



COLORADO
Department of Education

2017 District Accreditation Ratings

Alyssa Pearson
Jessica Knevals Watson
Ashley Piche

Accountability & Data Analysis Unit

November 2017

Agenda

- Background and Overview
- Request to Reconsider Process
- 2017 District Results
- Accountability Clock
- Next Steps

Background and Overview

Background

- The Education Accountability Act of 2009 (SB-163, section 22-11-208 and 22-11-210 C.R.S.) requires an annual review of district and school performance.
- All districts annually receive a District Performance Framework (DPF) report. This determines their accreditation rating.
- All schools annually receive a School Performance Framework (SPF) report. This determines their school plan types.
- For districts, the Commissioner makes the final determination of the accreditation ratings. For schools, the department makes a recommendation to the State Board. The State Board will make the final determination of the school plan types in December.

Purposes of the Performance Frameworks

- For all districts and schools, provide a statewide comparison of student performance that highlights areas of success and areas for improvement.
- Identify those districts and schools whose student performance is the lowest-performing in relation to state goals and direct state support and intervention appropriately.
- Identify those districts and schools whose students are the highest-performing, recognize them and learn from their practices.

Ratings and Explanatory Notes

DISTRICT ACCREDITATION RATINGS

ACCREDITED WITH DISTINCTION

ACCREDITED


ACCREDITED WITH IMPROVEMENT PLAN

ACCREDITED WITH PRIORITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

ACCREDITED WITH TURNAROUND PLAN

INSUFFICIENT STATE DATA: SMALL TESTED POPULATION*

INSUFFICIENT STATE DATA: LOW PARTICIPATION**



Descriptors

Meets Participation

At or above 95% participation rate in 2 or more content areas

Low Participation

below 95% participation rate in 2 or more content areas

Decreased Due to Participation

below 95% participation, once parent excuses are removed, in 2 or more content areas

School and District Performance Frameworks

Performance Indicator	Performance Data	Weight
Academic Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mean scale score • English language arts, math, and science CMAS assessments • 10th grade PSAT for Evidence Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) and Math, and DLM (alternate assessment) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and for disaggregated groups 	40% (EM) 30% (H, districts)
Academic Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Median student growth percentile • English language arts and mathematics on CMAS • PSAT 10 to SAT growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and for disaggregated groups 	60% (EM) 40% (H, districts)
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduation Rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall and for disaggregated groups • Dropout Rate • SAT Mean Scale Scores by content area (EBRW and Math) • Matriculation Rate 	30% (H, districts)

Request to Reconsider Process

Requests to Reconsider Process

- Districts had until October 16th to submit additional evidence for the Commissioner's consideration
 - CDE supported districts by reviewing drafts submitted by September 15 and providing detailed feedback, along with offering individual office hours
 - 35 districts participated in the draft process and we received 12 district draft submissions (DPF) and 57 school draft submissions (SPF)
- CDE received fewer requests in 2017 than in 2016
 - 20 district requests, compared to 41 in 2016
 - Over 140 school requests (including 38 schools DPS requested to lower), compared to 239 in 2016

Considerations for Requests

1. Body of Evidence
2. Accountability Participation Impact
3. Calculation Error
4. Impact of Alternative Education Campuses on the District Performance Framework rating
5. Retroactive AEC Designation
6. Small districts and schools
7. Districts with a single school
8. Districts with a closed school
9. Insufficient State Data Rating
10. EL Newcomers

Request to Reconsider - Approvals

- Approvals (16*)
 - 5 based on the impact of AEC students on the DPF rating
 - District rating increased when AEC students were removed
 - AEC received AEC: Performance or AEC: Improvement and has improved since 2016
 - 2 based on using the single school rating for the district
 - 7 based on miscoding on the state assessment (participation calculations)
 - 2 based on a body of evidence
 - 2 based on request for insufficient state data

*One approval is pending SPF determination in December

Requests to Reconsider – Not Approved

- Not approved (4)
 - 3 based on fact that additional, supplemental data did not support a higher rating
 - 2 based on the fact that the AEC impact did not meet requirements of the state board rule
 - 1 based on removal of a closed/transferred school

District Appeals of Ratings

- If the district receives a Priority Improvement or Turnaround rating, the local board of education may submit an appeal to the State Board of Education
 - Within 10 days of final notification from CDE
 - State board office coordinates with local school board to schedule the hearing

