

# District Accountability Handbook

Version 4.0

August 2013



COLORADO DEPARTMENT *of* EDUCATION

**The purpose of this handbook is to provide an outline of the requirements and responsibilities for state, district and school stakeholders in the state’s accountability process established by the Education Accountability Act of 2009 (S.B. 09-163), as well as federal requirements and responsibilities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.**

**Contents**

- Overview of Accountability System ..... 4
- Stakeholder Roles ..... 4
- District Accreditation Contracts..... 6
  - Contract Contents..... 6
  - Compliance with Contract Terms..... 6
  - Accreditation Contract Template..... 7
- District Accreditation Reviews ..... 7
  - District Performance Framework..... 7
  - Annual Accreditation Process ..... 8
- NCLB District Accountability Measures..... 10
  - Title IA Accountability ..... 10
  - Title IIA Accountability ..... 10
  - Title IIIA Accountability: Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives ..... 10
  - Title IIIA Accountability: Identification for Improvement ..... 11
- District Accountability Committees ..... 11
  - Composition of Committees ..... 11
  - Committee Responsibilities ..... 12
- Developing and Submitting District Plans..... 14
  - State Requirements for District Plans..... 14
  - Timelines for Submitting a District Plan..... 15
- Review of District Plans..... 15
  - Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans ..... 16
  - Performance and Improvement Plans ..... 17
- Accrediting Schools and Assigning School Plan Types ..... 17
  - Accreditation of Public Schools..... 17
  - School Performance Framework ..... 18
- NCLB School Accountability Measures ..... 19

Title IA Accountability .....	19
School Accountability Committees .....	20
Composition of Committees .....	20
Committee Responsibilities .....	21
School Accountability Committees for Charter Schools .....	22
Developing and Submitting School Plans.....	22
School Plan Requirements .....	22
Requirements for Involving Parents in Development of Plan.....	24
Timelines for Submitting a School Plan .....	24
Review of School Plans .....	24
Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans .....	25
Performance and Improvement Plans .....	25
Performance Reporting.....	26
SchoolView.....	26
Performance Reports .....	26
District Performance Reports .....	27
School Performance Reports .....	27
Appendix A: Colorado Educational Accountability System Terminology .....	29
Appendix B: Model District Accreditation Contract.....	45
Appendix C: District Accreditation Contract for District Accredited with Priority Improvement or Turnaround .....	48
Appendix D: Components of the District and School Performance Framework .....	52
Appendix E: Sample District Performance Framework Report.....	53
Appendix F: Timelines for District Accreditation and Plan Submission .....	60
Appendix G: Process for Reviewing .....	61
Appendix H: Sample School Performance Framework Reports .....	62
Appendix I: Timelines for School Accreditation and Plan Submission.....	71
Appendix J: Understanding the Role of School Accountability Committees in Charter Schools.....	72
Appendix K: Sample Notification Letter to Parents .....	73
Appendix L: Process for Reviewing <i>School</i> Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans .....	74

## Overview of Accountability System

The Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids Act of 2008 (CAP4K) aligns the public education system from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness. The intent of this alignment is to ensure that all students graduate high school ready for postsecondary and workforce success. The Education Accountability Act of 2009 aligns the state's education accountability system to focus on the goals of CAP4K: hold the state, districts and schools accountable on a set of consistent, objective measures and report performance in a manner that is highly transparent and builds public understanding.

Additionally, for districts in Colorado that accept federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funds through No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in the Title IA (Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged), Title IIA (Preparing, Training and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals) and Title IIIA (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students) programs, there are additional accountability measures and requirements associated with the purposes of those programs. The ESEA Flexibility waiver, granted to CDE by the U.S. Department of Education in February 2012, brought greater alignment to the state and federal accountability systems. Information concerning the implications of the waiver is included in this handbook.

## Stakeholder Roles

Colorado's system of accountability and support requires the coordinated efforts of several key stakeholder groups:

- The **Colorado Department of Education** (Department) is responsible for providing high-quality information to a variety of stakeholders about school and district performance. The Department evaluates the performance of all public schools, all districts and the state using a set of common Performance Indicators. The Department also accredits districts and supports and assists them in evaluating their own and their schools' performance results so that information can be used to inform improvement planning.
- The **Colorado State Board of Education** (State Board) is responsible for entering into accreditation contracts with local school boards and directing local school boards regarding the types of plans the district's schools implement.
- **Local school boards** are responsible for accrediting their schools and for overseeing that the academic programs offered by their schools meet or exceed state and local performance expectations for levels of attainment on the state's four key Performance Indicators (achievement, growth, closing gaps, and postsecondary/workforce readiness). Local school boards also are responsible for creating, adopting and implementing a Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan, whichever is required by the Department, and ensuring that their schools create, adopt and implement the type of plan required by the State Board.

- **District leaders** are responsible for overseeing that the academic programs offered by district schools meet or exceed state and local performance expectations for levels of attainment on the state's four key Performance Indicators. They play a key role in the creation, adoption, and implementation of their district's Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, whichever is required by the State Board, as well as in reviewing their schools' Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement or Turnaround plans. They also have a key role in recommending to the local school board the accreditation category of each district school.
- **District Accountability Committees** are responsible for (1) making recommendations to their local school boards concerning priorities for spending district and federal funds, (2) making recommendations concerning the preparation of the district's Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan (whichever is applicable), (3) providing input and recommendations to principals, on an advisory basis, concerning the development and use of assessment tools to measure and evaluate student academic growth as it relates to teacher evaluations, and (4) cooperatively determining other areas and issues to address and make recommendations upon. SB 13-193 also authorized District Accountability Committees to publicize opportunities to serve on District and School Accountability Committees and solicit parents to do so, assist the district in implementing its parent engagement policy, and assist school personnel in increasing parents' engagement with educators. A more comprehensive description of the composition of DAC and its responsibilities is available [here](#).
- **School leaders** are responsible for overseeing that the academic programs offered by their school meet or exceed state and local performance expectations for levels of attainment on the state's four key Performance Indicators. They also play a key role in the creation, adoption, and implementation of a school's Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, whichever is required by the State Board.
- **School Accountability Committees** are responsible for (1) making recommendations to their principal concerning priorities for spending school funds, (2) making recommendations concerning the preparation of the school's Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan (whichever is applicable), (3) providing input and recommendations to District Accountability Committees and district administration concerning principal development plans and principal evaluations, and (4) meeting at least quarterly to discuss implementation of the school's plan and other progress pertinent to the school's accreditation contract with the local school board. SB 13-193 also authorized School Accountability Committees to publicize opportunities to serve on the School Accountability Committee and solicit parents to do so, assist in implementing the district's parent engagement policy at the school, and assist school personnel to increase parents' engagement with teachers.

## District Accreditation Contracts

### Contract Contents

The Department is responsible for annually accrediting all of the school districts in the state. Accreditation contracts have a term of one year and are automatically renewed each July so long as the district remains in the accreditation category of “Accredited with Distinction,” “Accredited,” or “Accredited with Improvement Plan.” A district that is “Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan” or “Accredited with Turnaround Plan” will have its contract reviewed and agreed upon annually. The parties to the contract may renegotiate the contract at any time during the term of the contract, based upon appropriate and reasonable changes in circumstances.

Each contract, at a minimum, must address the following elements:

- The district’s level of attainment on the four key Performance Indicators— Student Achievement on Statewide Assessments , Student Longitudinal Academic Growth, Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness, and Progress Made on Closing the Achievement and Growth Gaps;
- The district’s adoption and implementation of its Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan (whichever appropriate based on the district’s accreditation category);
- The district’s implementation of its system for accrediting its schools, which must emphasize school attainment on the four key Performance Indicators and may, in the local school board’s discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures adopted by the district; and
- The district’s substantial, good-faith compliance with the provisions of Title 22 and other statutory and regulatory requirements applicable to districts and all Department policies and procedures applicable to the district, including the following:
  - the provisions of article 44 of title 22 concerning budget and financial policies and procedures;
  - the provisions of article 45 of title 22 concerning accounting and financial reporting; and
  - the statewide assessment administration and security policies adopted by the Department pursuant to section 22-7-409(4), C.R.S.

### Compliance with Contract Terms

To monitor substantial good-faith compliance with the provisions of Title 22 and other statutory and regulatory requirements applicable to districts, each contract will include the following assurances: (1) an assurance that the district is in compliance with the budgeting, accounting, and reporting requirements set forth in Articles 44 and 45 of Title 22, (2) an assurance that the district is in compliance with the provisions of section 22-32-109.1, C.R.S., concerning school safety, and the Gun Free School Act, 20 U.S.C. 7151, and (3) an assurance that the district is in substantial good-faith compliance with all

other statutory and regulatory requirements that apply to the district. For purposes of monitoring a district's compliance with its accreditation contract, the Department may require information or conduct site visits as needed.

If the Department has reason to believe that a district is not in substantial compliance with one or more of the statutory or regulatory requirements applicable to districts, it will notify the local school board and the board will have 90 days after the date of the notice to come into compliance. If, at the end of the 90 day period, the Department finds that the district is not substantially in compliance with the application requirements, meaning that the district has not yet taken the necessary measures to ensure that it will meet all legal requirements as soon as practicable, the district may be subject to loss of accreditation and to the interventions specified in section 22-11-209, C.R.S.

A district's failure to comply with the Department's statewide assessment administration and security policies and procedures will be considered by the Department in assigning the District to an accreditation category, and may result in the district being assigned to an accreditation category at least one level lower than what otherwise would have been assigned.

## Accreditation Contract Template

*For the Model District Accreditation Contract, please see Appendix B.*

## District Accreditation Reviews

### District Performance Framework

The Department will review each district's performance annually, no later than August 15<sup>th</sup> of each school year. In reviewing the district's performance, the Department will consider the district's results on the District Performance Framework. The District Performance Framework measures a district's attainment on the four key Performance Indicators identified in Education Accountability Act of 2009 (article 11 of title 22):

- **Academic Achievement:** The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects how a district's students are doing at meeting the state's proficiency goal: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This Indicator includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and Lectura and Escritura.
- **Academic Growth:** The Academic Growth Indicator reflects academic progress using the Colorado Growth Model. This Indicator reflects 1) normative (median) growth: how the academic progress of the students in the district compared to that of other students statewide with a similar content proficiency (CSAP/TCAP) score history or a similar English language proficiency (CELApro/ACCESS) score history, and 2) adequate growth: whether this level of growth was sufficient for the typical (median) student in the district to reach or maintain a specified level of proficiency within a given length of time. For CSAP/TCAP, students are expected to score proficient or advanced within three years or by 10<sup>th</sup> grade, whichever comes

first. For 2013, adequate growth cannot be determined for English language proficiency as a result of the assessment transition, and thus only the median growth percentile for English language proficiency growth is included in the 2013 performance frameworks.

- **Academic Growth Gaps:** The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator reflects the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups and students needing to catch up. It disaggregates the Growth Indicator by student groups, and reflects their normative and adequate growth. The disaggregated groups include students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities (IEP status), English learners, and students needing to catch up.
- **Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness:** The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator reflects the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates for historically disadvantaged students (students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, and English learners), dropout rates and average Colorado ACT composite scores.

Based on State identified measures and metrics, districts receive a rating on each of these Performance Indicators that evaluates if they exceeded, met, approached or did not meet the state's expectations. These Performance Indicators are then combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of a district's performance. *Please see Appendix C for a visual of the components of the District Performance Framework (DPF).* For more information about the DPF, please see:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/PerformanceFrameworks.asp>.

## Annual Accreditation Process

**Step One:** On August 15<sup>th</sup><sup>1</sup> of each school year, based on an objective analysis of each district's attainment on the four key Performance Indicators, the Department will determine whether each district exceeds, meets, approaches, or does not meet state expectations for attainment on the Performance Indicators. At that time, the Department will also consider each district's compliance with the requirements specified in that district's accreditation contract. Taking into account information concerning attainment on the Performance Indicators and compliance with the accreditation contract, the Department will make an initial assignment for each district to one of the following accreditation categories:

- **Accredited with Distinction-** the district meets or exceeds state expectations for attainment on the Performance Indicators and is required to adopt and implement a Performance plan;
- **Accredited-** meaning the district meets state expectations for attainment on the Performance Indicators and is required to adopt and implement a Performance plan;

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to the timing of receipt of state assessment results, CDE will have the preliminary School and District Performance Framework reports to districts by August 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013.



- **Accredited with Improvement Plan-** the district has not met state expectations for attainment on the Performance Indicators and is required to adopt and implement an Improvement plan;
- **Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan-** the district has not met state expectations for attainment on the Performance Indicators and is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement plan; and
- **Accredited with Turnaround Plan-** the district has not met state expectations for attainment on the Performance Indicators and is required to adopt, with the commissioner’s approval, and implement a Turnaround plan.

On August 15<sup>th</sup> of each school year, the Department will provide to each district a District Performance Framework Report with the data used by the Department to conduct its analysis of the District’s performance and the Department’s initial accreditation assignment. *Please see Appendix D for a sample District Performance Framework Report, with an initial accreditation assignment.*

**Step Two:** Districts are highly encouraged to notify CDE (Lisa Steffen at [steffen\\_l@cde.state.co.us](mailto:steffen_l@cde.state.co.us)) of their intent to submit a request to reconsider by September 16<sup>th</sup>, in order for CDE staff to provide adequate technical assistance. CDE is unable to provide any follow-up or clarification to requests received on or after October 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Step Three:** No later than October 15<sup>th</sup>, if a district disagrees with the Department’s initial assignment of an accreditation category for the district, the district may submit additional information for the Department’s consideration. The Department will only consider requests that would result in a different district accreditation category than the one initially assigned by the Department. Districts should not submit a request unless they believe that they can make a compelling case to change a district’s accreditation category based on information that the Department does not already have or has not considered. The Department will consider the full body of evidence presented in the request and in the district’s performance framework report, and review it on a case-by-case basis. For more information about how to submit additional information for consideration, please see the guidance document titled “Submitting School Accreditation and Requests to Reconsider” posted online at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/RequestToReconsider.asp>.

SB 13-217 authorized the state board to consider the unique circumstances of Alternative Education Campuses (schools) in the annual accreditation process for districts. In the fall of 2013, the Department will begin piloting methods for considering AECs in the district accreditation process.

**Step Four:** No later than November 15<sup>th</sup> of each school year, the Department shall determine a final accreditation category for each district and shall notify the district of the accreditation category to which it has been assigned.

A district may not remain in the accreditation categories of Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan and/or Accredited with Turnaround Plan for longer than a total of five consecutive school years before having its accreditation removed. The calculation of the total of five consecutive school years will

commence July 1, during the summer immediately following the fall in which the district is notified that it has been placed in the category of Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan or Accredited with Turnaround Plan. For districts that were placed by the Department in the “Accredited: Accreditation Notice with Support” or “Accredited: Probation” category during the 2009-10 academic school year, the 2009-10 status will count towards the five consecutive school years.

## NCLB District Accountability Measures

### Title IA Accountability

The NCLB Flexibility waiver replaced the previous district Title IA Accountability measure, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), with Colorado’s District Performance Frameworks. Districts now receive one set of accountability data for both Title IA and state accountability. A district that accepts Title IA funds and is accredited with a Turnaround or Priority Improvement Plan must set aside 10% of its Title I funds in support of professional development tied directly to the areas where the district has not met expectations. Identified districts must complete the ESEA addendum in the UIP to outline how the district proposes to spend this set aside. The addendum will be reviewed by CDE during the January UIP submission window.

### Title IIA Accountability

With the approval of the Colorado’s NCLB waiver, the state has aligned the identification process for Title IIA accountability (ESEA § 2141c) with the state accountability system. Colorado no longer uses Highly Qualified and AYP data to identify districts. Instead, for the purpose of Title IIA accountability, districts that receive Title IIA funds and have a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type will be identified.

Identified districts will be required to outline how their Title IIA allocation will be leveraged in the following school year to address priority performance challenges and root causes identified in the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). Identified districts must complete the ESEA addendum in the UIP to outline how the district proposes to spend its Title IIA allocation. The addendum will be reviewed by CDE during the January UIP submission window.

### Title IIIA Accountability: Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

NCLB requires states to make a determination regarding Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for every Title III grantee. AMAOs are performance objectives or targets that Title III grantees must meet each year. There are three AMAOs, which are based on the ACCESS English language proficiency assessment, TCAP and graduation rate data. All three AMAO targets must be met in order for the grantee to be considered to have met AMAO targets.

- **AMAO 1** – The grantee’s progress in moving English learners towards English proficiency, as measured by the district’s performance on the Academic Growth English language proficiency growth sub-indicator on the District Performance Framework report. The expectation is that the

grantee receives a rating of “Meets” or “Exceeds.” For 2013, with the transition to the ACCESS assessment, the sub-indicator will include only the median growth percentile (MGP) as adequate growth percentiles (AGP) cannot yet be calculated.

