.1% - Performance*
2010-11	75.2% - Performance	57.1% - Improvement*
2011-12	75.2% - Performance	37.6% - Priority Improvement*

* Indicates official performance framework rating

- Academic Achievement.** Achievement results have stayed adequately high for this school over time, consistently earning a *Meets* ratings. On the 1-year SPF, the 2010 percentile ranks for this school ranged between the 69th and 94th percentiles. In 2011, results were between the 60th and 80th percentiles and in 2012 between the 73rd and 84th percentiles. 3-year SPF results for achievement also include Science across all years. In 2010, percentile ranks were between 72nd and 94th percentiles, in 2011, between 69th and 91st percentiles and in 2012 between 56 and 85th percentiles.
- Academic Growth.** Growth results are only available on the 3-year SPFs for this school, meaning roughly 2/3 of each year's results overlap with the next consecutive year. In the 2010 SPF, the school earned a *Meets* rating with MGPs between 53 and 57 and met adequate growth targets across all content areas. In 2011 SPF, the rating had dropped to *Approaching* with MGPs between 32 and 44 and only Reading and Writing still making adequate growth targets. By the 2012 SPF, these results had further dropped to a *Does Not*

					<p><i>Meet</i> rating based on MGPs between 23 and 28, with the school continuing to meet adequate growth targets in Reading and Writing. The 2012 3-year growth results were based on the results of 37-38 students, over the course of 3-years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Growth Gaps. Lamb Elementary school does not have large enough student sub-groups to receive any growth gap ratings on any 1-year SPF. The 3-year SPFs for 2010 and 2011 also do not meet the minimum N to receive growth gap ratings. 2012 is the first year this school receives a growth gap rating of <i>Does Not Meet</i> for the 3-year SPF. This indicator rating is based solely on 22 students eligible for free or reduced price meal plans, over three years. <p>As CDE's data provides a limited view of performance for Lamb Elementary including achievement for the 3rd-5th graders and growth just for 4th and 5th graders, CDE reviewed the additional performance data submitted by the district.</p> <p>Additional Performance Data</p> <p>The district provided NWEA MAP growth data for students in grades 1-5 over the past three years for Lamb Elementary School. While the number of students in any given grade, year, and/or content combination does not meet the minimum number of 16 students, aggregating across these scenarios provides reliably meaningful data. CDE has TCAP/CSAP growth data for grades 4 and 5, and thus, NWEA MAP data were not analyzed for these students. Instead, all aggregations concentrated on grades 1 (where available), 2 and 3 in the content areas of Language Usage, Mathematics, and Reading. Across the years 2010, 2011, and 2012, the percent of students making target growth was as follows: Language Usage: 78%, Mathematics: 74%, and Reading: 53%. These data can be interpreted as 78% of students making at least average growth, which would probably result in an MGP between 40 and 50. Although the Reading results are low there has been moderate improvement over time.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						This additional data shows a school performing at the Improvement level. CDE recognizes the limited information we have on small schools such as Lamb Elementary and uses data submitted by districts to gain a wider picture of performance.
PUEBLO CITY 60	CHAVEZ/HUERTA K-12 PREPARATORY ACADEMY	Priority Improvement	Improve-ment Plan*	The school was re-chartered from two schools into one beginning in the 2012-12SY and going forward, the district would like to consider them a single entity.	Approve: Improvement	<p>As per the district's explanation, in June of 2012, Cesar Chavez Academy and Dolores Huerta Preparatory High School merged into one charter school called Chavez/Huerta Preparatory Academy. In the 2011-12 school year, Cesar Chavez Academy and Dolores Huerta Preparatory High School operated as two different schools and thus were given two different plan designations, resulting in the plan type of Priority Improvement for the Elementary/Middle School and Performance for the High School.</p> <p>After re-calculating the School Performance Framework for Chavez/Huerta Preparatory Academy as one K-12 school comprised of elementary, middle, and high school grades (EMH), the school would receive a plan type assignment of Improvement. Although Cesar Chavez Academy and Dolores Huerta Preparatory High School were two different entities in the 2011-12 school year, they are a single entity in the 2012-13 school year. Thus, CDE accepts Pueblo City School District's request to reconsider for the plan type for Chavez/Huerta Preparatory Academy as one charter school with an Improvement rating.</p>
NORWOOD R-2J	NORWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improve-ment Plan*	The school submitted additional growth data: STAR and AIMS Web.	Deny: Priority Improvement	<p>Review of SPF Performance Data</p> <p>Looking at the school's overall performance ratings from the past several years, the results have been inconsistent but generally show a decline in performance.</p>

