

Education Accountability Act of 2009 (SB 09-163)

Frequently Asked Questions

Contents

Rulemaking	1
District and School Accreditation	1
Plan Implementation and Review	3
District and School Performance Frameworks	6
Additional Resources	10

Rulemaking

Q. Did districts have an opportunity to provide input on the SB-163 rules?

A. Throughout the fall and winter of 2009, the department collaborated with stakeholders on the development of the SB-163 rules. Among others, these stakeholders included the SB-163 Advisory Committee, which includes representatives from key stakeholder groups across the state, the Technical Advisory Panel for Longitudinal Growth, and the Commissioner’s Superintendent Advisory Committee, which includes representatives from each regional superintendent group and BOCES, as well as the Colorado Association of School Executives and the Colorado Association of School Boards. The proposed rules were submitted to the State Board in December, and the department accepted written comments on the proposed rules through the end of March. The State Board approved the rules on April 15, 2010.

Q. Did the department share a draft of the performance framework before the State Board hearing on the SB-163 rules in March?

A. No, the performance framework was still in the development stages at that point. The department did provide notice that the framework would:

- align school and district performance framework reports;
- place greatest weight on academic growth and postsecondary and workforce readiness; and
- use the most recent year of data as well as the most recent three years of data.

District and School Accreditation

Q. Who accredits districts? Who accredits schools?

A. The department will assign districts to an accreditation category and will assign schools to a plan type. The department will assign districts to an accreditation category using the district performance framework, and schools to a plan type based on the school performance framework. The performance frameworks evaluate a district’s and school’s attainment on the key performance indicators of academic achievement, academic growth, academic gaps, and postsecondary and workforce readiness.

Districts will continue to accredit their schools. They may do so using the State’s performance framework or using their own more comprehensive or stringent framework. In either case, the State’s evaluation of both district and school performance will be guided using a single, consistent framework based on the same four key performance indicators. For more information, please refer to the District Accountability Handbook.

Q. Are accreditation categories for schools (assigned by districts) the same as the accreditation categories for districts (assigned by the state)? If they are different, what does the district need to do?

A. No, accreditation categories for schools (assigned by districts) do not need to be the same as those for districts (assigned by the state). However, districts are encouraged to use the same categories. Each district's system for accrediting its schools must emphasize school 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. If a district chooses to use a school performance framework for accrediting schools that is different from the state's school performance framework for assigning plan types, the district's framework and the additional evidence used to evaluate the district's schools will need to be submitted to CDE for publication on *SchoolView*. CDE will issue additional guidance by July.

Q. How much latitude do districts have in developing their own performance framework or accreditation process for their schools?

A. Districts are responsible for accrediting their schools in a manner that emphasizes school attainment on the four statewide performance indicators and are encouraged to use the state's school performance framework. Districts may, in the local school board's discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures adopted by the district. Districts' performance frameworks must place the greatest weight on growth and postsecondary and workforce readiness (for high schools), and must meet or exceed state rigor. If the district's performance framework differs from the state's performance framework, the district's framework and the additional evidence used to evaluate the district's schools will need to be submitted to CDE for publication on *SchoolView*. CDE will issue additional guidance by July.

Q. Will the accreditation contracts be revised?

A. The State Board will enter into an accreditation contract with each local school board and with the Institute board. Each contract will have a term of one year and shall be automatically renewed each year so long as the district or the Institute remains in the accreditation category of "Accredited with Distinction," "Accredited," or "Accredited with Improvement Plan." The Department's model accreditation contract is being revised to include changes required by SB-163 and will be shared with superintendents by the end of May. Contracts will need to be signed by all parties not later than July 1.

Q. When will the district and school performance framework reports be completed?

A. Superintendents received e-mails from CDE with initial drafts of their school-specific framework reports on April 30, 2010. A draft template and supporting materials can be viewed online at <http://www.schoolview.org/learningcenter.asp>. In June, CDE plans to release initial drafts of the district performance framework reports. The district performance framework report will largely mirror the current school performance framework report but may be modified based on feedback from stakeholders. CDE invites district leaders to share their feedback on the school performance framework report at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/spffeedback>. CDE will run school and district performance framework reports with 2010 data to provide initial 2010 school plan assignments and district accreditation categories by August 15, 2010.

Q. How will the school performance framework report be distributed to the public?

A. Districts and schools will receive a preliminary plan assignment on the school performance framework by August 15, and a final plan assignment by November 15. The department will post each district's and school's performance framework on *SchoolView* for public review. Superintendents are encouraged to share preliminary copies of their performance framework report with their district and school staff (e.g., assessment coordinator, principal) as they deem appropriate, but the actual framework results for each school will not be posted publically until they are finalized.