- **AMAO 2** – the percent of students attaining English proficiency by scoring a level 5 overall and a level 5 for literacy on the ACCESS assessment. The proposed 2013 target is 11%, and is pending U.S. Department of Education approval.
- **AMAO 3** – The district’s progress in moving English learners towards state content expectations, as measured by the district’s performance on the District Performance Framework report in: 1) Academic Growth Gaps sub-indicator ratings in reading, mathematics, and writing for English learners, 2) Disaggregated graduation rate sub-indicator for English learners, and 3) participation rates for English learners. The expectation is that the district receives a rating of “Meets” or “Exceeds” on these sub-indicators for English learners and meets or exceeds the 95% participation rate requirement for at least two of the three content areas.

### **Title IIIA Accountability: Identification for Improvement**

A district/consortium that accepts Title III funds is identified for Title III Improvement if it does not make AMAOs for two consecutive years. A Title III grantee that fails to meet state defined AMAO targets for two consecutive years must develop an improvement plan (the Unified Improvement Plan) that specifically addresses the factors that prevented it from achieving these AMAOs. Identified districts must complete the Title III addendum as part of its UIP submission.

If a grantee fails to meet AMAO targets for four consecutive years, Title III law requires the State to take additional action. Specifically, Title III law (Section 3122(b)(4)) requires that the SEA provide additional review of the grantee’s language instruction education program and provide technical assistance on any reform that should take place regarding the education of ELLs.

More information about AMAOs can be found here: [www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp](http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp). Once final, district AMAO data can be found in the Data Center under the “Accountability” tab and the “Federal” sub-tab, when you select, “NCLB-AMAOs”.

## **District Accountability Committees**

### **Composition of Committees**

Each local school board is responsible for either appointing or creating a process for electing the members of a district accountability committee (DAC). These committees must consist of the following:

- At least three parents of students enrolled in the district<sup>2</sup>;

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: Generally, a parent who is an employee of the district or who is a spouse, son, daughter, sister, brother, mother or father of a person who is an employee of the district is not eligible to serve on a DAC. However, such an

- At least one teacher employed by the district;
- At least one school administrator employed by the district; and
- At least one person involved in business in the community within the district boundaries.

A person may not be appointed or elected to fill more than one of these required member positions in a single term. If the local school board chooses to increase the number of persons on the DAC, it must ensure that the number of parents appointed or elected exceeds the number of representatives from the group with the next highest representation.

To the extent practicable, the local school board must ensure that the parents who are appointed reflect the student populations that are significantly represented within the district. Such student populations might include, for example, students who are members of non-Caucasian races, students who are eligible for free or reduced-cost lunch, students whose dominant language is not English, students who are migrant children, students who are identified as children with disabilities and students who are identified as gifted children.

If a local school board *appoints* the members of a DAC, the board should, to the extent practicable, ensure that at least one of the parents appointed to the committee is the parent of a student enrolled in a charter school authorized by the board (if the board has authorized any charter schools) and ensure that at least one of the persons appointed to the committee has demonstrated knowledge of charter schools.

DACs must select one of their parent representatives to serve as chair or co-chair of the committee. Local school boards will establish the length of the term for the committee chair or co-chairs.

If a vacancy arises on a DAC because of a member's resignation or for any other reason, the remaining members of the DAC will fill the vacancy by majority action.

## Committee Responsibilities

Each DAC is responsible for the following:

- Recommending to its local school board priorities for spending school district moneys;
- Submitting recommendations to the local school board concerning preparation of the district's Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan (whichever is applicable);
- Reviewing any charter school applications received by the local school board and, if the local school board receives a charter school renewal application and upon request of the district and at the DAC's option, reviewing any renewal application prior to consideration by the local school board;

---

individual may serve as a parent on the DAC if the district makes a good faith effort but is unable to identify a sufficient number of eligible parents who are willing to serve on the DAC.

- At least annually, cooperatively determining, with the local school board, the areas and issues, in addition to budget issues, that the DAC shall study and make recommendations upon;
- At its option, meeting at least quarterly to discuss whether district leadership, personnel, and infrastructure are advancing or impeding implementation of the district's performance, improvement, priority improvement, or turnaround plan, whichever is applicable and
- Providing input and recommendations to principals, on an advisory basis, concerning the development and use of assessment tools to measure and evaluate student academic growth as it relates to teacher evaluations.
- For districts receiving ESEA funds, consulting with all required stakeholders with regard to federally funded activities; and
- Publicizing opportunities to serve and soliciting parents to serve on the DAC;
- Assisting the district in implementing the district's parent engagement policy; and
- Assisting school personnel to increase parents' engagement with educators, including parents' engagement in creating students' READ plans, Individual Career and Academic Plans, and plans to address habitual truancy.

Whenever the DAC recommends spending priorities, it must make reasonable efforts to consult in a substantive manner with the School Accountability Committees (SACs) in the district. Likewise, in preparing recommendations for and advising on the district plan, the DAC must make reasonable efforts to consult in a substantive manner with the SACs in the district and must submit to the local school board the *school* performance, improvement, priority improvement and turnaround plans submitted by the SACs.

The Educator Evaluation and Support Act (S.B. 10-191) added the authority for DACs to make recommendations concerning the assessment tools used in the district to measure and evaluate academic growth, as they relate to teacher evaluations. This should not in any way interfere with a district's compliance with the statutory requirements of the Teacher Employment, Compensation and Dismissal Act.

## Developing and Submitting District Plans

### State Requirements for District Plans

All districts must submit a plan that addresses how the district will improve its performance.<sup>3</sup> All districts and schools, regardless of their accreditation category, must use the Department's District Unified Improvement Plan template.

For purposes of accreditation, all district plans must include the following elements:

- **Targets:** Ambitious but attainable targets that the district will set on the four key statewide Performance Indicators (achievement, growth, growth gaps and postsecondary and workforce readiness). The local school board must ensure that the targets are aligned with the statewide targets set by the State Board.
- **Trends:** Positive and negative trends in the levels of attainment by the district on the Performance Indicators.
- **Priority Performance Challenges:** A prioritized list of challenges in each performance indicator area where the school did not meet state performance expectations.
- **Root Causes:** Root causes for each identified priority performance challenge for the district that must be addressed to raise the levels of attainment on the Performance Indicators and, if the district's schools serve students in preschool and kindergarten, to improve school readiness.
- **Strategies:** Specific, research-based major improvement strategies that are appropriate in scope, intensity and type to address the district's root causes of any low-performance. Depending on the type of plan required, the strategies appropriate for each district will vary.
- **Resources:** Identification of local, state and federal resources that the district will use to implement the identified major improvement strategies with fidelity.
- **Interim Measures and Implementation Benchmarks:** Interim measures that will be used to assess whether the identified strategies are having the desired performance results and implementation benchmarks that will be used to assess whether or not the strategies are being carried out with fidelity.

---

<sup>3</sup> A district with 1,000 students or fewer has the option of submitting a single plan for the district and school(s), so long as the plan meets all state and federal requirements for district and school plans. A district with more than 1,000 students but fewer than 1,200 students may, upon request and at the Department's discretion, submit a single plan for the district and school(s), so long as the plan meets all state and federal requirements for district and school plans.

### Appropriate Strategies:

- Performance Plans, Improvement Plans, and Priority Improvement Plans: Strategies should be appropriate in scope, intensity and type.
- Turnaround Plans: Strategies identified in Turnaround Plans must, at a minimum, include one or more of the following:
  - Employing a lead turnaround partner that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with districts under similar circumstances, which turnaround partner will be immersed in all aspects of developing and collaboratively executing the plan and will serve as a liaison to other district partners;
  - Reorganizing the oversight and management structure within the district to provide greater, more effective support for district schools;
  - Recognizing individual district schools as innovation schools or clustering district schools with similar governance or management structures into one or more innovation school zones and seeking designation as a District of Innovation pursuant to Article 32.5 of Title 22;
  - Hiring an entity that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with districts under similar circumstances to operate one more district schools pursuant to a contract with the local school board or the Charter School Institute;
  - Converting one or more district schools to a charter school(s);
  - Renegotiating and significantly restructuring a charter school's charter contract; and/or
  - Other actions of comparable or greater significance or effect.

*For additional information on the unique requirements for districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type, refer to the [Priority Improvement and Turnaround Accountability Handbook supplement](#). For additional information about how to develop plans that will meet state and federal requirements, visit the UIP website: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/index.asp>.*

### **Timelines for Submitting a District Plan**

*For a visual describing the timelines for district accreditation and submission of district plan, see Appendix E.*

### **Review of District Plans**

Upon notification of the district's accreditation category, the District Accountability Committee should advise the local school board concerning the preparation and contents of the type of plan required by

the district's accreditation category (i.e., a Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan, whichever is applicable). As improvement planning is on a continuous cycle, districts should be reviewing and adjusting the existing improvement plan on an ongoing basis throughout the year. Typically, districts begin revising the UIP in late spring or summer based upon local assessment data. As state level data is made available in the fall, schools and districts make another set of broader revisions. The plan must cover at least two years (the current school year and the next school year).

### **Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans**

Local school boards that are required to submit a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan must adopt a plan no later than January 15<sup>th</sup> of the school year in which it is directed to adopt such a plan. All districts must use the District Unified Improvement Plan template to address the requirements for a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan and any other applicable federal planning requirements. The commissioner may provide additional time to the extent he finds an extension to be reasonable. The Department may provide technical assistance, evaluation and feedback to the local school board in preparing the plan.

No later than five business days after the local school board has adopted a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan, the local school board must submit the plan to the Department for review. The Department will evaluate the plan to ensure that it meets all state and federal requirements.

The commissioner *shall* assign the State Review Panel to review all Turnaround plans and *may* assign the State Review Panel to review Priority Improvement plans. In evaluating plans, the panel members will be asked to reflect on the following questions:

- Whether the district's/school's leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results;
- Whether the district's/school's infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement;
- The readiness and apparent capacity of the district/school personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate actions to improve student academic performance;
- The readiness and apparent capacity of the district/school personnel to engage productively with and benefit from the assistance provided by an external partner;
- The likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the district's/school's performance within the current management structure and staffing; and
- The necessity that the district or school remain in operation to serve students.

The State Review Panel may make recommendations for modification to the plan to the commissioner and the commissioner may recommend modification to the local school board. Those districts required to make modifications to their plans must submit their revised plans no later than March 30<sup>th</sup>.

All districts will submit final plans no later than April 15<sup>th</sup> to the Department for publication on SchoolView.



*For a visual summarizing review process for district Priority Improvement and Turnaround plans, please see Appendix F. For additional information on the unique requirements for districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type, refer to the Accountability Handbook supplement. It will be re-released in late August 2013.*

## **Performance and Improvement Plans**

Local school boards that are required to submit a Performance or Improvement plan will only need to submit their plans in January if the district is required to submit a plan to comply with federal NCLB Program Improvement requirements. The Department will review those plans to ensure they meet federal requirements. All districts, regardless of whether or not they are identified under federal programs, are required to use the Department's District Unified Improvement Plan template.

Districts required to make modifications to their plans must submit their revised plans no later than March 30<sup>th</sup>. All districts will submit final plans no later than April 15<sup>th</sup> to the Department for publication on SchoolView.

## **Accrediting Schools and Assigning School Plan Types**

### **Accreditation of Public Schools**

Districts are responsible for accrediting their schools in a manner that emphasizes attainment on the four statewide Performance Indicators and may, in the local school board's discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures adopted by the district. In addition, the Department will annually review the performance of each public school and the State Board will assign to each school the type of plan that the school will be responsible for implementing.

Each year, the following process will take place:

**Step One:** Each school year, based on an objective analysis of each school's attainment on the four key Performance Indicators, the Department will determine whether each school exceeds, meets, approaches, or does not meet state expectations on each of the four Performance Indicators. The Department will formulate an initial recommendation for each school as to whether the school should implement a Performance Plan, an Improvement Plan, a Priority Improvement Plan or a Turnaround Plan, or that the school should be subject to restructuring. At that time, the Department will provide to each district the data used by the Department to conduct its analysis of the school's performance and the Department's initial recommendation concerning the type of plan the school should implement. *Please see Appendix G for sample School Performance Framework Reports, with initial plan assignments.*

**Step Two:** Districts are highly encouraged to notify CDE (Lisa Steffen at [steffen\\_l@cde.state.co.us](mailto:steffen_l@cde.state.co.us)) of their intent to submit a request to reconsider by September 16<sup>th</sup>, in order for CDE staff to provide adequate technical assistance. CDE is unable to provide any follow-up or clarification to requests received on or after October 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Step Three:** No later than October 15<sup>th</sup>, if a district disagrees with the Department’s initial assignments of a school plan type for any of the district’s schools, the district may submit additional information for the Department’s consideration. The Department will only consider requests that would result in a school plan type different from the one initially assigned by the Department. Districts should not submit a request unless they believe that they can make a compelling case to change a school’s plan type based on information that the Department does not already have or has not considered. The Department will consider the full body of evidence presented in the request and in the school’s performance framework report, and review it on a case-by-case basis. For more information about how to submit accreditation categories and additional information for consideration, please see the guidance document titled “Submitting School Accreditation and Requests to Reconsider” posted online at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/RequestToReconsider.asp>.

**Step Four:** No later than November 15<sup>th</sup> of each school year, the Department will formulate a final recommendation as to which type of plan each school should implement. This recommendation will take into account both the results reported on the School Performance Framework report and any additional information submitted by the district. The Department will submit its final recommendation to the State Board along with any conflicting recommendation provided by the district. By December, the State Board will make a final determination regarding the type of plan each school shall implement, and each school’s plan assignment will be published on *SchoolView*.

A school will not be permitted to implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a total of five consecutive school years before the district is required to restructure or close the school. The calculation of the total of five consecutive school years will commence July 1, during the summer immediately following the fall in which the school is first notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.

## School Performance Framework

In conducting its annual review of each school’s performance, the Department will consider the school’s results on the School Performance Framework. The School Performance Framework measures a school’s attainment on the four key Performance Indicators identified in the Education Accountability Act of 2009 (article 11 of title 22):

- **Academic Achievement:** The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects how a school's students are doing at meeting the state's proficiency goal: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This Indicator includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.
- **Academic Growth:** The Academic Growth Indicator reflects academic progress using the Colorado Growth Model. This Indicator reflects 1) normative (median) growth: how the academic progress of the students in the school compared to that of other students statewide with a similar content proficiency (CSAP/TCAP) score history or a similar English language proficiency (CELAPro/ACCESS) score history, and 2) adequate growth: whether this level of

growth was sufficient for the typical (median) student in the school to reach or maintain a specified level of proficiency within a given length of time. For CSAP/TCAP, students are expected to score proficient or advanced within three years or by 10<sup>th</sup> grade, whichever comes first. For 2013, adequate growth cannot be determined for English language proficiency as a result of the assessment transition, and thus is not included in the performance frameworks.

- **Academic Growth Gaps:** The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator reflects the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student subgroups and students needing to catch up. It disaggregates the Growth Indicator into student subgroups, and reflects their normative and adequate growth. The subgroups include students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities (IEP status), English learners, and students needing to catch up.
- **Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness:** The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator reflects the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates for historically disadvantaged students (students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, and English learners), dropout rates, and average Colorado ACT composite scores.

Based on State identified measures and metrics, schools receive a rating on each of these Performance Indicators that evaluates if they exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet the state's expectations. These performance indicators are then combined to arrive at an overall evaluation of a school's performance. *Please see Appendix C for a visual of the components of the Performance Framework (SPF).* For more information about the SPF, please see:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/PerformanceFrameworks.asp>.

Note: A school's failure to comply with the Department's statewide assessment administration and security policies and procedures will be considered by the Department in determining which type of plan a school must implement, and may result in the school plan type that is at least one level lower than what would have otherwise been required.

## NCLB School Accountability Measures

### Title IA Accountability

The NCLB Flexibility Waiver replaced the previous Title IA school accountability measure, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), with Colorado's School Performance Frameworks. Schools now receive one set of accountability data for both Title IA and state accountability.

School districts with Title IA schools that are identified with Turnaround or Priority Improvement plans must use Title IA funds for the following, in support of its schools:

- Offer public school choice

- Offer supplemental education services (SES)
- Set-aside funds for professional development

Additionally, as a condition of the waiver, CDE must identify certain Title IA schools as “focus” schools and “priority” schools. Focus schools are 10 percent of Colorado’s Title I schools that are identified by:

- (1) Low graduation rate (regardless of plan type), and/or
- (2) Turnaround or Priority Improvement Plan type with either (or both) (a) low-achieving disaggregated student groups (i.e., minority, ELL, IEP and FRL) or (b) low disaggregated graduation rate.