						<p>On behalf of Norwood Elementary School, the district submitted additional data to CDE from AIMS web and STAR to present its case for request to reconsider. The AIMS web data showed some increases in math and literacy gains, particularly in grades 1 and 2. However, for kindergarten, the students did not meet any of the targets for the AIMS web assessments in 2011-12, with the exception of one, Missing Numbers. The data submitted for the STAR assessment includes mathematics results for grades 3, 4, and 5; because these grades and content area are already tested by TCAP/CSAP, this evidence is not supplementary and cannot be given much weight in the final request for reconsideration decision. Norwood’s 2011-12 STAR math data shows that students in grades 3 and 5 started the year slightly below the national norm (NCE values of 46.0 and 44.3) and ended the year slightly above the national norm (NCEs of 52.7 and 54.0). Fourth grade students started and ended the year below the national norm (fall NCE value of 40.9 and spring of 40.8), continuing to decline compared to the national norm. These results align with the TCAP/CSAP results and do not provide evidence of gains in academic achievement in Norwood Elementary School.</p> <p>CDE does recognize the school is showing incentives to improve its math and literacy, primarily through the new hire of an instructional math coach and the “Every Child is a Writer” program. Although these are strong efforts to moving scores upward, this is not enough to pull the school out of Priority Improvement. The school’s achievement, growth, and growth gap data has been declining. In addition, with inconsistent AIMS Web and STAR assessment data, CDE is unable to approve Norwood Elementary School’s request to reconsider.</p>
SUMMIT RE-1	SNOWY PEAKS HIGH SCHOOL	Turnaround	Improve-ment Plan*	The school was considered a new school in the 2011-	Approve: Improvement	The SPF generated by CDE puts Snowy Peaks on a Turnaround plan based on limited data-dropout rate from the 2010-11 school year and ACT data for the school. However, based on school changes, the school that existed in 2010-11 was a completely different school from the school in place in the 2011-12 school year. In May 2011, the district applied to change the name

				12SY and different from the school in the 2010-11SY. The school submitted additional NWEA MAP data to show performance.		<p>for the school (from Summit Alternative High to Snowy Peaks High School). However a new school code was not requested at that time. A new school code would have been warranted based on the changes to the school (new purpose, new principal and new students). Since dropout rate data is lagged a year, and a new school was not in place, the dropout rate used on the SPF should not be attributed to Snowy Peaks High School.</p> <p>Although without a new school code, Snowy Peaks was a new school in the 2011-12 school year and consisted of a very small student population (38 students). The only SPF data CDE has are the ACT results, warranting a broader look at the school's performance. The data submitted by the district on the performance of students on the NWEA MAPs test was used as an academic achievement indicator. There were too few students with fall and spring results to measure growth or growth gaps. Using the district's methodology, the school earned an Improvement Plan.</p>												
AULT-HIGHLAND RE-9	HIGHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	Priority Improvement	Improvement Plan*	The school only receives growth data for grades 4 and 5. To show upward growth for their K-3 students, the school submitted: DIBELS, and Diagnostic Online Reading	Approve: Improvement	<p>Review of SPF Performance Data</p> <p>Looking at the school's overall performance ratings from the past several years, the data show that the percent of points and ratings have fluctuated around the improvement cut-score.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> <th>3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>47.2% - Improvement*</td> <td>42.6% - Priority Improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>38.6% - Priority Improvement</td> <td>42.2% - Priority Improvement*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>46.9% - Priority Improvement*</td> <td>42.8% - Priority Improvement</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Indicates official performance framework rating</p> <p>Comparing results on the 1-year SPFs for the most recent three years, the following trends can be seen:</p>		1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	2009-10	47.2% - Improvement*	42.6% - Priority Improvement	2010-11	38.6% - Priority Improvement	42.2% - Priority Improvement*	2011-12	46.9% - Priority Improvement*	42.8% - Priority Improvement
	1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating																
2009-10	47.2% - Improvement*	42.6% - Priority Improvement																
2010-11	38.6% - Priority Improvement	42.2% - Priority Improvement*																
2011-12	46.9% - Priority Improvement*	42.8% - Priority Improvement																