Q. How will the data file used for the performance frameworks be shared? Will districts be able to replicate the frameworks and generate data reports/displays from their own district systems?

A. The district’s growth and status flat files, postsecondary data, and state-provided data on the values at the cut points for distributions will contain everything necessary for the district to reproduce the calculations for the performance framework report.

Plan Implementation and Review

Q. How many districts and schools are expected to fall into each plan category?

A. The department anticipates that roughly 5% of districts and schools will be required to implement a Turnaround plan and roughly 10% of districts and schools will be required to implement a Priority Improvement plan. The remainder of districts and schools will be identified to develop and implement an Improvement plan or a Performance plan.

Q. What timeline should districts and schools follow in developing and submitting plans?

A. The table below outlines the timeline for releasing district and school performance framework results and for district and school plan submissions. By August 15, CDE will release preliminary accreditation ratings and preliminary school plan assignments. By November 15, CDE will finalize accreditation ratings, and, no later than December, the State Board will finalize school plan assignments. Those plans that require department review (Priority Improvement and Turnaround plans) will be due to CDE by January 15, 2011. All plans will be due April 15, 2011 for publication on *SchoolView*. The expectation, however, is that districts and schools begin planning in the fall and that, at a minimum, plans will be 18-month plans that carry over into the 2011-2012 school year. This timeline was created with stakeholder input and is designed to align with the NCLB improvement planning timeline for Title I, IIA, and III.

Aug. 15, 2010	CDE will provide DPF and SPF results with an initial district accreditation category and initial recommendation for school plan type.
Oct. 15, 2010	Districts will submit to CDE the accreditation categories they have assigned to schools. <i>For districts and schools on a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan:</i> If districts disagree with CDE’s initial district accreditation or initial school plan assignment, the district may submit additional data for consideration by this date.
Nov. 15, 2010	CDE will form a final accreditation designation and a final recommendation for school plan, and, along with any conflicting recommendation from the district, submit that final recommendation for approval by the State Board. The accreditation designations and plan assignments will be published on <i>SchoolView</i> .
Jan. 15, 2011	District plans will be due to CDE for review for districts “Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan” or “Accredited with Turnaround Plan,” or districts on NCLB Title I, IIA or III Program Improvement and/or Corrective Action. School plans will be due to CDE for review for schools assigned a Priority Improvement plan or a Turnaround plan, or due to districts for review for schools on NCLB Title IA School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring.
Apr. 15, 2011	All district or school plans will be due to CDE for publication on <i>SchoolView</i> .

Q. When do school and district plans go into effect?

A. District plans are due January 15 for districts “Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan” or “Accredited with Turnaround Plan,” or districts on NCLB Title I, IIA or III Program Improvement and/or Corrective Action. School plans are due to CDE by January 15 for review for schools assigned a Priority Improvement plan or a Turnaround plan, and/or due to districts for review for schools on NCLB Title IA School Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring. All district and school plans are due to CDE for publication on *SchoolView* by April 15. The expectation is that districts and schools begin planning in the fall 2010 and that, at a minimum, plans will be 18-month plans that carry over into the 2011-2012 school year. Districts and schools should begin putting in place

the processes and preparation required to effectively implement their plans along this timeline as soon as they deem necessary.

Q. Is there a limit to how long a school can continue to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan?

A. A school will not be permitted to implement a Priority Improvement plan 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.

Q. What happens if a district disagrees with the department's initial recommendation for which type of plan a school should implement?

A. The SB-163 rules specify that if a district disagrees with the department's initial recommendation and would like the State to review its recommendation in light of other data, the district may submit such data for the department's consideration. The district would submit its own recommendation for the appropriate plan type and a statement about the extent to which the school has effectively implemented its school plan during the previous academic school year, including information about specific improvements, evidence of outcomes, changes and interventions implemented and the extent to which the school has met implementation benchmarks. For schools that the department has initially assigned to a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, the district would need to submit valid and reliable data demonstrating the progress the school has made in improving its performance and in meeting statewide and local targets, including evidence for approved third-party reviews. All information from the district must be received by CDE by October 15.

Q. What will CDE consider for additional data?

A. The department is in the process of drafting guidance that will clarify what additional data it will consider during the accreditation review process, and will disseminate this document by July, prior to the August release of the preliminary district and school performance framework reports. In line with SB-163 requirements, CDE will consider additional data that reflects academic growth or postsecondary and workforce readiness in the district or school. Data that demonstrates growth on assessments like NWEA would be one example of acceptable data.