The “focus” school list was created using 2011-12 assessment and accountability data. This is a three year designation. CDE Performance Managers assigned to districts accredited with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, will assist districts in supporting any “focus” schools within the district, with an emphasis on the Unified Improvement Plan process. CDE will also provide assistance to districts accredited with an Improvement or Performance plan to support any “focus” schools in the district.

“Priority” schools are defined as schools implementing Title I Tiered Intervention Grants (TIG). The TIG is a competitive grant (funded from Title I, 1003g of ESEA) for schools identified as 5 percent of lowest performing Title I or Title I-eligible schools to implement one of four reform models as defined by the USDE.

To be removed from “focus” or “priority” school status, a school must receive an Improvement or Performance Plan type assignment for two consecutive years.

## School Accountability Committees

### Composition of Committees

Each school is responsible for establishing a School Accountability Committee (SAC), which should consist of at least the following seven members:

- The principal of the school or the principal’s designee;
- At least one teacher who provides instruction in the school;
- At least three parents of students enrolled in the school<sup>4</sup>;

---

<sup>4</sup> Note: Generally, a parent who is an employee of the school or who is a spouse, son, daughter, sister, brother, mother or father of a person who is an employee of the school is not eligible to serve on a SAC. However, if, after making good-faith efforts, a principal or organization of parents, teachers and students is unable to find a sufficient number of persons who are willing to serve on the SAC, the principal, with advice from the organization of parents,

- At least one adult member of an organization of parents, teachers, and students recognized by the school; and
- At least one person from the community.

The local school board will determine the actual number of persons on the SAC and the method for selecting members. If the local school board chooses to increase the number of persons on the SAC, it must ensure that the number of parents appointed or elected exceeds the number of representatives from the group with the next highest representation. A person may not be appointed or elected to fill more than one of these required member positions in a single term.

If the local school board determines that members are to be appointed, the appointing authority must, to the extent practicable, ensure that the parents who are appointed reflect the student populations that are significantly represented within the school. If the local school board determines that the members are to be elected, the school principal must encourage persons who reflect the student populations that are significantly represented within the school to seek election. Such student populations might include, for example, students who are members of non-Caucasian races, students who are eligible for free or reduced-cost lunch, students whose dominant language is not English, students who are migrant children, students who are identified as children with disabilities and students who are identified as gifted children.

SACs must select one of their parent representatives to serve as chair or co-chair of the committee. If a vacancy arises on a SAC because of a member's resignation or for any other reason, the remaining members of the SAC will fill the vacancy by majority action.

The members of the governing board of a charter school may serve as members of the SAC. In a district with 500 or fewer enrolled students, members of the local school board may serve on a SAC, and the DAC may serve as a SAC.

## **Committee Responsibilities**

Each SAC is responsible for the following:

- Making recommendations to the principal on the school priorities for spending school moneys, including federal funds, where applicable;
- Making recommendations to the principal of the school and the superintendent concerning preparation of a school Performance or Improvement plan, if either type of plan is required;
- Publicizing and holding a SAC meeting to discuss strategies to include in a school Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, if either type of plan is required, and using this input to make

---

teachers and students, may establish an alternative membership plan for the SAC that reflects the membership specified above as much as possible.

recommendations to the local school board concerning preparation of the school Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan prior to the plan being written;

- Publicizing the district’s public hearing to review a written school Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan;
- Meeting at least quarterly to discuss whether school leadership, personnel, and infrastructure are advancing or impeding implementation of the school’s Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan, whichever is applicable, and other progress pertinent to the school’s accreditation contract;
- Providing input and recommendations to the DAC and district administration, on an advisory basis, concerning principal development plans and principal evaluations. (Note that this should not in any way interfere with a district’s compliance with the statutory requirements of the Teacher Employment, Compensation and Dismissal Act.); and
- Publicizing opportunities to serve and soliciting parents to serve on the SAC;
- Assisting the district in implementing at the school level the district’s parent engagement policy; and
- Assisting school personnel to increase parents’ engagement with teachers, including parents’ engagement in creating students’ READ plans, Individual Career and Academic Plans, and plans to address habitual truancy.

## **School Accountability Committees for Charter Schools**

*For information about School Accountability Committees in the charter school context, please see Appendix I.*

## **Developing and Submitting School Plans**

### **School Plan Requirements**

All schools must submit a plan that addresses how the school will improve its performance.<sup>5</sup> All districts and schools, regardless of their plan assignment, are required to use CDE’s School Unified Improvement Plan template<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> A district with 1,000 students or fewer has the option of submitting a single plan for the district and school(s), so long as the plan meets all state and federal requirements for district and school plans. A district with more than 1,000 students but fewer than 1,200 students may, upon request and at the Department’s discretion, submit a single plan for the district and school(s), so long as the plan meets all state and federal requirements for district and school plans.

For more information about how to use the template and prepare a plan, please see: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/UnifiedImprovementPlanning.asp>. All school plans also must include the following elements:

- **Targets:** Ambitious but attainable targets that the school shall set on the four key statewide Performance Indicators (achievement, growth, growth gaps and postsecondary and workforce readiness).
- **Trends:** Positive and negative trends in the levels of attainment by the school on the Performance Indicators.
- **Priority Performance Challenges:** A prioritized list of challenges in each performance indicator area where the school did not meet state performance expectations.
- **Root Causes:** Root causes for each identified priority performance challenge that must be addressed to raise the levels of attainment on the Performance Indicators and, if the school serves students in preschool and kindergarten, to improve school readiness.
- **Major Improvement Strategies:** Specific, research-based improvement strategies that are appropriate in scope, intensity and type to address the school's root causes of any low-performance. Depending on the type of plan required, the strategies appropriate for each school will vary.
- **Resources:** Identification of local, state and federal resources that the school will use to implement the identified strategies with fidelity.
- **Interim Measures and Implementation Benchmarks:** Interim measures and implementation benchmarks are used to assess whether the identified strategies are having the desired performance results and whether or not the strategies are being carried out with fidelity.

Appropriate Strategies:

- **Performance Plans, Improvement Plans, and Priority Improvement Plans:** Strategies should be appropriate in scope, intensity and type.
- **Turnaround Plans:** Strategies identified in Turnaround Plans must, at a minimum, include one or more of the following:
  - Employing a lead turnaround partner that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances, which turnaround partner will be immersed in all aspects of developing and collaboratively executing the plan and will serve as a liaison to other school partners;
  - Reorganizing the oversight and management structure within the school to provide greater, more effective support;

- Seeking recognition as an innovation school or clustering with other schools that have similar governance management structures to form an innovation school zone pursuant to the Innovation Schools Act;
- Hiring a public or private entity that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances to manage the school pursuant to a contract with the local school board or the Charter School Institute;
- For a school that is not a charter school, converting to a charter school;
- For a charter school, renegotiating and significantly restructuring the charter school’s charter contract; and/or
- Other actions of comparable or greater significance or effect, including those interventions required for low-performing schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and accompanying guidance (i.e., “turnaround model”, “restart model”, “school closure”, “transformation model”).

### **Requirements for Involving Parents in Development of Plan**

For a school that is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, the district must notify parents of the students enrolled in the school of the type of plan that is required and of the performance results that led to that plan assignment. This notice must be given within 30 days after the district has received the initial plan assignment or, if the district appeals the initial plan assignment, within 30 days after the district receives the State Board’s final determination. The notice must include the timeline for developing and adopting the required plan and the date, time and location of a public hearing held by the local board of education to review the plan prior to adoption. The date for the public hearing must be at least 30 days after the date on which the district provides the written notice.

During these public hearings, the local board of education also must review the school’s progress in implementing its plan during the preceding year and in improving its performance.

*For a sample notification letter to parents, please see Appendix J.*

### **Timelines for Submitting a School Plan**

*For a visual describing the timelines for school accreditation and submission of school plans, please see Appendix K.*

### **Review of School Plans**

As soon as a school is notified of the type of plan required, the principal and superintendent and/or local school board will begin to collaborate with the School Accountability Committee to develop the Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan, whichever is applicable.



## Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans

For schools that are required to submit a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, local school boards must adopt a plan no later than January 15<sup>th</sup> of the school year in which the school is directed to adopt such a plan. All schools must use the School Unified Improvement Plan template to address the requirements for a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan and to address any other applicable federal planning requirements. The commissioner may provide additional time to the extent he finds an extension to be reasonable. The Department may provide technical assistance, evaluation and feedback to the local school board in preparing the plan. No later than five business days after the local school board has adopted a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan, the local school board must submit the plan to the Department for review. The Department will evaluate the plan to ensure that it meets all state and federal requirements.

The commissioner *shall* assign the State Review Panel to review all Turnaround plans and *may* assign the State Review Panel to review Priority Improvement plans. In evaluating plans, the panel members will be asked to reflect on the following questions:

- Whether the district's/school's leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results;
- Whether the district's/school's infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement;
- The readiness and apparent capacity of the district/school personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate actions to improve student academic performance;
- The readiness and apparent capacity of the district/school personnel to engage productively with and benefit from the assistance provided by an external partner;
- The likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the district's/school's performance within the current management structure and staffing; and
- The necessity that the district or school remain in operation to serve students.

The State Review Panel may make recommendations for modification to the plan to the commissioner and the commissioner may recommend modification to the local school board. If required to make modifications to Turnaround plans, local school boards must submit the revised plans no later than March 30<sup>th</sup>.

Districts will submit all final school plans no later than April 15<sup>th</sup> to the Department for publication on SchoolView.

*For a visual summarizing review process for school Priority Improvement and Turnaround plans, please see Appendix J. For additional information on the unique requirements for schools with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type, refer to the Accountability Handbook supplement. It will be released in late August 2012.*

## Performance and Improvement Plans

For schools that are required to submit a Performance or Improvement plan, school principals and the district superintendent, or his or her designee, must submit an adopted plan for publication no later

than April 15th. Local school boards are encouraged to review and approve such plans and to consider in their local policies whether they would like to require school principals and superintendents to submit the plan to the local school board for approval.

These plans may need to be submitted to local school boards in January if the school is required to submit a plan to comply with federal requirements. The local school board will review those plans to ensure they meet federal planning requirements. All schools will be required to submit a plan to their local school board using the Department’s School Unified Improvement Plan template.

Districts will submit all final plans no later than April 15<sup>th</sup> to the Department for publication on SchoolView.

## Performance Reporting

### SchoolView

The Colorado Department of Education is responsible for developing and maintaining a Web portal, “SchoolView,” to provide high-quality information about student, school and state performance to public schools, school districts, the Charter School Institute, parents and other members of the public.



SchoolView includes the following information:

- Performance reports for schools, districts and the state (see below for more detail);
- For each district, the accreditation category assigned by the Department;
- For each public school, the school’s Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan (whichever is appropriate based on the State Board’s direction); and
- For each district, the district’s Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan (whichever is appropriate based on the district’s accreditation category).

### Performance Reports



The Department no longer issues the paper report cards that were once referred to as School Accountability Reports (SARs). In place of the SAR, the Department publishes on SchoolView, a school performance report for each public school, a district performance report for each school district and a performance report for the state as a whole. This information can be accessed on the SchoolView Data Center at:

<https://edx.cde.state.co.us/SchoolView/DataCenter/reports.aspx> .

The Department continuously updates the data included in the school and district performance reports. Prior to publication of the performance reports, each district has a reasonable period of time to review the information as it will appear on the district's performance report, and to notify the Department of any needed corrections.

Finally, each public school is responsible for notifying parents of the availability of these reports on SchoolView. Schools must ask parents whether they want a printed copy of these reports and provide those copies, upon request.

## **District Performance Reports**

At a minimum, each district's performance report will include the following:

- The District Performance Framework Report (*see Appendix D for sample*);
- A comparison of the district's levels of attainment on the Performance Indicators with other districts in the state;
- Information concerning comparisons of student performance over time and among student groups;
- The district's rates of completion, mobility and truancy;
- Financial data, as required in 1 CCR 301-1; and
- Any additional information required to be reported by state or federal law.

## **School Performance Reports**

At a minimum, each public school's performance report will include the following:

- The School Performance Framework Report (*see Appendix E for sample*);
- A comparison of the school's levels of attainment on the Performance Indicators with the levels of attainment of other public schools of the school district and in the state;
- Information concerning comparisons of student performance over time and among student groups;
- The school's rates of completion, mobility and truancy;
- The name of the school, type of school program provided and school directory information;
- Information concerning the percentages of students who are not tested or whose scores are not included in determining attainment of the Performance Indicators;
- The occurrences of student conduct and discipline code violations reported (i.e., incidences involving drugs, alcohol, violence, etc.);

- Information concerning student enrollment, the number and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-cost lunch, student enrollment stability, average daily attendance, and the availability of a preschool program, fully-day kindergarten program and before- and after-school program at the school;
- Information concerning staff employed at the school, including the students-per-classroom-teacher ratios for each grade level, the average years of teaching experience among the teachers employed at the school, the number of teachers at the school who hold master's or doctoral degrees, the number of teachers at each junior high, middle, and high school who are teaching in the subject areas in which they received their bachelor's or graduate degrees, the number of teachers at the school who have three or more years of teaching experience, and the number of professional development days included in the school year;
- Information concerning whether the school offers the following: visual art, drama or theater, music, dance, comprehensive health education, P.E., economics, world languages, history, geography, civics, career and technical education, concurrent enrollment courses, opportunities for civic or community engagement, Internet safety programs, school library programs, A.P., I.B. or honors courses, Montessori curricula, extra-curricular activities and athletics, credit recovery programs and assistance for out-of-school youth to re-enroll; and
- Information concerning programs and services that are available at the public school to support student health and wellness, including links to district and school wellness policies and information about whether all students in grades K-6 have access to recess, whether a school health team or school wellness committee exists, whether students have access to a school-based or school-linked health center, whether comprehensive health education and P.E. are required for all students, whether the school participates in the federal school breakfast program, and whether a registered school nurse who is licensed with the Department and DORA is available on school premises or for consultation.

## Appendix A: Colorado Educational Accountability System Terminology

Term	Definition
<p><b>Academic Achievement</b></p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Achievement</b></p>	<p>A single point in time score on an assessment. Achievement for an individual is expressed as a test score (or “scale score”), or it may be described using an achievement level.</p> <p>Academic Achievement is one of four performance indicators used to evaluate schools and districts in Colorado</p> <p>See also: <b>Status Score and Scale Score.</b></p>
<p><b>Academic Growth</b></p>	<p>For an individual student, academic growth is the progress shown by the student, in a given subject area, over a given span of time.</p> <p>The Colorado Growth Model expresses annual growth, for an individual, with a student growth percentile in reading, writing, and mathematics. For a school, district, or other relevant student grouping, student growth is summarized using the median of the student growth percentiles for that grouping.</p> <p>Academic growth is one of four statewide performance indicators used to evaluate schools and districts in Colorado. This indicator contains measures of both normative and adequate growth.</p> <p>See also: <b>Normative growth and Adequate growth</b></p>
<p><b>Academic Growth Gaps</b></p>	<p>Academic Growth Gaps is a Performance Framework indicator that reflects the academic progress of students in the following disaggregated groups: students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and low-proficiency students.</p> <p>Academic Growth Gaps constitute one of four statewide performance indicators used to evaluate schools and districts in Colorado. This indicator contains measures of both normative and adequate growth for student disaggregated groups.</p> <p>See also: <b>Normative growth, Adequate growth, and Subgroup</b></p>
<p><b>Academic Peers</b></p>	<p>Students currently in the same grade, being tested in the same subject, with a similar CSAP/TCAP achievement score history in that subject. More simply put, these are a particular student’s comparison group when interpreting his/her student growth percentile.</p>
<p><b>Achievement</b></p>	<p><b>See Academic Achievement</b></p>

Term	Definition
<b>ACCESS for ELLs</b>	<p>ACCESS for ELLs (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners) is a secure large-scale English language proficiency assessment given to kindergarten through 12th graders who have been identified as English language learners (ELLs). It was administered in Colorado for the first time in 2013. The assessment measures student achievement in reading, writing, speaking and listening comprehension standards, specifically.</p> <p>The assessment results are used for Title III Accountability (AMAOs 1 and 2) and in the growth results are used in the state performance frameworks.</p>
<b>Achievement Level</b>	<p>Verbal descriptions of score levels on an assessment, using ranges of scores, separated by cut points. On the CSAP/TCAP tests, for example, the four achievement levels are: Unsatisfactory, Partially Proficient, Proficient and Advanced. The cut scores associated with these four achievement levels are different for each content area and grade.</p>
<b>Action Step</b>	<p>Something that is done to make progress towards goals. Action steps are created for each strategy and identify resources (people, time, and money) that will be brought to bear so that goals and targets can be reached. This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process.</p>
<b>Adequate Growth</b>	<p>A growth level (student growth percentile) sufficient for a student to reach an achievement level of proficient or advanced, in a subject area, within one, two, or three years or by 10<sup>th</sup> grade; whichever comes first.</p> <p>The performance framework reports the median adequate growth rate for a school or district. This number is the growth level sufficient for the <i>typical</i> or <i>median</i> student in that district, school, or other disaggregated group to reach a performance level of proficient or advanced, in a subject area, within one, two or three years, or by 10<sup>th</sup> grade; whichever comes first.</p>