				Assessment (DORA).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Achievement: Over the last 3 years, Highland Elementary School has consistently earned an <i>Approaching</i> rating for Academic Achievement at 50% of points earned. Drilling down further in the data, the school's percentile rankings ranged from the 23rd to 47th percentiles in 2010, dropped to the 24th to 35th percentiles in 2011, and dropped again to the 17th to 28th percentiles in 2012. This shows a decline in TCAP/CSAP test scores over the 3 years for two of the four subjects, and a significant decline in 2012 in all subjects. Academic Growth: Growth data over time at Highland Elementary School shows volatility with low marks overall. Growth data in 2010 received an <i>Approaching</i> rating with 50% of points earned. However, in 2011, Growth data dropped to <i>Does Not Meet</i> with only 33.3% of points earned out of points possible. In 2012, Growth improved to 50% of points earned, with an <i>Approaching</i> rating. Looking further into the growth data, the MGPs ranged from 40 to 44 in 2010, declined to between 30 and 42 in 2011, and improved to between 40 and 49 in 2012. Adequate growth was met only in reading in 2012 and 2010. Academic Growth Gaps: Over the past 3 years, Highland Elementary School has consistently earned an <i>Approaching</i> rating on the Growth Gap indicator. In 2010, Highland Elementary School earned 38.9% of points possible earning an <i>Approaching</i> rating. In 2011, this dropped slightly to 37.5% points earned and stayed consistent in 2012 earning 37.5% of points again, both receiving <i>Approaching</i> ratings. Looking at the subject areas of growth gaps, there has been significant fluctuation over the past 3 years. Reading and Mathematics growth have been fairly unstable over the past 3 years and Reading experienced a decline in 2012, earning a <i>Does Not Meet</i> rating. In Mathematics, the school experienced an increase from <i>Does Not Meet</i> in 2011 to <i>Approaching</i> in 2012. Writing has stayed consistent over the past 3 years earning
--	--	--	--	--------------------	--	---

Approaching ratings each year. Students needing to catch up have received the most *Does Not Meet* ratings over the past 3 years.

Additional Performance Data

As a K-5 school, Highland Elementary receives TCAP/CSAP growth data for just grades 4 and 5, representing only 38% of the student population. In presenting its request to reconsider to CDE, Highland Elementary School provided additional data from the DIBELS Next and Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment (DORA) Assessments, which are outlined as follows:

DIBELS 2011-12

Kinder- garten	40% at or above benchmark	increasing to	91% at or above benchmark
	31% well below benchmark	decreasing to	0% well below benchmark
1st Grade	62% at or above benchmark	staying the same at	62% at or above benchmark
	24% well below benchmark	increasing to	27% well below benchmark
2nd Grade	37% at or above benchmark	decreasing to	32% at or above benchmark
	44% well below benchmark	decreasing to	25% well below benchmark

After viewing these data, CDE has found kindergarten students attained significant growth from the beginning of the year to the end. First grade percentiles remained stagnant while second grade made significant progress moving students out of intensive support into the strategic category but the overall percentage of students meeting the benchmark dropped. In summary, two of three grade levels demonstrated significant growth on the DIBELS Next assessment, however, the percentage of

students meeting benchmarks only improved with kindergarten.

DORA:

The assessment uses grade level equivalency with one year of growth represented at 1.0.

2009/2010 School Year

Grade	N	8/2009	5/2010	Growth
<i>First</i>	72	.19	1.51	1.32
<i>Second</i>	67	1.37	2.22	.85
<i>Third</i>	70	2.30	3.70	1.40
<i>Fourth</i>	50	3.75	5.14	1.39
<i>Fifth</i>	66	5.88	7.35	1.47

2010/2011 School Year

Grade	N	8/2010	5/2011	Growth
<i>First</i>	64	.42	1.83	1.41
<i>Second</i>	75	1.26	2.53	1.27
<i>Third</i>	64	2.45	5.05	2.60
<i>Fourth</i>	74	3.31	5.77	2.46
<i>Fifth</i>	51	5.23	7.07	1.84