2017 District Accreditation Results


2010 - 2017 District Results

Accreditation Rating	2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2016		2017	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Distinction	14	7.7%	18	9.9%	19	10.4%	16	8.8%	27	14.8%	25	13.6%	30	16.3%
Accredited*	97	53.6%	94	51.9%	87	47.8%	95	52.2%	102	55.7%	99	53.8%	90	48.9%
Improvement	46	25.4%	46	25.4%	52	28.6%	55	30.2%	44	24.0%	37	20.1%	49	26.6%
Priority Improvement	17	9.4%	17	9.4%	19	10.4%	14	7.7%	9	4.9%	9	4.9%	9	4.9%
Turnaround	7	3.9%	6	3.3%	5	2.8%	2	1.1%	1	0.5%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%
Insuff. Data											13	7.1%	6	3.3%
Total	181		181		182		182		183		184		184	

* Includes BOCES Accredited with AEC: Performance Plan or Accredited with AEC: Priority Improvement as relevant.



District Accreditation Ratings 2010-2017



By 2016 October Count pupil membership, 2.7% of students in the state were enrolled in districts Accredited on Priority Improvement Plans (none were Accredited with Turnaround Plans).

2016 to 2017 DPF Changes

- **65%** of districts (119 districts) received the same plan type in 2017 as they did in 2016.
- **13%** of districts (24) increased at least one level (12 of those as a result of request to reconsider decisions)

Change in Accreditation Rating from 2016 to 2017

	# of districts	% of districts
Moved up 2 levels	1	0.5%
Moved up 1 level	23	12.5%
Stayed the same	119	64.7%
Moved down 1 level	25	13.6%
Moved down 2 levels	2	1.1%
Moved to or stayed at Insufficient State Data	6	3.3%
Moved from Insufficient State Data	8	4.4%
Total	184	

Participation Impact

- 6 districts with Insufficient State Data ratings
 - 5 with Low Participation
 - 1 with Meets 95% Accountability Participation
- 5 districts whose final ratings were decreased due to accountability participation rate below 95% in two or more content areas
- 85 districts receiving plan ratings with “low participation” description, due to participation rates below 95% in two or more content areas

30 Districts Accredited with Distinction for 2017

*District reached Accredited with Distinction through request to reconsider process

ACADEMY 20*

ASPEN 1*

BIG SANDY 100J

BUENA VISTA R-31*

CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12

CREEDE SCHOOL DISTRICT

EADS RE-1

EAST GRAND 2

EDISON 54 JT*

EXPEDITIONARY BOCES

FRENCHMAN RE-3

GILPIN COUNTY RE-1

HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1

KIM REORGANIZED 88

KIT CARSON R-1

LEWIS-PALMER 38

LIBERTY J-4

LIMON RE-4J

LITTLETON 6

MC CLAVE RE-2

MEEKER RE1

NORTH CONEJOS RE-1J*

OURAY R-1

PAWNEE RE-12

PLATEAU RE-5

PLATTE CANYON 1

PRAIRIE RE-11

SANGRE DE CRISTO RE-22J

STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2

TELLURIDE R-1

Accountability Clock

Accountability Clock from 2010 to 2017

Blue boxes indicate the district came off of the clock

Priority Improvement

Turnaround

District Name	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2017
Adams County 14	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Aguilar Reorganized 6	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Westminster 50	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Montezuma-Cortez Re-1	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	
Julesburg Re-1	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	
Ignacio 11 JT	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5		Year 1
Pueblo City 60	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5		
Sheridan 2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5		
Karval Re-23	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5			Year 1
Vilas Re-5	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5			
Rocky Ford R-2	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4			
Charter School Institute	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3				
Denver County 1	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3				
Englewood 1	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3				Year 1
Mountain BOCES*	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4				
Huerfano Re-1	Year 2	Year 3				Year 1	
Center 26 JT	Year 2	Year 3					
Lake County R-1	Year 1		Year 1	Year 2		Year 1	
Branson Reorganized 82	Year 1		Year 1				
De Beque 49JT	Year 1						
Fort Morgan Re-3	Year 1						
Las Animas Re-1	Year 1						
Mountain Valley Re 1	Year 1						
South Conejos Re-10	Year 1						Year 1



Next Steps

What's Coming?

- School Plan Types
 - Coming in December
 - SBE approves school plan types
- Possible District Appeals
- Accountability Clock Hearings