Term	Definition
<b>Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) NCLB</b>	Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (NCLB Title III Accountability measures). Districts are accountable for the progress students make in reaching higher achievement levels on the ACCESS for ELLs assessment (AMAO 1) and the percent of students attaining English language proficiency as measured by the ACCESS assessment (AMAO 2). To successfully reach AMAOs, districts must also make academic content growth and graduation rate targets for their ELLs (AMAO 3).
<b>Average</b>	A summary of a collection of numbers, calculated by adding all of the numbers together and dividing by how many numbers were in the collection. Also known as the mean.  See also: <i>Mean, Median</i>
<b>Baseline</b>	The initial value of a metric against which future values are compared to determine if progress is being made towards goals.
<b>Catch-Up Growth</b>	Growth needed for a student scoring at the unsatisfactory or partially proficient levels, in the previous year, to reach the proficient or advanced achievement level within 3 years or by 10th grade; whichever comes first.  A student is catching up if he/she has demonstrated growth in the most recent year that, if sustained, would enable the student to reach a proficient or advanced level of achievement.  See also: <i>Keep-Up Growth, Move-Up Growth, and Adequate Growth.</i>
<b>CELA proficiency (CELA pro)</b>	Colorado English Language Assessment for Proficiency: the standards-based English proficiency assessment given from 2008-2012 annually to English language learners, which was used for Title III accountability and to calculate NCLB Title III AMAOs. The assessment measures student achievement in reading, writing, speaking and listening comprehension standards, specifically.
<b>CoAlt</b>	Colorado Alternate: the standards-based assessment used to measure academic content knowledge for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The CoAlt is given in the same content areas and grades as the TCAP. These assessments were first administered in 2012.
<b>Colorado ACT Composite Score</b>	The composite score, on the Colorado ACT, is the rounded average of a student's Colorado ACT scores across English, mathematics,

Term	Definition
<p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Average Colorado ACT Composite Score</b></p>	<p>reading and science.</p> <p>The average Colorado ACT composite score is the average composite score for all of the students in a district or school. Average Colorado ACT composite score is one of the required state measures of the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness indicator.</p>
<p><b>The Colorado Growth Model</b></p>	<p>The Colorado Growth Model is both:</p> <p>(a) a statistical model to calculate each student’s progress on state assessments.</p> <p>(b) a computer-based data visualization tool for displaying student, school, and district results over the internet.</p>
<p><b>Consolidated Application (NCLB)</b></p>	<p>The Colorado grant application process for local educational agencies to apply for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) funds. This grant application includes: <a href="#">Title I, Part A</a>; Title I, Part D, <a href="#">Title II, Part A</a>; <a href="#">Title III, Part A</a>; Title III Set-aside; and <a href="#">Title VI Part B</a>.</p>
<p><b>CSAP</b></p>	<p>Colorado Student Assessment Program. Content areas tested included 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. These assessments were last given in 2011.</p>
<p><b>CSAPA</b></p>	<p>Colorado Student Assessment Program Alternate: the standards-based assessment used to measure academic content knowledge for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The CSAPA was given in the same content areas and grades as the CSAP. These assessments were last given in 2011.</p>
<p><b>Cut Score</b></p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Cut Point</b></p>	<p>The number required for a school or district to earn a particular level of performance indicator rating on the performance framework reports. The cut point for each performance indicator level is defined on the performance framework scoring guide.</p>
<p><b>Disaggregated Group</b></p>	<p>A demographic subset of students.</p> <p>Colorado reports student academic growth, on the performance framework reports, for five historically disadvantaged student disaggregated groups: students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities and English Language</p>



Term	Definition
	<p>Learners, and for students scoring below proficient.</p> <p>For federal accountability, data is disaggregated by: race/ethnicity categories and minority overall, students eligible for free/reduced lunch, English language learners, and students with disabilities.</p>
<p><b>Disaggregated Group Median Adequate Growth</b></p>	<p>The student growth percentile sufficient for the median student in a subgroup to reach or maintain a level of proficient or advanced in a subject area within one, two or three years. If the disaggregated group’s median student growth percentile is high enough to reach the adequate level, this means that, as a group, students in this category are making enough growth to catch up and keep up.</p> <p>On the performance framework reports, disaggregated groups include students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English language learners and students at a performance level of unsatisfactory or partially proficient.</p> <p>See also: <b><i>Median Student Growth Percentile</i></b></p>
<p><b>Disaggregated Graduation Rate</b></p>	<p>Graduation rates are disaggregated by student groups, and were added to the accountability within the performance frameworks in 2012.</p> <p>On the performance framework reports, disaggregated groups include students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, and English language learners.</p> <p>See also: <b><i>Graduation Rate</i></b></p>
<p><b>District Performance Framework</b></p>	<p>The framework with which the state evaluates the level to which districts meet the state’s expectations for attainment on the performance indicators, and makes an accreditation level determination. The district’s results on the district performance framework are summarized in the district performance framework report.</p>

Term	Definition
<b>Drop-Out Rate</b>	<p>The drop-out rate reflects the percentage of all students enrolled in grades 7-12 who leave school during a single school year. It is calculated by dividing the number of dropouts by a membership base, which includes all students who were in membership any time during the year.</p> <p>The Colorado dropout rate is an <u>annual</u> rate, reflecting the percentage of all students enrolled in grades 9-12 who leave school during a single school year, without subsequently attending another school or educational program. It is calculated by dividing the number of dropouts by a membership base, which includes all students who were in membership any time during the year. In accordance with a 1993 legislative mandate, beginning with the 1993-94 school year, the dropout rate calculation excludes expelled students.</p>
<b>ELD Standards</b>	English Language Development Standards
<b>ELs</b>	English learners
<b>Fluent English Proficient (FEP)</b>	<p>This is the highest of three English language proficiency designations for English language learners. Students at this level are able to understand and communicate effectively with various audiences, on a wide range of familiar and new topics, to meet social and academic demands in English. They are able to score comparably, in content areas, to native speakers, but may still need some linguistic support.</p> <p>Compare to: <b>NEP, LEP</b></p>
<b>Framework Points</b>	<p>The point values schools or districts can earn on each performance indicator included in the school or district performance framework. Framework points define the relative weighting of each of the performance indicators, within the overall framework. They can be directly understood as percentage weights of the indicators when the school or district has data on all four indicators.</p> <p>For elementary and middle level schools only, the framework points possible are: 25 points for Academic Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth and 25 for Academic Growth Gaps.</p> <p>For schools with high school levels and districts, the framework points possible are: 15 points for Academic Achievement, 35 for Academic Growth, 15 for Academic Growth Gaps and 35 for</p>

Term	Definition
	<p>Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.</p> <p>When a school or district does not have sufficient data to allow the calculation of a score, on a particular performance indicator, the remaining indicators are still used, but their weighted contributions change.</p>
<b>Framework Score</b>	<p>The sum of the framework points a school or district earns on all of the performance indicators on the school or district performance framework. The framework score determines a school's plan type or a district's accreditation category.</p>
<b>Goal</b>	<p>A projected state of affairs that a school or district plans or intends to achieve—a desired end-point following intentional effort. Goals are set within performance indicator areas.</p>
<b>Graduation Rate</b>	<p>Colorado calculates "on-time" graduation as the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. A student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade, and the graduating class is assigned by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. The formula anticipates, for example, that a student entering ninth grade in fall 2006 will graduate with the Class of 2010.</p> <p>This current formula is a change from how graduation rates were reported prior to 2010 rates. With the old calculation, students who took longer than four years to graduate were factored into the formula. To ensure that districts and schools are credited for their efforts to ensure that all students are college and career ready upon graduation, which at times means taking longer than four years to graduate, Colorado also uses the new calculation to report 5-year, 6-year and 7-year graduation rates. For accountability purposes, districts/schools are credited with the highest of these rates.</p> <p>On the 1-year 2013 District and School Performance Framework report, districts/schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: 2012 4-year graduation rate, 2011 5-year graduation rate, 2010 6-year graduation rate and 2009 7-year graduation rate. On the 3-year 2013 District and School Performance Framework report, districts/schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: aggregated 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 4-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009, 2010 and 2011 5-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009 and 2010 6-year graduation rate, or 2009 7-year graduation rate. For each of these rates, the aggregation is the result of adding the graduation totals for all available years and dividing by the sum of the</p>

Term	Definition
	<p>graduation bases across all available years. For both 1-year and 3-year District and School Performance Framework reports, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized on the Performance Indicators detail page.</p>
<p><b>Growth</b></p>	<p>For an individual student, growth is the progress shown by the student, in a given subject area, over a given span of time.</p> <p>The Colorado Growth Model describes how much growth a student has made, relative to his/her “academic peers”, by providing a student growth percentile in reading, writing, and mathematics. For a school, district, or other relevant student grouping, student growth is summarized using the median of the student growth percentiles for that group.</p> <p>Academic growth is one of four performance indicators used to evaluate schools and districts in Colorado. On the Performance Frameworks, this academic growth indicator contains measures of both normative and adequate growth.</p> <p>The performance frameworks provide both normative and criterion-referenced (growth to a proficiency standard) measures of growth. The performance framework reports summarize growth for a school, district, or student disaggregated group using the median of the student growth percentiles of the school, district, or student group. It then evaluates if that growth rate is sufficient for the <i>typical</i> or <i>median</i> student in a district, school, or other disaggregated group to reach an achievement level of proficient or advanced, in a subject area, within one, two, or three years, or by 10<sup>th</sup> grade, whichever comes first.</p>
<p><b>Growth Percentile</b></p>	<p>See Student Growth Percentile.</p>
<p><b>Improvement Plan</b></p>	<p>Senate Bill 09-163 (The Educational Accountability Act of 2009) requires all schools and districts, in Colorado, to implement one of four types of plans: a Performance Plan, Improvement Plan, Priority Improvement Plan, or Turnaround Plan.</p> <p>Elementary and middle schools that earn at least 47% but less than 59% of their framework points, on the school performance framework, will be assigned to the “Improvement Plan” category.</p> <p>High schools that earn at least 47% but less than 60% of their framework points, on the school performance framework report, are assigned to the “Improvement Plan” category.</p> <p>Improvement plans are also required for Title I schools “on Improvement,” and districts “identified for Program Improvement”</p>

Term	Definition
	<p>based on criteria defined by NCLB.</p> <p>The Unified Improvement Plan template (for districts and schools) is designed to meet the requirements of both SB09-163 and NCLB.</p>
<b>Implementation Benchmark</b>	<p>A measure (with associated metric) used to assess the degree to which action steps have been implemented. This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process.</p> <p>See also: <i>Measure</i> and <i>Metric</i></p>
<b>Interim Measure</b>	<p>A measure (and associated metric) used to assess, for the level of a given performance indicator, at various times during a school year. This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process.</p>
<b>Keep-Up Growth</b>	<p>Growth needed for a student scoring at the proficient or advanced levels, in the previous year, to continue scoring at least at the proficient level in the current year and future 3 years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first.</p> <p>A student is keeping up if he/she has demonstrated growth in the most recent year that, if sustained, would enable the student to maintain a proficient level of achievement.</p> <p>See also: <i>Catch-Up Growth, Move-Up Growth, and Adequate Growth.</i></p>
<b>Lectura</b>	<p>State 3rd and 4th grade reading assessment in Spanish; similar to CSAP/TCAP reading assessment, but measuring students' ability to read in Spanish. Lectura is administered to those students who receive their primary reading instruction in Spanish.</p>
<b>LEA</b>	<p>Local Educational Agency; this can be a School District, BOCES or the lead school district in a multi- school district consortium.</p>
<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP)</b>	<p>This is the middle of the three English proficiency designations for English language learners. LEP students are able to understand and be understood in many to most social communication situations, in English. They are gaining increasing competence in the more cognitively demanding requirements of content areas; however, they are not yet ready to fully participate in academic content areas without linguistic support. [CELA Levels 3 and 4]</p> <p>Compare to: <i>NEP, FEP</i></p>
<b>Major Improvement Strategy</b>	<p>An overall approach that describes a series of related maneuvers or actions intended to result in improvements in performance. This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP)</p>

Term	Definition
	process.
<b>Mean</b>	A summary measure of a collection of numbers, calculated by adding all of the numbers together and dividing by how many numbers were in the collection (commonly known as the average).  See also: <b>Average</b> .
<b>Measure</b>	Instruments or means to assess performance in an area identified by an indicator.
<b>Median</b>	A number that summarizes a set of numbers, similar to an average. When a collection of numbers is ordered in a list from smallest to largest, the median is the middle score of the ordered list. The median is therefore the point below which 50 percent of the scores fall.  Medians are more appropriate to calculate than averages in particular situations, such as when percentiles are grouped.
<b>Median Adequate Growth</b>  <b>Or</b>  <b>Median Adequate Growth Percentile</b>	The growth (student growth percentile) sufficient for the median student in a district, school, or other group of interest to reach an achievement level of proficient or advanced, in a subject area, within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first.  In the case of the performance framework, this is a relatively simple calculation. Each student, in a school, has a Catch up or a Keep up growth number. If you take the median of all these numbers, you get the growth level that would, on average, enable all students to be either catching up or keeping up; whichever they need to do.
<b>Median Growth</b>	Median growth summarizes student growth rates by district, school, grade level, or other group of interest. It is measured using the median student growth percentile, which is calculated by taking the individual student growth percentiles of the students, in the group of interest, and calculating the median.
<b>Median Student Growth Percentile</b>  <b>Or</b>  <b>Median Growth Percentile (MGP)</b>	Summarizes student growth by district, school, grade-level, or other group of interest. It is calculated by taking the individual Student Growth Percentiles of the students in the group of interest and calculating the median.  See also: <b>Median</b>
<b>Metric</b>	A numeric scale indicating the level of some variable of interest. For example, your credit score is a metric that companies use to

Term	Definition
	decide whether to give you a loan.
<b>Move-Up Growth</b>	<p>Growth needed for a student scoring at the proficient level in the previous year to score at the advanced level in the current year or in the next 3 years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first.</p> <p>A student is moving up if he/she has demonstrated growth in the most recent year that, if sustained, would enable the student to attain an advanced level of achievement.</p> <p>See also: <i>Catch-up Growth, Keep-up Growth.</i></p>
<b>NCLB</b>	No Child Left Behind, federal statute 2001, the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
<b>Non-English Proficient (NEP)</b>	<p>This is the lowest of the three English proficiency designations, for English language learners. NEP students may be just beginning to understand and respond to simple routine communication in English, or they may be beginning to have the ability to respond, with more ease, to a variety of social communication tasks. [CELA Levels 1 and 2]</p> <p>Compare to: <i>LEP, FEP</i></p>
<b>Normative Growth</b>	One student's growth understood in comparison to that of similar students. The Colorado Growth Model describes growth, normatively, as defined by how each student's progress compares to other students with a similar achievement history - his/her academic peers.
<b>Participation Rate</b>	<p>Percentage of students, in a school or district, taking required state assessment; including: CSAP/TCAP, CSAPA/CoAlt, Lectura, and Escritura.</p> <p>On the performance framework, schools or districts that do not meet a minimum of 95% participation rate in two or more subject areas, on these required state assessments, are assigned a plan type one category lower than their framework points indicate.</p>
<b>Percentage/Percent</b>	A way of expressing a fraction in a single number. For example, one out of 17 is 5.9%.