2011/2012 School Year

Grade	N	8/2009	5/2010	Growth
<i>First</i>	58	.04	.65	.61
<i>Second</i>	62	.43	1.67	1.24
<i>Third</i>	63	1.49	2.61	1.12
<i>Fourth</i>	76	2.16	3.76	1.60
<i>Fifth</i>	71	4.59	5.62	1.03

CDE has analyzed the data submitted from the DORA assessments for grades 1 through 3. Grades 4 and 5 are already represented by TCAP/CSAP data and so cannot be included. These data reveal that seven of the nine grade and year combinations demonstrated more than one year of reading

					<p>growth with the grade level average being 1.31 years (a growth value of 1.0 represents growth equivalent to one grade level). These data show consistently strong growth patterns over all three years of DORA growth results.</p> <p>In summary, CDE reviewed the additional data submitted by Highland Elementary School focusing on data in grades K through 3 on the DIBELS and DORA assessments. These data points showed upward trends in performance and growth for Reading proficiency at the school level. Performance in Academic Growth Gaps for Reading was very low in 2012 with all subgroups scoring a <i>Does Not Meet</i> rating. These additional data points show the school is improving in reading in the early grades and provide a broader picture of performance in the school. Given how close the school's rating was to the Improvement cut-score, the additional data presented provides adequate justification to move the school's rating from Priority Improvement to Improvement.</p>
CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	HIGH POINT ACADEMY	Performance	Performance Plan*	The Charter School Institute submitted information to CDE explaining that the Institute had committed a coding error resulting in the erroneous	<p>Deny: Improvement</p> <p>After CDE released initial plan designations, CSI submitted more information to CDE explaining the organization had committed a coding error resulting in the erroneous invalidation of several TCAP scores. This included students initially included in calculations who should have been removed, as well as students not included in calculations who should have been. The Institute worked with CDE, the testing vendor, CTB, and the Center for Assessment, to obtain accurate figures for all schools. The re-run data resulted in an Improvement Plan for High Point Academy.</p> <p>High Point Academy then requested a reconsideration to return the school to a Performance Plan, due to 1) demographic changes 2) improvement strategies and 3) NWEA MAP data.</p> <p>Review of SPF Performance Data</p>

			<p>invalidation of several TCAP scores in its schools. This school would have received an Improvement rating. The school requested to retain the Performance rating citing change in demographics, District of Residence, attrition and retention, and supplemental NWEA MAP data.</p>		<p>The 2010 and 2011 data discussed below are from the official reports produced by the state but the 2012 results come from the recalculated SPF report provided by the Charter School Institute. Looking at the school's overall performance ratings from the past several years, the data show that the school has fallen on both sides of the Performance cut-score. This year with the revised calculations, their percent of point earned would fall just below the Performance threshold.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1121 423 1988 708"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> <th>3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>52.4% - Improvement</td> <td>60.2% - Performance*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>70.1% - Performance*</td> <td>61.3% - Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>56.0% - Improvement</td> <td>58.8% - Improvement*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Indicates official performance framework rating</p> <p>Comparing results on the 1-year SPFs for the most recent three years, the following trends can be seen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Achievement. Achievement for High Point Academy has been consistently below state expectation scoring mostly <i>Approaching</i> ratings across all grade levels and content areas. In 2010, percentile ranks at the elementary level ranged from the 16th to 43rd percentiles. For middle school the range was 13th to 29th percentiles. In 2011, elementary percentiles had increased slightly to between 32 and 44, while middle school results dropped slightly to between the 20th and 34th percentiles. According to the recalculated results from 2012, elementary percentiles were between the 29th and 57th percentiles while middle school results were between the 13th and 20th percentiles. Academic Growth. Growth ratings vary widely for this school across years and content areas. In 2010, elementary MGPs were between 38 and 55 while middle school MGPs were between 30 		1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	2009-10	52.4% - Improvement	60.2% - Performance*	2010-11	70.1% - Performance*	61.3% - Performance	2011-12	56.0% - Improvement	58.8% - Improvement*
	1-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating	3-year SPF Percent of Points & Rating															
2009-10	52.4% - Improvement	60.2% - Performance*															
2010-11	70.1% - Performance*	61.3% - Performance															
2011-12	56.0% - Improvement	58.8% - Improvement*															