Term	Definition
<b>Percentile</b>	<p>A percentile is a way of showing how a particular score compares with all the other scores, in a dataset, by ranking ranges of scores from 1 to 99. The higher the percentile, the higher ranking the score is among all the other values. Each range of scores represents 1% of the pool of scores.</p> <p>For example, if your vocabulary knowledge is at the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile for people your age, that means that you are higher in the distribution than 60% of other people – in other words, you know more words than 60% of your peers. Conversely, 40% of people know more words than you.</p> <p>The percentile is useful because you do not need to know anything about the scales used for particular metrics or tests – if you know that your score was at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, you know that your score is right in the middle of all the other scores, an average score.</p>
<b>Performance</b>	<p>General term used to encompass growth and achievement. Used to discuss both student and school level of attainment.</p>
<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<p>A specific component of school or district quality. Colorado has identified four performance indicators that are used to evaluate all schools and districts in the state: student achievement, student academic growth, growth gaps, and postsecondary/workforce readiness.</p>
<b>Performance Plan</b>	<p>The type of plan required for those schools that already meet the state’s expectations, for attainment, on the performance indicators.</p> <p>Elementary and middle schools that earn at least 59%, of their framework points, on the school performance framework report are assigned to the Performance plan category.</p> <p>High schools that earn at least 60%, of their framework points, on the school performance framework report are assigned to a Performance plan category.</p>
<b>Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness</b>	<p>The preparedness, of students, for college or a job after completing high school.</p> <p>This is one of the performance indicators used to evaluate the performance of all schools and districts in the state. This indicator includes graduation rate, dropout rate, and Colorado ACT scores.</p>



Term	Definition
<b>Priority Improvement Plan</b>	<p>One of the types of plans required for those schools that do not meet the state’s performance standards.</p> <p>Elementary and middle schools that earn at least 37% but less than 47%, of their framework points, on the school performance framework report are assigned to a Priority Improvement Plan category.</p> <p>High schools that earn at least 33% but less than 47%, of their framework points, on the school performance framework report are assigned to a Priority Improvement Plan category.</p>
<b>Priority Performance Challenges</b>	<p>Specific statements about the school or district’s student performance challenges, which have been prioritized. (This does not include statements about budgeting, staffing, curriculum, instruction, etc.). This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process.</p>
<b>Rating</b>	<p>On the performance framework reports, CDE’s evaluation of the extent to which the school or district has met the state’s standards on the performance indicators and their component parts. The rating levels on the performance framework reports are: Does Not Meet, Approaching, Meets, and Exceeds.</p>
<b>Root Cause</b>	<p>The deepest underlying cause(s) of a problem or situation that, if resolved, would result in elimination or substantial reduction, of the symptom. If action is required, the cause should be within one’s ability to control, and not a purely external factor such as poverty that is out of one’s ability to control. This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process.</p>
<b>SASID</b>	<p>State Assigned Student Identifier Number – the number that Colorado uses to identify students in public schools.</p>
<b>Scale Score</b>	<p>Exact test score - this is considered a measure of student achievement. Such scores are calculated from participants' responses to test questions. On the CSAP/TCAP, students receive a scale score in reading, writing, math, and science.</p> <p>See also: <b><i>Achievement</i></b></p>
<b>School Performance Framework</b>	<p>The framework used, by the state, to provide information to stakeholders about each school’s performance based on the four key performance indicators: student achievement, student academic growth, achievement and growth gaps, and postsecondary/workforce readiness. Schools are assigned to a type of improvement plan based on their performance across all of</p>

Term	Definition
	the indicator areas.
<b>School Plan Type</b>	The type of plan to which a school is assigned, by the state, on the school performance framework report. The school plan types are: Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement and Turnaround. This is also the type of plan that must be adopted and implemented, for the school, by either the local board (priority improvement and turnaround) or the principal and the superintendent (performance and improvement).
<b>Schoolwide Plan (Title I ESEA)</b>	A comprehensive plan required of Title I schools that operate School wide Programs. This plan has 10 required components, including the need for a comprehensive needs assessment and analysis, as well as a yearly evaluation. The plan must be developed and evaluated in conjunction with parents.
<b>SEA</b>	State Education Agency (Colorado Department of Education)
<b>Strategic Plan or Comprehensive Plan</b>	An organization's documented definition of its overall direction and intention to allocate its resources to follow this direction. This is distinct from an <b>Improvement Plan</b> which is a focused plan aimed at prioritizing actions based upon identified student and school needs.
<b>Strategy</b>	Methods to reach goals. Which strategies are chosen depends on coherence, affordability, practicality and efficiency and should be research-based. This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process.
<b>Students Below Proficient</b>  <b>Or</b>  <b>Students Scoring Below Proficient</b>	Students who scored Unsatisfactory or Partially Proficient in the prior year's CSAP/TCAP. Adequate growth for these students would enable them to reach Proficient or Advanced within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first.
<b>Student Growth Percentile</b>	A way of understanding a student's current CSAP/TCAP scale score based on his/her prior scores and relative to other students with similar prior scores. The student growth percentile provides a measure of academic growth (i.e. relative position change) where students who have similar academic score histories provide a baseline for understanding each student's progress. For example, a growth percentile of 60 in mathematics means the student's growth exceeds that of 60 percent of his/her academic peers. In other words, the student's latest score was somewhat higher than we would have expected based on past score history. Also referred to as a "growth percentile."

Term	Definition
<b>Subgroup</b>	See <b>Disaggregated group</b> .
<b>Subgroup Median Adequate Growth</b>	See <b>Disaggregated group Median Adequate Growth</b>
<b>Subgroup Median Growth</b>	See <b>Disaggregated group Median Growth</b>
<b>Target</b>	A specific, quantifiable outcome that defines what would constitute success in a particular area of intended improvement, within a designated period of time. This is a component of the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) process.
<b>Targeted Assistance Plan (Title I) ESEA</b>	This plan is a requirement for Title I schools that operate Targeted Assistance programs. The plan has 8 components that focus on how students, most at risk of not meeting state standards in reading and/or math, will be served.
<b>TCAP</b>	Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (given in 2012 for the first time). Content areas currently tested include reading and writing (in English and 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> grade Spanish versions) and mathematics, in grades 3-10, and science in grades 5, 8, and 10.
<b>Test Participation Test Participation Rate</b>	On the performance framework reports, the percentage of students in a school or district taking a state assessment, including: CSAP/TCAP, CSAPA/CoAlt, Lectura or Escritura. The performance framework reports set a minimum 95% participation rate across all subject areas. Schools or districts do not receive points for test participation; however, schools or districts that do not meet the 95% rate in two or more content areas are assigned a plan type one category lower than their framework points indicate.
<b>Turnaround Plan</b>	<p>One of the types of plans required for those schools that do not meet state expectations for attainment on the performance indicators.</p> <p>Elementary and Middle schools that earn 37% or less, of their framework points, on the school performance framework report are assigned to a Turnaround plan category.</p> <p>High schools that earn less than 33%, of their framework points, on the school performance framework report are assigned to a Turnaround plan category.</p> <p>In Colorado’s state accountability system, schools that are assigned to the turnaround plan category must engage in one of the following strategies:</p>

Term	Definition
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employ a lead turnaround partner that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances, which turnaround partner will be immersed in all aspects of developing and collaboratively executing the plan and will serve as a liaison to other school partners;</li> <li>• Reorganize the oversight and management structure within the school to provide greater, more effective support;</li> <li>• Seek recognition as an innovation school or clustering with other schools that have similar governance management structures to form an innovation school zone pursuant to the Innovation Schools Act;</li> <li>• Hire a public or private entity that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances to manage the school pursuant to a contract with the local school board or the Charter School Institute;</li> <li>• For a school that is not a charter school, convert to a charter school;</li> <li>• For a charter school, renegotiate and significantly restructure the charter school’s charter contract; and/or</li> </ul> <p><b>Other actions of comparable or greater significance or effect, including those interventions required for low-performing schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and accompanying guidance (i.e., “turnaround model,” “restart model,” “school closure,” “transformation model”).</b></p>
<b>Turnaround School</b>	School identified using federal framework for identification, for receiving Title I 1003(g) funds. Includes three tiers of classification.

## **Appendix B: Model District Accreditation Contract**

### **Colorado State Board of Education**

#### **1. Parties**

This Contract is between [*insert name of local school board*], hereinafter referred to as the District, and the Colorado State Board of Education, hereinafter referred to as the State Board, to administer accreditation in accordance with part 2 of article 11 of title 22 and 1 CCR 301-1.

#### **2. Length of Contract**

This accreditation contract shall have a term of one year and shall be automatically renewed each year so long as the District remains in the accreditation category of “accredited with distinction”, “accredited”, or “accredited with improvement plan” as described in 1 CCR 301-1.

#### **3. Renegotiation**

The contract may be renegotiated at any time by the parties, based upon appropriate and reasonable changes in circumstances upon which the original terms of the contract were based.

#### **4. Attainment on Performance Indicators**

The District will be responsible for overseeing the academic programs offered in its schools and ensuring that those programs meet or exceed state and local expectations for levels of attainment on the four statewide performance indicators, and specified in 1 CCR 301-1.

#### **5. Adoption and Implementation of District Plan**

The District shall create, adopt and implement a Performance Plan, Improvement Plan, Priority Improvement Plan, or Turnaround Plan, whichever is required by the Colorado Department of Education (Department), in accordance with the time frames specified in 1 CCR 301-1. Said plan will conform to all of the requirements specified in 1 CCR 301-1. As required by 1 CCR 301-1, the District will be provided with an opportunity to appeal placement in the category of Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan or Accredited with Turnaround Plan.

#### **6. Accreditation of Public Schools and Adopting and Implementation of School Plans**

The District will implement a system of accrediting all of its schools. The system shall include accreditation categories that are comparable to the accreditation categories for school districts specified in section 22-11-207, C.R.S, meaning that the District’s accreditation system shall emphasize school attainment of the four statewide performance indicators, as described in 1 CCR 301-1, and may, in the District’s discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures adopted by the District. District accreditation systems also may include additional measures specifically for those schools that have been designated as Alternative Education Campuses, in accordance with the provisions of 1 CCR

301-57. The District will ensure that plans are implemented for each school in compliance with the requirements of the State Board pursuant to 1 CCR 301-1.

The District shall not permit a school to implement a Priority Improvement Plan and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a total of 5 consecutive school years before the District is required to restructure or close the school.

### **7. Accreditation of On-line Programs**

The District will implement a system of accrediting its certified full-time multi-district online programs that are authorized pursuant to article 30.7 of title 22, C.R.S. and to which the Department has assigned a school code and/or its full-time single-district online programs that are authorized pursuant to article 30.7 of title 22, C.R.S. and to which the Department has assigned a school code. This system shall emphasize school attainment on the four statewide performance indicators, as described in 1 CCR 301-1, as well as the extent to which the school has met the quality standards outlined in section 22-30.7-105, C.R.S. and made progress in implementing any corrective actions required pursuant to section 22-30.7-103(3)(m) C.R.S., and may, in the District's discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures adopted by the District.

### **8. Substantial and Good-Faith Compliance with Statutory and Regulatory Requirements**

The District will substantially comply with all statutory and regulatory requirements applicable to the District, including, but not limited to, the following:

- the provisions of article 44 of title 22 concerning budget and financial policies and procedures;
- the provisions of article 45 of title 22 concerning accounting and financial reporting; and
- the provisions of section 22-32-109.1 concerning school safety.

### **9. Consequences for Non-Compliance**

If the Department has reason to believe that the District is not in substantial compliance with one or more of the statutory or regulatory requirements applicable to the District, the Department shall notify the District that it has ninety (90) days after the date of notice to come into compliance. If, at the end of the ninety-day period, the Department finds the District is not substantially in compliance with the applicable statutory or regulatory requirements, meaning that the District has not yet taken the necessary measures to ensure that it shall meet the applicable legal requirements as soon as practicable, the District may be subject to the interventions specified in sections 22-11-207 through 22-11-210, C.R.S. If the District has failed to comply with the provisions of article 44 of title 22 or article 45 of title 22 and the District has not remedied the noncompliance within ninety (90) days and loss of accreditation is required to protect the interests of the students and parents of student enrolled in the District public schools, the Department may recommend to the State Board that the State Board remove the District's accreditation.

If the Department determines that the District has substantially failed to meet requirements specified in this accreditation contract and that immediate action is required to protect the interests of the students

and parents of students enrolled in the District’s public schools, the Department may change the District’s accreditation category prior to conclusion of the annual performance review. When the Department conducts its annual performance evaluation of the District’s performance, the Department will take into consideration the District’s compliance with the requirements specified in this accreditation contract before assigning the District to an accreditation category. The District will not be permitted to remain in the accreditation category of Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan and/or Accredited with Turnaround Plan for longer than a total of five (5) consecutive school years before having its accreditation removed.

**10. Monitoring Compliance with Contract**

For purposes of monitoring the District’s compliance with this contract, the Department may require the District to provide information or may conduct site visits as needed.

**11. Signatures**

Local School Board President

_____	_____
Signature	Date
District Superintendent	

_____	_____
Signature	Date
Colorado State Board of Education Chairman	

_____	_____
Signature	Date
Commissioner of the Colorado Department of Education	

_____	_____
Signature	Date

# Appendix C: District Accreditation Contract for District Accredited with Priority Improvement or Turnaround

## Colorado State Board of Education

### 1. Parties

This Contract is between [*insert name of local school board*], hereinafter referred to as the District, and the Colorado State Board of Education, hereinafter referred to as the State Board, to administer accreditation in accordance with part 2 of article 11 of title 22 and 1 CCR 301-1.

### 2. Length of Contract

This accreditation contract shall have a term of one year.

### 3. Renegotiation

The contract may be renegotiated at any time by the parties, based upon appropriate and reasonable changes in circumstances upon which the original terms of the contract were based.

### 4. Attainment on Performance Indicators

The District will be responsible for overseeing the academic programs offered in its schools and ensuring that those programs meet or exceed state and local expectations for levels of attainment on the four statewide performance indicators, and specified in 1 CCR 301-1.

### 5. Adoption and Implementation of District Plan

The District shall create, adopt and implement a Performance Plan, Improvement Plan, Priority Improvement Plan, or Turnaround Plan, whichever is required by the Colorado Department of Education (Department), in accordance with the time frames specified in 1 CCR 301-1. Said plan will conform to all of the requirements specified in 1 CCR 301-1. As required by 1 CCR 301-1, the District will be provided with an opportunity to appeal placement in the category of Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan or Accredited with Turnaround Plan.

### 6. Consequences of Continued Low-Performance

XX district was accredited with PI in 2012-13. The district will enter Year X of Priority Improvement or Turnaround status on July 1, 2013. In the event that the District remains in an accreditation category of either Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan or Accredited with Turnaround Plan in the [2013-14] and [2014-15] academic school years, the Department will recommend to the State Board that the State Board remove the District's accreditation, pursuant to section 22-11-209 (1), C.R.S. The State Board may not allow a District to remain in the category of either Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan or Accredited with Turnaround Plan for longer than a total of five (5) consecutive school years before



removing the District's accreditation. If the State Board removes the District's accreditation, the state Board will notify the District of which of the actions outlined in section 22-11-209 (2) (a), C.R.S. the District is required to take. After the District takes the required actions, the State Board will reinstate the District's accreditation at the accreditation category deemed appropriate by the State Board.

### **7. Accreditation of Public Schools and Adopting and Implementation of School Plans**

The District will implement a system of accrediting all of its schools. The system shall include accreditation categories that are comparable to the accreditation categories for school districts specified in section 22-11-207, C.R.S, meaning that the District's accreditation system shall emphasize school attainment of the four statewide performance indicators, as described in 1 CCR 301-1, and may, in the District's discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures adopted by the District. District accreditation systems also may include additional measures specifically for those schools that have been designated as Alternative Education Campuses, in accordance with the provisions of 1 CCR 301-57. The District will ensure that plans are implemented for each school in compliance with the requirements of the State Board pursuant to 1 CCR 301-1.

The District shall not permit a school to implement a Priority Improvement Plan and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a total of five (5) consecutive school years before the District is required to restructure or close the school.

### **8. Accreditation of On-line Programs**

The District will implement a system of accrediting its certified full-time multi-district online programs that are authorized pursuant to article 30.7 of title 22, C.R.S. and to which the Department has assigned a school code and/or its full-time single-district online programs that are authorized pursuant to article 30.7 of title 22, C.R.S. and to which the Department has assigned a school code. This system shall emphasize school attainment on the four statewide performance indicators, as described in 1 CCR 301-1, as well as the extent to which the school has met the quality standards outlined in section 22-30.7-105, C.R.S. and made progress in implementing any corrective actions required pursuant to section 22-30.7-103(3)(m) C.R.S., and may, in the District's discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures adopted by the District.

### **9. Substantial and Good-Faith Compliance with Statutory and Regulatory Requirements**

The District will substantially comply with all statutory and regulatory requirements applicable to the District, including, but not limited to, the following:

- the provisions of article 44 of title 22 concerning budget and financial policies and procedures;
- the provisions of article 45 of title 22 concerning accounting and financial reporting; and
- the provisions of section 22-32-109.1 concerning school safety.

**10. Consequences for Non-Compliance**

If the Department has reason to believe that the District is not in substantial compliance with one or more of the statutory or regulatory requirements applicable to the District, the Department shall notify the District that it has ninety (90) days after the date of notice to come into compliance. If, at the end of the ninety-day period, the Department finds the District is not substantially in compliance with the applicable statutory or regulatory requirements, meaning that the District has not yet taken the necessary measures to ensure that it shall meet the applicable legal requirements as soon as practicable, the District may be subject to the interventions specified in sections 22-11-207 through 22-11-210, C.R.S. If the District has failed to comply with the provisions of article 44 of title 22 or article 45 of title 22 and the District has not remedied the noncompliance within ninety (90) days and loss of accreditation is required to protect the interests of the students and parents of student enrolled in the District public schools, the Department may recommend to the State Board that the State Board remove the District’s accreditation.

If the Department determines that the District has substantially failed to meet requirements specified in this accreditation contract and that immediate action is required to protect the interests of the students and parents of students enrolled in the District’s public schools, the Department may change the District’s accreditation category prior to conclusion of the annual performance review. When the Department conducts its annual performance evaluation of the District’s performance, the Department will take into consideration the District’s compliance with the requirements specified in this accreditation contract before assigning the District to an accreditation category. The District will not be permitted to remain in the accreditation category of Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan and/or Accredited with Turnaround Plan for longer than a total of five (5) consecutive school years before having its accreditation removed.

**11. Monitoring Compliance with Contract**

For purposes of monitoring the District’s compliance with this contract, the Department may require the District to provide information or may conduct site visits as needed.

**12. Signatures**

Local School Board President

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

District Superintendent

---

Signature

---

Date

Colorado State Board of Education Chairman

---

Signature

---

Date

Commissioner of the Colorado Department of Education

---

Signature

---

Date

## Appendix D: Components of the District and School Performance Framework

<b>Achievement</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Proficiency rate</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % proficient/ advanced in TCAP, CoAlt, Lectura, and Escritura in:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reading</li> <li>- Mathematics</li> <li>- Writing</li> <li>- Science</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Growth</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Normative Growth</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Median Student Growth Percentiles (MGPs) in:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TCAP Reading, Math, Writing</li> <li>- English language proficiency (ACCESS for ELLs)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Criterion-referenced Growth</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Median Adequate Student Growth Percentiles (AGPs) in:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TCAP Reading, Math, Writing</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Growth Gaps</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Normative and Criterion-Referenced Growth for Disaggregated Student Groups</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MGPs and AGPs in:</li> <li>○ TCAP Reading, Math, Writing</li> <li>○ For the following student groups:</li> <li>○ Free/Reduced Lunch students</li> <li>○ Minority students</li> <li>○ Students with disabilities</li> <li>○ English learners</li> <li>○ Students needing to catch up</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Post-Secondary Workforce Readiness</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Graduation Rate</b></li> <li>• <b>Disaggregated Graduation Rate</b> for the following Student Groups:       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Free/Reduced Lunch students</li> <li>○ Minority students</li> <li>○ Students with disabilities</li> <li>○ English learners</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Dropout Rate</b></li> <li>• <b>Colorado ACT Composite Score</b></li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Test Participation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 95% participation in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Colorado ACT</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Test Administration Assurances</b></li> <li>• <b>Finance &amp; Safety</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Meet compliance requirements</li> <li>○ Applicable to districts only</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

# Appendix E: Sample District Performance Framework Report

## Annotated District Performance Framework Report

The four key performance indicators for which districts are held accountable.

Different indicators are worth different amounts of total framework points. For districts with data on all indicators, the total eligible points across all indicators is 100. For districts with incomplete data (because of small numbers of students), the total eligible points may be less than 100.

The percentage of points earned divided by points for which the district was eligible. See pages 2-4 for data used to calculate this percentage. This percentage determines the district's rating on this indicator.

The sum of the total framework points earned across all indicators.

### District Performance Framework 2013 - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

Level: EMH

District: MOSTLY REAL DISTRICT- DNM TEST-ADMIN - 9010

(All - 1 Year)

**Accredited w/Priority Improvement Plan**  
Will enter Year 2 of Priority Improvement or Turnaround

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>1</sup>
Academic Achievement	Approaching	52.1% ( 7.8 out of 15 points )
Academic Growth	Meets	77.8% ( 27.2 out of 35 points )
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	59.7% ( 9.0 out of 15 points )
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Meets	83.3% ( 29.2 out of 35 points )
Test Participation <sup>3</sup>	Meets 95% Participation Rate	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>73.2% ( 73.2 out of 100 points )</b>

This is the district's official accreditation rating, which is based on the 1 Year District Performance Framework. Districts are designated an accreditation category based on the overall percent of points earned for the official year. The official percent of points earned is matched to the scoring guide below to determine the accreditation category. Additionally, failing to meet finance, safety, test administration and/or test participation assurances will result in a lower accreditation category.

Accreditation Category	Framework Points Earned
Accred. w/Distinction	at or above 80%
Accredited	at or above 64% - below 80%
Accred. w/Improvement Plan	at or above 52% - below 64%
Accred. w/Priority Impr. Plan	at or above 42% - below 52%
Accred. w/Turnaround Plan	below 42%

Framework points are calculated using the percentage of points earned out of points eligible. For districts with data on all indicators, the total points possible are: 15 points for Academic Achievement, 35 for Academic Growth, 15 for Academic Growth Gaps, and 35 for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

\* on July 1, 2014

<sup>1</sup> Districts may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

<sup>2</sup> Districts do not receive points for test participation. However, districts are assigned one accreditation category lower than their points indicate if they do not (1) meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area (reading, writing, math, science and COACT), or (2) for districts serving multiple levels (elementary, middle and high school grades, e.g., a 6-12 school, meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area when individual content area rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

Finance<sup>4</sup> Meets Requirements

Safety<sup>4</sup> Meets Requirements

Test Administration<sup>5</sup> Does Not Meet

<sup>4</sup> Districts do not receive points for finance and safety assurances. However, districts that do not meet requirements in at least one area default to Accredited with Priority Improvement (or remain Accredited with Turnaround Plan) until they meet requirements.

<sup>5</sup> Districts found to have pervasive and egregious breaches to statewide assessment administration and security policies and procedures may also be subject to lowered accreditation ratings.

The accreditation category the State has assigned to the district based on the data presented in this report.

The framework is based on either the 1 or 3 year report. Refer to page 7.

### Test Participation Rates

Content Area	# of Students Tested				Participation Rating				Students Tested				Total Students			
	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.5%	98.5%	96.3%	98.3%	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	571	511	393	1476	574	519	408	1501
Mathematics	99.7%	98.5%	96.8%	98.7%	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	570	510	395	1478	572	518	408	1498
Writing	98.4%	98.7%	93.8%	97.4%	Meets	Meets	Does Not Meet	Meets	569	512	393	1476	578	519	419	1516
Science	98.9%	99.5%	97.1%	98.6%	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	185	181	198	565	187	182	204	573
Colorado ACT	-	-	97.4%	97.4%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	224	224	-	-	230	230

<sup>1</sup> The district has exceeded the 1% cap on the percent of students scoring proficient on the COALT assessment. This may indicate that the district is over-identifying students for the alternate content assessment. Scores that exceed the 1% cap do not count toward the district's overall score.

Districts that exceed the 1% cap of students scoring proficient on CoALT will receive a flag.

Districts that do not meet finance, safety or test administration requirements default to "Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan" or remain "Accredited with Turnaround Plan."

Districts that do not meet the 95% test participation rate for more than one subject area are assigned one accreditation category lower than what they would have earned.

The sum of the total framework points earned out of points for which the district was eligible is converted to a percentage. This helps determine the final accreditation category.

# Annotated DPF Report

ACCESS is the new English Language Proficiency Assessment, replacing CELApro.

This is the district's data for each metric on this performance indicator. The data are used to determine the number of points and the indicator ratings the district earned. How performance relates to points is described on pages 6 and 7.

Districts have separate pages for elementary, middle and high school level data.

Performance Indicators - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW								Level: Elementary
District: REAL DISTRICT 4 - 9004								(1 Year)
<b>Academic Achievement</b>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>	<i>District's Percentile</i>	
Reading	3	4		Meets	275	83.27	87	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	275	75.64	65	
Writing	3	4		Meets	276	61.59	73	
Science	3	4		Meets	91	56.04	67	
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
<b>Academic Growth</b>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
Reading	3	4		Meets	176	49	24	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	176	40	50	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	177	54	44	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
<b>Academic Growth Gaps</b>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Subgroup N</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
<b>Reading</b>	10	12	83.3%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	51	49	35	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	29	54	29	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	26	65	61	Yes
<b>Mathematics</b>	5	12	41.7%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	51	38	63	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	28	43	55	No
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	50	54	75	No
<b>Writing</b>	9	12	75%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	51	45	51	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	29	57	48	Yes
Students with Disabilities	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-
Students needing to catch up	4	4		Exceeds	69	68	58	Yes
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				

N<20 or N<16 is displayed when the minimum student N is not met.

# Annotated DPF Report

The district's points across sub-indicators are added together and converted to a percentage for this indicator. The percentage of points is then used to assign an indicator rating.

N refers to the number of students included in each sub-indicator.

Performance Indicators - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW							Level: Middle	
District: REAL DISTRICT 1 - 9001							(1 Year)	
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	11405	76.45	71	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	11149	66.63	86	
Writing	3	4		Meets	11412	66.48	79	
Science	3	4		Meets	3807	59.02	77	
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	10874	51	23	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	10635	50	54	No
Writing	3	4		Meets	10869	51	41	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	2	2		Exceeds	419	68	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>71.4%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				

Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
<b>Reading</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	3181	51	40	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	4896	51	32	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	1008	47	73	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	1288	52	46	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2457	51	65	No
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	3054	52	75	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	4761	52	66	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	995	49	95	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	1262	59	74	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2942	53	93	No
<b>Writing</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	3182	51	60	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	4891	52	50	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	1008	44	86	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	1290	56	64	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	3160	50	79	No
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>				

Growth gaps are calculated for five different subgroups in three subject areas. Each row shows the median growth percentile and the adequate median growth percentile needed for students to reach or maintain proficiency.

# Annotated DPF Report

The English language proficiency growth rating is determined only by the median growth percentile for 2013.

The district can earn between 1 and 4 points for each metric based on the rating assigned. Ratings are assigned through the rubrics on page 6.

Performance Indicators – PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW								Level: High
District: REAL DISTRICT 2 - 9002								(1 Year)
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile	
Reading	3	4		Meets	2448	84.15	87	
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	2448	55.68	95	
Writing	4	4		Exceeds	2446	69.01	91	
Science	4	4		Exceeds	1247	73.06	94	
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>				
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	2256	55	7	Yes
Mathematics	4	4		Exceeds	2248	60	53	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	2256	57	27	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2		Approaching	68	52	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
<b>Reading</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	361	55	28	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	473	54	16	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	182	50	86	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	124	55	46	Yes
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	413	55	68	No
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	360	58	94	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	471	58	84	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	183	52	99	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	124	60	97	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	810	64	99	No
<b>Writing</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	361	50	68	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	473	55	49	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	183	44	98	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	124	55	81	No
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	636	55	88	No
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>68.3%</b>	<b>Meets</b>				
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Rate/Score	Expectation	
Graduation Rate: 4yr/5yr/6yr/7yr	4	4		Exceeds	1376/1386/1344/1406	89.2/90.2/90/91.3%	80%	
Disaggregated Graduation Rate	2.25	4	56.3%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0.5	1		Approaching	179/170/170/147	71.5/74.1/72.9/66.7%	80%	
Minority Students	0.75	1		Meets	252/189/188/189	79/83.1/80.9/77.2%	80%	
Students with Disabilities	0.5	1		Approaching	124/127/133/132	62.9/71.7/69.9/75.8%	80%	
English Learners	0.5	1		Approaching	41/38/41/47	73.2/76.3/58.5/70.2%	80%	
Dropout Rate	4	4		Exceeds	8338	0.7%	3.6%	
Colorado ACT Composite Score	4	4		Exceeds	1309	22.5	20	
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.25</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>89.1%</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>				

The ratings for the Growth and Growth Gaps indicators are determined by the median growth percentile and the median adequate growth percentile. See pages 6 and 7 for details regarding how these metrics result in different ratings.



# Annotated DPF Report

This page has been moved to follow the Performance Indicators page in order to keep all pages with district data together.

## Graduation Rates – PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

Level: High

### Graduation and Disaggregated Graduation Rates

The District Performance Framework reports use the 4-, 5-, 6- and 7-year graduation rates for the district and disaggregated student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities and English learners).

This District's Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate  
Overall Graduation Rate (1-year)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Overall Graduation Rate (1-year)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	43.1	49.6	51.5	53
2010	46.4	53.2	55.8	
2011	51.8	<b>58.5</b>		
2012	56.1			

Overall Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Overall Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	43.1	49.6	51.5	53
2010	46.4	53.2	55.8	
2011	51.8	58.5		
2012	56.1			
Aggregated	49.2	<b>53.7</b>	53.7	53

These tables show the 4, 5, 6, and 7-year graduation rates for the district overall and for disaggregated student groups. This page provides more detailed trend data than included in the PWR section.

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (1-year)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (1-year)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	39.7	46.6	49.2	50.8
2010	40.3	49.2	52.6	
2011	47.7	<b>55.8</b>		
2012	51.9			

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	39.7	46.6	49.2	50.8
2010	40.3	49.2	52.6	
2011	47.7	55.8		
2012	51.9			
Aggregated	45	<b>50.6</b>	<b>50.9</b>	50.8

The gray boxes refer to the 4,5,6, and 7-year grad rates used to determine the "best of" rate.

Minority Student Graduation Rate (1-year)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Minority Student Graduation Rate (1-year)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	38.3	46.1	48.4	49.8
2010	41.8	50	52.7	
2011	49	<b>56.3</b>		
2012	53.5			

Minority Student Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Minority Student Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	38.3	46.1	48.4	49.8
2010	41.8	50	52.7	
2011	49	56.3		
2012	53.5			
Aggregated	45.5	<b>50.7</b>	50.5	49.8

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (1-year)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (1-year)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	32.2	39.3	43	47.3
2010	31.1	41.1	<b>48.4</b>	
2011	34.4	44.7		
2012	38.9			

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	32.2	39.3	43	47.3
2010	31.1	41.1	48.4	
2011	34.4	44.7		
2012	38.9			
Aggregated	34	41.7	45.8	<b>47.3</b>

Red italics designate the "best of" grad rate among the 4, 5, 6, and 7-year rates.

English Learners Graduation Rate (1-year)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	English Learners Graduation Rate (1-year)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	36.3	49.2	52.3	<b>53.5</b>
2010	39.4	49.4	53.4	
2011	42.5	52.9		
2012	47.2			

English Learners Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

Anticipated Year of Graduation	English Learners Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)			
	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2009	36.3	49.2	52.3	53.5
2010	39.4	49.4	53.4	
2011	42.5	52.9		
2012	47.2			
Aggregated	40.2	50.1	52.8	<b>53.5</b>

Colorado calculates "on-time" graduation as the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. A student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. The formula anticipates, for example, that a student who entered ninth grade in fall 2006 would graduate with the Class of 2010.

For the 1-year DPF, districts earn points based on the highest value among the following: 2012 4-year graduation rate, 2011 5-year graduation rate, 2010 6-year graduation rate and 2009 7-year graduation rate (the shaded cells in the tables on the left). For the 3-year DPF, districts earn points based on the highest value among the following: aggregated 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 4-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009, 2010 and 2011 5-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009 and 2010 6-year graduation rate, or 2009 7-year graduation rate. For each of these rates, the aggregation is the result of adding the graduation totals for all available years and dividing by the sum of the graduation bases across all available years. For both 1-year and 3-year DPFs, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized here and on the Performance Indicators detail page.

# Annotated DPF Report

The "No AGP" section refers only to English language proficiency growth for the 2013 DPF

Scoring Guide - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW Overall district framework points are an aggregate of EMH levels. **Level: EMH**

## Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the District Performance Framework Report

Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide	Rating	Point Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points			
Academic Achievement	<i>The district's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:</i>		TCAP	16 (4 for each content area)	15			
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all districts (using 2009-10 baseline).	Exceeds	4					
	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all districts (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets	3					
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all districts (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching	2					
	• below the 15th percentile of all districts (using 2009-10 baseline).	Does Not Meet	1					
Academic Growth	<i>Made AGP</i>	<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>	<i>No AGP</i>	TCAP	ACCESS	14 (4 for each subject area and 2 for English language proficiency)	35	
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.	• at or above 65.	Exceeds	4			2
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.	• below 65 but at or above 50.	Meets	3			1.5
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.	• below 50 but at or above 35.	Approaching	2			1
	• below 30.	• below 40.	• below 35.	Does Not Meet	1			0.5
Academic Growth Gaps	<i>Made AGP</i>	<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>		TCAP		60 (4 for each of 5 subgroups in 3 subject areas)	15	
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.		Exceeds	4			
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.		Meets	3			
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching	2			
	• below 30.	• below 40.		Does Not Meet	1			
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	<i>Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate: The district's graduation rate/disaggregated graduation rate was:</i>			Overall	Disaggr.	16 (4 for each sub-indicator)	35	
	• at or above 90%.			Exceeds	4			1
	• at or above 80% but below 90%.			Meets	3			0.75
	• at or above 65% but below 80%.			Approaching	2			0.5
	• below 65%.			Does Not Meet	1			0.25
	<i>Dropout Rate: The district's dropout rate was:</i>							
	• at or below 1%.			Exceeds	4			
	• at or below the state average but above 1% (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3			
	• at or below 10% but above the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2			
	• above 10%.			Does Not Meet	1			
	<i>Colorado ACT Composite Score: The district's average Colorado ACT composite score was:</i>							
	• at or above 22.			Exceeds	4			
	• at or above the state average but below 22 (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3			
• at or above 17 but below the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2				
• below 17.			Does Not Meet	1				

### Cut-Points for Each Performance Indicator Cut-Points for Accreditation Category Assignment

Performance Indicator	Cut Point: The district earned ... of the points eligible on this indicator.	Rating	Total Framework Points	Cut Point: The district earned ... of the total framework points eligible.	Accreditation Category
Achievement; Growth; Growth Gaps; Postsecondary Readiness	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds	Total Framework Points	• at or above 80%	Distinction
	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets		• at or above 64% - below 80%	Accredited
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching		• at or above 52% - below 64%	Improvement
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• at or above 42% - below 52%	Priority Improvement
				• below 42%	Turnaround

### District Plan Type Assignments

Plan Type	Plan description
Accred. w/Distinction	The district is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.
Accredited	The district is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.
Accred. w/Improvement Plan	The district is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.
Accred. w/Priority Impr. Plan	The district is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.
Accred. w/Turnaround Plan	The district is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.