					<p>and 54. In 2011, MGPs had increased with elementary results between 41 and 63 and middle school between 60 and 65. The recalculated data in 2012 show elementary MGPs between 43 and 57 and middle school MGPs between 34 and 53. High Point met its adequate growth targets in reading for all grade levels but was inconsistent in meeting math and writing targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Growth Gaps. Growth gap ratings for this school improved from an <i>Approaching</i> rating in 2010 to a <i>Meets</i> rating in 2011 and dropped back to <i>Approaching</i> rating in 2012. In 2010, growth gap data were available for three of the five student groups and varied widely by content area and grade level. 2011 and 2012 data included four of the five student groups and showed widely varying results. <p>Demographic Changes The school presented attrition and retention data as an explanation for their declining performance. While this information may explain some of the results the school is seeing, it cannot be considered in assigning a plan type. Requests to reconsider are evaluated based on student performance data, and not the demographic composition of the student population.</p> <p>We hope the school understands that even with a high influx of new students, High Point Academy has the ability to produce growth data with the new students. It may help the school to look more closely at the new students enrolling and the specific academic needs they may have, which may differ compared to students previously enrolled in the school.</p> <p>Improvement Strategies CDE appreciates the work that High Point Academy has done with their UIP to determine areas of focus. Although a specific focus on math standards, growth gaps, and ELL students did result in an improvement in scores for most grades in those areas, the school received an Improvement Plan rating for 2012. These improvement strategies cannot out-weigh the student</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>performance data.</p> <p>Additional Performance Data</p> <p>Although High Point Academy has provided additional NWEA Maps data, the information is not compelling enough to increase the school's performance rating. CDE does not supplant TCAP/CSAP data with NWEA Maps data in the tested grade ranges (3-8), as they are testing the same subject areas. CDE will consider the K-3 NWEA data, which shows decent growth for students, with 65.9-81.2% of students meeting growth projections in reading, 66.7-78.2% of students meeting growth projections in math, and 69.1-84.4% meeting growth projections in Language usage. Results for grades 4-8 tended to have a wider distribution with lower scores in grades 6-8. The percent of students meeting growth projections in reading was between 54.2-68.8%, 50.7-76.6% for math, and 50.7-84.3% in language usage. This NWEA data shows a pattern consistent with the TCAP results previously discussed, student growth varies widely by grade and content area with middle school results generally lower than elementary results.</p> <p>The additional data presented to CDE corroborates the information already presented in the School Performance Framework. The demographic factors cannot be used in the review of performance. Improvement plan implementation is important for moving forward, but it is ultimately the students' performance outcomes that are weighed the most. When looking at the supplemental K-3 NWEA data, the information does not provide enough evidence to counter the SPF rating of Improvement. Thus, CDE is unable to approve this request to reconsider.</p>
CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	COLORADO PROVOST ACADEMY	Turnaround	Priority Improvement Plan*	The Charter School Institute submitted	Approve: Priority Improvement	In the preliminary report for Provost Academy, the school did not meet the 95% participation rate and was given a performance plan of Turnaround, instead of the rating of Priority Improvement, based on the percent of

			<p>information to CDE explaining that the Institute had committed a coding error resulting in the erroneous invalidation of several TCAP scores in its schools. This school would not have met participation requirements.</p>	<p>points earned. In accordance with CDE's Performance Framework guidelines, if a school does not meet the 95% participation testing benchmark, the school will automatically receive a performance plan one level below what it would have otherwise.</p> <p>After the initial plan designation, CSI submitted information to CDE explaining the organization had committed a coding error resulting in the erroneous invalidation of several TCAP scores in its schools. This included students initially included in calculations who should have been removed, as well as students not included in calculations who should have been. The Institute worked with the Department, the testing vendor, CTB, and the Center for Assessment, to obtain accurate figures for all schools. The results of the re-run SPF show that the school did make the 95% participation rate and remained at the Priority Improvement Plan level.</p> <p>CDE has reviewed confirmed the validity of the re-run data and will consider the school to have made participation. Thus by making participation, Provost Academy will receive a Priority Improvement Plan.</p>
--	--	--	--	--