A district may not be accredited with a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the State Board of Education is required to restructure or close the district. The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the district is notified that it is Accredited with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.

# Annotated DPF Report

## Reference - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

### 1-year vs. 3-year Report

Districts receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated District Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more districts to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small districts may not have public data on the basis of a single year because of small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count. Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) will be the official accreditation category for the district: the one under which the district has ratings on a greater number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it earned a higher total percent of points. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available.

### Reference Data for Key Performance Indicators

#### Academic Achievement

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a district's proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoALT in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.

Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Districts	175	165	167	176	165	167	175	165	167	133	135	138
15th percentile	59.26	58.87	57.14	57.99	34.46	18.30	38.48	42.37				
50th percentile	71.51	70.50	71.53	70.51	50.00	32.16	54.72	56.36				
90th percentile	84.37	83.57	84.78	84.60	68.84	52.06	69.66	72.27				

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregate

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Districts	181	182	183	181	182	182	181	182				
15th percentile	60.45	56.61	57.63	56.84	36.37	17.78	41.44	41.85	33.82	32.93	30.02	31.43
50th percentile	72.19	69.22	71.31	70.37	49.11	30.51	55.78	56.80	49.70	47.50	46.81	49.18
90th percentile	85.16	81.53	83.80	83.42	65.33	48.02	71.02	70.87	67.71	66.52	65.86	67.31

Use this data in conjunction with the Academic Achievement section of the Scoring Guide, comparing your district's percent proficient/advanced to Colorado's percent proficient/advanced, to understand the ratings assigned.

#### Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

This is a visual representation of the rubric for the Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps section of the Scoring Guide. Use the column that matches with whether your district met or did not meet adequate growth.

The median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the district met adequate growth (AGP). For 2012-13, Adequate Growth cannot be calculated for English language proficiency therefore English language proficiency growth is determined only by the median growth percentile.

	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP	No AGP
Exceeds	60-99	70-99	65-99
Meets	45-59	55-69	50-64
Approaching	30-44	40-54	35-49
Does Not Meet	1-29	1-39	1-34

The No AGP column has been added for the 2013 DPF for English Language proficiency (ACCESS) growth.

The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator disaggregates the results of the Academic Growth Indicator, measuring the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English learners) and students needing to catch up.

#### Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator measures the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates, dropout rates, and mean Colorado ACT (COACT) composite scores.

State Mean Dropout Rate (2009-10 baseline)


	N of Students	Mean Rate
1-year (2009)	416,953	3.6
3-year (2007-09)	1,238,096	3.9

State Mean COACT Composite Score

	Mean Score
1-year (2010)	20.5
3-year (2008-10)	20.5


Use this data in conjunction with the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness section of the Scoring Guide, comparing your district's results to the Colorado dropout rate and average ACT composite score, to understand the ratings assigned.

## Appendix F: Timelines for District Accreditation and Plan Submission



## Appendix G: Process for Reviewing

### District Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans



(Light green boxes indicates district action; dark blue boxes indicates state action.)

# Appendix H: Sample School Performance Framework Reports

## Annotated School Performance Framework Report (Elementary/Middle School)

The three key performance indicators for which elementary and middle schools are held accountable.

The percentage of points earned out of the points for which the school was eligible. See page 2 for data used to calculate this percentage. This percentage determines the school's rating on this indicator.

Different indicators are worth different amounts of total framework points. For schools with data on all indicators, the total eligible points across all indicators is 100. For schools with incomplete data (because of small numbers of students), the total eligible points may be less than 100.

**School Performance Framework 2013 - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW** Level: E  
 School: MOSTLY REAL SCHOOL-E- TEST ADMIN - 9989 District: REAL DISTRICT ANOMALIES - 0002 (1 Year)

**Priority Improvement**  
 Entering Year 1\* of Priority Improvement or Turnaround

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement, based on the 3 Year School Performance Framework. Schools are assigned a plan type based on the overall percent of points earned for the official year. The official percent of points earned is matched to the scoring guide below to determine the plan type. Additionally, failing to meet test administration and/or test participation assurances will result in a lower plan type category.

Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned
Performance	at or above 59%
Improvement	at or above 47% - below 59%
Priority Improvement	at or above 37% - below 47%
Turnaround	below 37%

Framework points are calculated using the percentage of points earned out of points eligible. For schools with data on all indicators, the total points possible are: 35 points for Academic Achievement, 50 for Academic Growth, and 25 for Academic Growth Gaps.

\* on July 1, 2014

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>	
Academic Achievement	Meets	75.0% ( 18.8 out of 25 points )	
Academic Growth	Meets	75.0% ( 37.5 out of 50 points )	
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	58.3% ( 14.6 out of 25 points )	
Test Participation <sup>3</sup>	Meets 95% Participation Rate		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>70.9%</b> ( 70.9 out of 100 points )	

<sup>2</sup>Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

<sup>3</sup>Schools do not receive points for test participation. However, schools are assigned one plan category lower than their points indicate if they do not (1) meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area (reading, writing, math, science and COACT), or (2) for schools serving multiple levels (elementary, middle and high school grades, e.g., a 6-12 school), meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area when individual content area participation rates are reported for each content area (elementary, middle and high school grades).

Test Administration<sup>4</sup> **Does Not Meet**

<sup>4</sup>Schools found to have pervasive and egregious breaches to statewide assessment administration and security policies and procedures, may also be subject to lowered plan types.

Schools that do not meet test administration requirements default to a "Priority Improvement Plan", or remain on a "Turnaround Plan"

Content Area	% of Students Tested				Participation Rating				Students Tested				Total Students			
	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	303	-	-	303	304	-	-	304
Mathematics	99.7%	-	-	99.7%	Meets	-	-	Meets	303	-	-	303	304	-	-	304
Writing	99.3%	-	-	99.3%	Meets	-	-	Meets	303	-	-	302	304	-	-	304
Science	100.0%	-	-	100.0%	Meets	-	-	Meets	-	-	97	97	-	-	-	97
Colorado ACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Schools that do not meet the 95% test participation rate for more than one subject area are assigned a plan one category lower than what they would have earned.

The sum of the total framework points earned across all indicators.

The type of plan the state has assigned to the school to implement, based on the data presented in this report.

The framework is based on either the 1 or 3 year report. Refer to page 4.

The sum of the total framework points earned out of points for which the school was eligible is converted to a percentage. This helps determine the final plan assignment.

# Annotated SPF Report (Elementary/Middle School)

The school can earn between 1 and 4 points for each metric depending on its rating. Schools with too few students may have fewer points eligible.

This is the school's data for each metric on this performance indicator. The data is used to determine the number of points and the indicator ratings the school earned. How performance relates to points is described on page 3.

The school's points are added together and converted to a percentage for this indicator. This percentage is shown on page 1 as the school's overall rating on this indicator.

Performance Indicators - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW								Level: Elementary	
School: MOSTLY REAL SCHOOL-E- TEST ADMIN - 9989								District: REAL DISTRICT ANOMALIES - 0002 (1 Year)	
Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile		
Reading	3	4		Meets	287	83.62	78		
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	287	82.58	77		
Writing	3	4		Meets	286	63.99	70		
Science	3	4		Meets	93	74.19	87		
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Meets</b>					
Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?	
Reading	3	4		Meets	172	54	19	Yes	
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	173	45	35	Yes	
Writing	3	4		Meets	172	57	37	Yes	
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-	
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>Meets</b>					
Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?	
<b>Reading</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>81.3%</b>	<b>Meets</b>					
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	27	47	28	Yes	
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	51	54	20	Yes	
Students with Disabilities	4	4		Exceeds	21	67	49	Yes	
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-	
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	32	58	61	No	
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>43.8%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>					
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	27	50	60	No	
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	51	42	44	No	
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	21	41	70	No	
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-	
Students needing to catch up	1	4		Does Not Meet	30	38	74	No	
<b>Writing</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>					
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	27	34	44	No	
Minority Students	1	4		Does Not Meet	51	39	40	No	
Students with Disabilities	3	4		Meets	21	58	68	No	
English Learners	0	0		-	N<20	-	-	-	
Students needing to catch up	3	4		Meets	53	58	60	No	
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>					

Growth gaps are calculated for five different subgroups in three subject areas. Each row shows the median growth percentile and the adequate median growth percentile needed for students to reach or maintain proficiency.

ACCESS is the new English Language Proficiency Assessment, replacing CELApro.

N refers to the number of students included in each sub-indicator.

The ratings for the Growth and Growth Gaps indicators are determined by the median growth percentile and the median adequate growth percentile. See page 3 for details regarding how these metrics result in different ratings.

# Annotated SPF Report (Elementary/Middle School)

The "No AGP" section refers only to English language proficiency growth for the 2013 DPF

Elementary and middle schools have a different scoring guide than high schools that does not include a Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness indicator.

**Scoring Guide - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW** **Level: E**

**Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report**

Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide	Rating	Point Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points		
Academic Achievement	<i>The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:</i>		TCAP	16 (4 for each subject area)	25		
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Exceeds	4				
	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets	3				
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching	2				
	• below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).	Does Not Meet	1				
Academic Growth	<i>Made AGP</i>	<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>	<i>No AGP</i>	TCAP	ACCESS	14 (4 for each subject area and 2 for English language proficiency)	50
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.	• at or above 65.	4	2		
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.	• below 65 but at or above 50.	3	1.5		
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.	• below 50 but at or above 35.	2	1		
	• below 30.	• below 40.	• below 35.	1	0.5		
Academic Growth Gaps	<i>Made AGP</i>	<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>		TCAP		60 (4 for each of 5 subgroups in 3 subject areas)	25
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.		4			
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.		3			
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.		2			
	• below 30.	• below 40.		1			

Cut-Points for Each Performance Indicator			Cut-Points for Plan Type Assignment		
	<i>Cut Point: The school earned ... of the points eligible on this indicator.</i>			<i>Cut Point: The school earned ... of the total framework points eligible.</i>	
Achievement Growth; Growth Gaps	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds	Total Framework Points	• at or above 59%	Performance
	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets		• at or above 47% - below 59%	Improvement
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching		• at or above 37% - below 47%	Priority Improvement
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 37%	Turnaround

School Plan Type Assignments		
	<i>Plan description</i>	
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.	A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.	
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.	
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.	



# Annotated SPF Report (Elementary/Middle School)

## Reference - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

### 1-year vs. 3-year Report

Schools receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated School Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more schools to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small schools may not have public data on the basis of a single year because of small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count. Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) will be the official plan type category for the school: the one under which the school has ratings on a greater number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it earned a higher total percent of points. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available.

### Reference Data for Key Performance Indicators

#### Academic Achievement

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.

Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1008	479	327	1007	480	327	1007	480	327	912	407	286
15th percentile	49.18	50.44	54.92	48.60	29.72	15.97	32.48	34.96	38.05	19.67	23.85	27.59
50th percentile	71.65	71.43	73.33	70.89	52.48	33.52	53.52	57.71	53.52	48.72	48.72	50.00
90th percentile	89.10	88.24	87.23	89.34	75.00	54.79	76.83	79.61	76.83	71.00	71.26	71.45

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregate

	Reading			Math			Writing		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1032	507	362	1032	507	361	1032	507	361
15th percentile	50.00	50.56	53.34	48.73	29.69	13.49	32.56	36.84	30.00
50th percentile	72.05	71.35	72.21	70.11	51.63	30.53	54.84	58.34	49.57
90th percentile	88.21	87.40	86.17	87.48	74.41	52.19	76.51	79.17	71.00

Use this data in conjunction with the Academic Achievement section of the Scoring Guide, comparing your district's percent proficient/advanced to Colorado's percent proficient/advanced, to understand the ratings assigned.

#### Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

This is a visual representation of the rubric the Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps section of the Scoring Guide. Use the column that matches with whether your district met or did not meet adequate growth.

required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth (AGP). For 2012-13, Adequate Growth cannot be calculated for English language proficiency therefore English language proficiency growth is determined only by the median growth percentile.

	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP	No AGP
Exceeds	60-99	70-99	65-99
Meets	45-59	55-69	50-64
Approaching	30-44	40-54	35-49
Does Not Meet	1-29	1-39	1-34

The No AGP column has been added for the 2013 DPF for English Language proficiency (ACCESS) growth.

The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator disaggregates the results of the Academic Growth Indicator, measuring the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English learners) and students needing to catch up.

#### Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator measures the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates, dropout rates, and mean Colorado ACT (COACT) composite scores.

State Mean Dropout Rate (2009-10 baseline)

	N of Students	Mean Rate
1-year (2009)	416,953	3.6
3-year (2007-08)		

State Mean COACT

1-year (2010)		
3-year (2008-10)		

Use this data in conjunction with the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness section of the Scoring Guide, comparing your district's results to the Colorado dropout rate and average ACT composite score, to understand the ratings assigned.

# Annotated School Performance Framework Report (High School)

The four key performance indicators for which schools are held accountable.

The percentage of points earned out of the points for which the school was eligible. See page 2 for data used to calculate this percentage. This percentage determines the school's rating on this indicator.

Different indicators are worth different amounts of total framework points. For schools with data on all indicators, the total eligible points across all indicators is 100. For schools with incomplete data (because of small numbers of students), the total eligible points may be less than 100.

**School Performance Framework 2013 - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW** Level: **H**

School: REAL SCHOOL-H - 0003 District: REAL DISTRICTS - 0001 (1 Year)

Improvement	Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible <sup>2</sup>											
<p>This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement, based on the 1 Year School Performance Framework. Schools are assigned a plan type based on the overall percent of points earned for the official year. The official percent of points earned is matched to the scoring guide below to determine the plan type. Additionally, failing to meet test administration and/or test participation assurances will result in a lower plan type category.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Plan Assignment</th> <th>Framework Points Earned</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Performance</td> <td>at or above 60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Improvement</td> <td>at or above 47% - below 60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Priority Improvement</td> <td>at or above 33% - below 47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Turnaround</td> <td>below 33%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Framework points are calculated using the percentage of points earned out of points eligible. For schools with data on all indicators, the total points possible are: 15 points for Academic Achievement, 35 for Academic Growth, 15 for Academic Growth Gaps, and 35 for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.</p>	Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned	Performance	at or above 60%	Improvement	at or above 47% - below 60%	Priority Improvement	at or above 33% - below 47%	Turnaround	below 33%	Academic Achievement	Approaching	50.0% ( 7.5 out of 15 points)	<div style="width: 50%; background-color: black;"></div>
	Plan Assignment	Framework Points Earned												
	Performance	at or above 60%												
	Improvement	at or above 47% - below 60%												
	Priority Improvement	at or above 33% - below 47%												
Turnaround	below 33%													
Academic Growth	Approaching	60.7% ( 21.2 out of 35 points)	<div style="width: 60.7%; background-color: black;"></div>											
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	56.7% ( 8.5 out of 15 points)	<div style="width: 56.7%; background-color: black;"></div>											
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Approaching	60.9% ( 21.3 out of 35 points)	<div style="width: 60.9%; background-color: black;"></div>											
Test Participation <sup>3</sup>		Meets 95% Participation Rate												
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>58.5% ( 58.5 out of 100 points)</b>	<div style="width: 58.5%; background-color: black;"></div>										

<sup>1</sup>Schools may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

<sup>2</sup>Schools do not receive points for test participation. However, schools are assigned one plan category lower than their points indicate if they do not (1) meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area (reading, writing, math, science and COACT), or (2) for schools serving multiple levels (elementary, middle and high school grades, e.g., a 6-12 school), meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area when individual content area rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

Content Area	% of Students Tested				Participation Rating				Students Tested				Total Students			
	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	-	-	95.3%	95.3%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	1103	1103	-	-	1158	1158
Mathematics	-	-	95.5%	95.5%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	1106	1106	-	-	1158	1158
Writing	-	-	96.6%	96.6%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	1119	1119	-	-	1158	1158
Science	-	-	96.7%	96.7%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	555	555	-	-	574	574
Colorado ACT	-	-	99.0%	99.0%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	474	474	-	-	479	479

The type of plan the state has assigned to the school to implement, based on the data presented in this report.

The framework is based on either the 1 or 3 year report. Refer to page 5.

Schools that do not meet the 95% test participation rate for more than one subject area are assigned a plan one category lower than what they would have earned.

The sum of the total framework points earned out of points for which the school was eligible is converted to a percentage. This help determine the final plan assignment.

The sum of the total framework points earned across all indicators.

# Annotated SPF Report(High School)

ACCESS is the new English Language Proficiency Assessment, replacing CELApro.

The school can earn between 1 and 4 points for each metric depending on its rating. Schools with too few students may have fewer points eligible.

This is the school's data for each metric on this performance indicator. The data are used to determine the number of points and the indicator ratings the school earned. How performance relates to points is described on page 4.

The school's points are added together and converted to a percentage for this indicator. This percentage is shown on page 1 as the school's overall rating on this indicator.

Growth gaps are calculated for five different subgroups in three subject areas. Each row shows the median growth percentile and the adequate median growth percentile needed for students to reach or maintain proficiency.

The ratings for the Growth and Growth Gaps indicators are determined by the median growth percentile and the median adequate growth percentile. See page 3 for details regarding how these metrics result in different ratings.

N refers to the number of students included in each sub-indicator.

Performance Indicators - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW										Level: High
School: REAL SCHOOL-H - 0003										District: REAL DISTRICTS - 0001 (1 Year)
<b>Academic Achievement</b>	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	School's Percentile			
Reading	2	4		Approaching	1053	61.35	24			
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	1058	23.72	28			
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1067	39.64	29			
Science	2	4		Approaching	522	34.1	23			
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>						
<b>Academic Growth</b>	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?		
Reading	3	4		Meets	991	55	31	Yes		
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	994	40	96	No		
Writing	2	4		Approaching	1002	51	70	No		
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2		Meets	97	61	-	-		
<b>Total</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>						
<b>Academic Growth Gaps</b>	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?		
<b>Reading</b>	13	20	65%	Meets						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	582	54		Yes		
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	739	55		Yes		
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	84	52		No		
English Learners	3	4		Meets	188	57		No		
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	412	54	80	No		
<b>Mathematics</b>	10	20	50%	Approaching						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	583	41	99	No		
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	741	40	98	No		
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	84	45	99	No		
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	188	44	99	No		
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	609	41	99	No		
<b>Writing</b>	11	20	55%	Approaching						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	587	51	81	No		
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	748	52	78	No		
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	85	48	99	No		
English Learners	3	4		Meets	198	58	94	No		
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	555	53	94	No		
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>56.7%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>						
<b>Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness</b>	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Rate/Score	Expectation			
Graduation Rate: 4yr/5yr/6yr/7yr	3	4		Meets	510/511/512/525	78.6/81.4/77.1/76.4%	80%			
Disaggregated Graduation Rate	2.75	4	68.8%	Meets						
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0.75	1		Meets	313/268/246/230	79.9/83.6/78.5/73%	80%			
Minority Students	0.75	1		Meets	374/340/332/331	78.6/80.9/76.8/76.1%	80%			
Students with Disabilities	0.5	1		Approaching	58/53/52/56	60.3/50.9/69.2/71.4%	80%			
English Learners	0.75	1		Meets	39/55/48/56	74.4/85.5/75/64.3%	80%			
Dropout Rate	2	4		Approaching	2688	4.1%	3.6%			
Colorado ACT Composite Score	2	4		Approaching	474	18.2	20			
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.75</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>60.9%</b>	<b>Approaching</b>						

The English language proficiency growth rating is determined only by the median growth percentile for 2013.

# Annotated SPF Report (High School)

Graduation Rates - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

This page has been moved to follow the Performance Indicators page in order to keep all pages with district data together.

Level: High

## Graduation and Disaggregated Graduation Rates

The School Performance Framework reports use the 4-, 5-, 6- and 7-year graduation rates for the school and disaggregated student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities and English learners).

This School's Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate:

Overall Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	68.1	74.2	75.1	76.4
	2010	69	74.4	77.1	
	2011	75.6	<b><i>81.4</i></b>		
	2012	78.6			

Overall Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	68.1	74.2	75.1	76.4
	2010	69	74.4	77.1	
	2011	75.6	81.4		
	2012	78.6			
	Aggregated	72.8	<b><i>76.7</i></b>	76.1	76.4

These tables show the 4, 5, 6, and 7-year graduation rates for the district overall and for disaggregated student groups. This page provides more detailed trend data than included in the PWR section.

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	61	69	71	73
	2010	66.1	74.4	78.5	
	2011	75.9	<b><i>83.6</i></b>		
	2012	79.9			

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	61	69	71	73
	2010	66.1	74.4	78.5	
	2011	75.9	83.6		
	2012	79.9			
	Aggregated	71.6	<b><i>76</i></b>	74.8	73

Colorado calculates "on-time" graduation as the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. A student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. The formula anticipates, for example, that a student who entered ninth grade in fall 2006 would graduate with the Class of 2010.

Minority Student Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	66.2	73.7	75.3	76.1
	2010	67.5	74.3	76.8	
	2011	74.5	<b><i>80.9</i></b>		
	2012	78.6			

Minority Student Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	66.2	73.7	75.3	76.1
	2010	67.5	74.3	76.8	
	2011	74.5	80.9		
	2012	78.6			
	Aggregated	71.9	<b><i>76.3</i></b>	76.1	76.1

For the 1-year SPF, schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: 2012 4-year graduation rate, 2011 5-year graduation rate, 2010 6-year graduation rate and 2009 7-year graduation rate (the shaded cells in the tables on the left). For the 3-year SPF, schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: aggregated 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 4-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009, 2010 and 2011 5-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009 and 2010 6-year graduation rate, or 2009 7-year graduation rate. For each of these rates, the aggregation is the result of adding the graduation totals for all available years and dividing by the sum of the graduation bases across all available years. For both 1-year and 3-year SPFs, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized here and on the Performance Indicators detail page.

The gray boxes refer to the 4,5,6, and 7-year grad rates used to determine the "best of" rate.

Red italics designate the "best of" grad rate among the 4, 5, 6, and 7-year rates.

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	39.3	56.1	62.5	<b><i>71.4</i></b>
	2010	42.3	52.8	69.2	
	2011	32.7	50.9		
	2012	60.3			

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	39.3	56.1	62.5	71.4
	2010	42.3	52.8	69.2	
	2011	32.7	50.9		
	2012	60.3			
	Aggregated	44.2	53.4	65.7	<b><i>71.4</i></b>

English Learners Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	55.2	64.3	64.3	64.3
	2010	60.4	72.9	75	
	2011	75.9	<b><i>85.5</i></b>		
	2012	74.4			

English Learners Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	55.2	64.3	64.3	64.3
	2010	60.4	72.9	75	
	2011	75.9	85.5		
	2012	74.4			
	Aggregated	66	<b><i>74.2</i></b>	69.2	64.3

# Annotated SPF Report (High School)

The "No AGP" section refers only to English language proficiency growth for the 2013 DPF

Scoring Guide - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW						Level: H		
Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report								
Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide			Rating	Point Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points	
Academic Achievement	<i>The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:</i>				TCAP	16 (4 for each subject area)	15	
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			Exceeds	4			
	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3			
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2			
Academic Growth	<i>Made AGP</i>		<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>	<i>No AGP</i>	TCAP	14 (4 for each subject area and 2 for English language proficiency)	35	
	• at or above 60.		• at or above 70.	• at or above 65.	Exceeds			4
	• below 60 but at or above 45.		• below 70 but at or above 55.	• below 65 but at or above 50.	Meets			3
	• below 45 but at or above 30.		• below 55 but at or above 40.	• below 50 but at or above 35.	Approaching			2
	• below 30.		• below 40.	• below 35.	Does Not Meet			1
					ACCESS			2
								1.5
Academic Growth Gaps	<i>Made AGP</i>		<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>		TCAP	60 (4 for each of 5 subgroups in 3 subject areas)	15	
	• at or above 60.		• at or above 70.		Exceeds			4
	• below 60 but at or above 45.		• below 70 but at or above 55.		Meets			3
	• below 45 but at or above 30.		• below 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching			2
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	<i>Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate: The school's graduation rate/disaggregated graduation rate was:</i>				Overall	Disaggr.	16 (4 for each sub-indicator)	35
	• at or above 90%.			Exceeds	4	1		
	• at or above 80% but below 90%.			Meets	3	0.75		
	• at or above 65% but below 80%.			Approaching	2	0.5		
	• below 65%.			Does Not Meet	1	0.25		
	<i>Dropout Rate: The school's dropout rate was:</i>							
	• at or below 1%.			Exceeds	4			
	• at or below the state average but above 1% (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3			
	• at or below 10% but above the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2			
	• above 10%.			Does Not Meet	1			
	<i>Colorado ACT Composite Score: The school's average Colorado ACT composite score was:</i>							
	• at or above 22.			Exceeds	4			
• at or above the state average but below 22 (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3				
• at or above 17 but below the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2				
• below 17.			Does Not Meet	1				

Elementary and middle schools have a different scoring guide than high schools, since high schools include a Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness indicator.

Cut-Points for Each Performance Indicator			Cut-Points for Plan Type Assignment		
Performance Indicator	Cut Point: The school earned ... of the points eligible on this indicator.	Rating	Total Framework Points	Cut Point: The school earned ... of the total framework points eligible.	Plan Type
Achievement; Growth; Growth Gaps; Postsecondary Readiness	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds	Total Framework Points	• at or above 60%	Performance
	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets		• at or above 47% - below 60%	Improvement
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching		• at or above 33% - below 47%	Priority Improvement
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet		• below 33%	Turnaround

School Plan Type Assignments		
Plan Type	Plan description	Notes
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.	A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.	
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.	
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.	

# Annotated SPF Report (High School)

Reference - PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISTRICT REVIEW

## 1-year vs. 3-year Report

Schools receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated School Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more schools to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small schools may not have public data on the basis of a single year because of small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count. Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) will be the official plan type category for the school; the one under which the school has ratings on a greater number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it earned a higher total percent of points. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available.

## Reference Data for Key Performance Indicators

### Academic Achievement

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.

Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1008	479	327	1007	480	327	1007	480	327	912	407	286
15th percentile	49.18	50.44	54.92	48.60	29.72	15.97	32.48	34.96	30.95	19.67	23.85	27.50
50th percentile	71.65	71.43	73.33	70.89	52.48	33.52	53.52	57.71	53.52	49.57	45.36	50.00
90th percentile	89.10	88.24	87.23	89.34	75.00	54.79	76.83	79.67	71.00	72.65	71.26	71.45

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregated

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1032	507	362	1032	507	361	1032	507	361	1032	507	361
15th percentile	50.00	50.56	53.34	48.73	29.69	13.49	32.56	36.84	30.00	20.46	25.00	27.93
50th percentile	72.05	71.35	72.21	70.11	51.63	30.53	54.84	58.34	49.57	45.36	48.72	50.00
90th percentile	88.21	87.40	86.17	87.48	74.41	52.19	76.51	79.17	71.00	72.65	71.26	71.45

Use this data in conjunction with the Academic Achievement section of the Scoring Guide, comparing your district's percent proficient/advanced to Colorado's percent proficient/advanced, to understand the ratings assigned.

### Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

This is a visual representation of the rubric the Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps section of the Scoring Guide. Use the column that matches with whether your district met or did not meet adequate growth.

required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth (AGP). For 2012-13, Adequate Growth cannot be calculated for English language proficiency therefore English language proficiency growth is determined only by the median growth percentile.

	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP	No AGP
Exceeds	60-99	70-99	65-99
Meets	45-59	55-69	50-64
Approaching	30-44	40-54	35-49
Does Not Meet	1-29	1-39	1-34

The No AGP column has been added for the 2013 DPF for English Language proficiency (ACCESS) growth.

The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator disaggregates the results of the Academic Growth Indicator, measuring the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English learners) and students needing to catch up.

### Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness


The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator measures the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates, dropout rates, and mean Colorado ACT (COACT) composite scores.

State Mean Dropout Rate (2009-10 baseline)

	N of Students	Mean Rate
1-year (2009)	416,953	3.6
3-year (2007-09)		

Use this data in conjunction with the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness section of the Scoring Guide, comparing your district's results to the Colorado dropout rate and average ACT composite score, to understand the ratings assigned.

## Appendix I: Timelines for School Accreditation and Plan Submission



## Appendix J: Understanding the Role of School Accountability Committees in Charter Schools

### ***Are charter schools required to have School Accountability Committees?***

Yes, the requirements of the Education Accountability Act of 2009 apply to *all* Colorado public schools, including charter schools. For more information about the requirements of the School Accountability Committees, please see the State Board of Education’s Rules for the Administration of Statewide Accountability Measures, available on the web page for the Education Accountability Act: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/StateAccountabilityRegulations.asp>.

### ***What is the relationship between a charter school’s governing board and its School Accountability Committee?***

Charter schools are administered and governed by a governing body in a manner agreed to and set forth in the charter contract. Colorado law allows the State Board to waive for charter schools many of the state requirements and rules promulgated by the State Board, which includes statutory and regulatory requirements of the Education Accountability Act of 2009. Charter Schools authorized by the Charter School Institute may not waive any statute or rule relating to the *creation of and membership* requirements for School Accountability Committees (see section 22-30.5-507(7), C.R.S.), but they can seek waivers from section 22-11-402, C.R.S., concerning the *duties* of the School Accountability Committee.

Charter schools may choose to have one or two members of their governing body serve on the School Accountability Committee in order to complete any of the required duties of the School Accountability Committee. In the alternative, governing boards may establish both a School Accountability Committee and Finance Committee that report to the governing board on all tasks that are delegated to them, including making recommendations for the school’s improvement plan and making recommendations on school spending priorities.

### ***In the past, school advisory councils were not required in any school that had in place, prior to 2000, a committee or council that performed the same duties as were outlined in law. Does that grandfather clause still apply?***

No, the grandfather clause was removed from legislation with the passage of the Education Accountability Act of 2009. The duties for School Accountability Committees are outlined in section 12.0 of the State Board of Education’s Rules for the Administration of Statewide Accountability Measures (1 CCR 301-1), available on the web page for the Education Accountability Act: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/StateAccountabilityRegulations.asp>.

### ***How are members of the School Accountability Committee selected?***

The Education Accountability Act of 2009 indicates that local school boards and the Institute must determine the actual number of persons on School Accountability Committees and the method for selecting the members of the committees. (See section 22-11-401, C.R.S.) For charter schools, local school boards or the Institute may delegate these responsibilities to the charter school governing board, or negotiate an arrangement in the charter contract. Ultimately, it is the charter school’s authorizer that determines how a school implements its School Accountability Committee.



## Appendix K: Sample Notification Letter to Parents

[District Address]

[Date—at least 30 days before public meeting]

Dear Parents,


Pursuant to the Education Accountability Act of 2009, all public schools in Colorado are required to develop unified improvement plans that outline targets for performance outcomes and strategies that the school will implement to achieve academic improvement. Schools may be required to implement a performance plan, improvement plan, priority improvement plan, or turnaround plan. Based on results from the Colorado School Performance Framework, [school name] will be required to develop a [PLAN ASSIGNMENT] plan during the 2013-14 school year.

The school was assigned to this plan type based on low-performance in the areas of [insert measures where the school did not meet expectations]. Attached is a school performance framework report that describes how the school has been evaluated.

The district is required to submit [school name]'s Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) to the Colorado Department of Education on or before [January 15, 2014]. The UIP provides the school a focused improvement plan, including a data analysis on student performance and a detailed action plan. To meet that deadline, the UIP will be developed according to the following timeline: [insert dates of any benchmarks for conducting analysis and developing plans, participation in CDE and/or district trainings and final adoption of plan].

The School Accountability Committee will hold a public meeting to gather input from parents concerning the development of the plan on [date], at [time], in [location]. Prior to adopting a plan, the local school board will hold a public hearing on [date—at least 30 days after this notice is issued], at [time], in [location] to review the plan. For more information, please contact [name] at [contact information].

## Appendix L: Process for Reviewing School Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans



(Light green font indicates district action; dark blue font indicates state action.)