Q. If a district successfully presents additional evidence to support a change in a school's plan type assignment, how will that be noted on the school performance framework report?

A. If a district successfully presents additional evidence that the State Board deems significant enough to change a school's plan type, then the school's final plan assignment will be changed on its school performance framework report. The school performance framework report will be publicly reported on *SchoolView*, and will display only the final plan assignment, together with a notation that the plan assignment was changed, and the additional evidence submitted by the district.

Q. Who will be on the State Review Panel that will review district and school Priority Improvement and Turnaround plans?

A. The commissioner is responsible for recruiting an appropriate number of highly qualified persons to serve when needed on the State Review Panel. The commissioner is required to select persons on the basis of demonstrated expertise in one or more of the following fields:

- School district or school leadership or governance;
- Standards-based elementary and secondary curriculum instruction and assessment;
- Instructional data management and analysis;
- School district, school or program evaluation;

- Educational program management;
- Teacher leadership;
- Organization management or school district and public school governance.
- School district or school budgeting and finance;
- Any other field that the commissioner deems to be relevant to the review and evaluation of school district, Institute or public school performance and improvement planning (§22-11-205, C.R.S.).

The department anticipates that it will finalize this panel's membership in the summer of 2010. Recommendations for membership should be emailed to Richard Wenning, Associate Commissioner, at Wenning_R@cde.state.co.us.

Q. Will the Unified School Improvement Plan suffice for a Title I School-wide or Targeted Assistance Plan? Will schools have to write multiple plans (a unified plan, a targeted assistance plan, and a consolidated application) each year?

A. The Unified Improvement Plan template for schools that CDE is drafting should work in tandem with the NCLB requirements for a Title I School-wide or a Targeted Assistance plan. Given that schools are expected to engage in an annual improvement planning process, the template will help the school to document that process. However, the school is still responsible for implementing and documenting all required elements of a school plan. Some elements may not need to be updated on an annual basis.

Q. Will all schools including non-Title I schools receive a plan category (e.g. secondary schools that typically do not receive an AYP rating through NCLB)?

A. All schools, with the exception of schools designated as Alternative Education Campuses and schools without CSAP-tested grades (K-2), will receive a plan category using the school performance framework report. This is the State's accountability system and therefore applies to all schools regardless of whether the school is served by Title I.

Q. How do the 1003-G School Improvement Grants (SIG) relate to CDE's performance framework?

A. There is a high degree of overlap between the school performance framework ratings and the analysis used to identify the persistently lowest-performing schools for SIG 1003(g) grant funding. In other words, almost all schools identified for 1003(G) SIG would also be identified for Turnaround plans by the School Performance Framework (SPF) report. Based on the preliminary April 2010 SPF results:

- Ten of the eleven total 1003(G) Tier 1 schools would be identified for Turnaround plans by the current draft results of the school performance framework.
- 43 of 61 Tier 2 schools would be identified for Turnaround plans by the current draft results of the school performance framework. The remaining 18 would be identified for Priority Improvement plans.

However, while the analyses used to identify schools for 1003(g) funding and the SPF plan assignments are similar, they do not perfectly match. First, the school performance framework report uses several additional metrics that the SIG analysis does not. Specifically, the SIG analysis does not include any growth gaps metrics, dropout rate, or ACT composite scores in the calculations. Instead, any high school with a dropout rate less than 60% for the three most recent years is automatically flagged as Tier 2. Second, the SIG analysis is conducted with no student exclusions, using only Reading and Math CSAP data. Finally, the list of SIG 1003(G) schools represents only a select subset of the total Colorado school population. The school performance framework identifies the lowest 5% of schools of nearly all schools in the state (with only a handful of schools with a small N excluded), whereas the SIG status identifies the lowest 5% of *eligible* schools. Title 1 eligibility, AYP performance, and School Improvement/Corrective Action/Restructuring conditions established by the U.S. Department of Education significantly limit the number of eligible schools included in the SIG analyses. For these reasons,

identification as Turnaround under one system and not another does not invalidate either system, and significant overlap remains.

Q. Will there be sufficient resources to support the districts and schools that are required under the State's accountability system to implement significant interventions?

A. The lack of state funding to support districts and schools remains a major concern of the department. The Statewide System of Accountability and Support (SSAS) differentiates support according to performance and need, whereby demonstration of high performance results in greater autonomy and demonstration of high need results in greater support.

Districts may use their formula ESEA dollars to supplement improvement efforts. This is especially true when a district and/or school is identified for improvement under Titles I, IIA and/or III. Note that districts and schools identified for improvement under any ESEA program are required to use the Unified Improvement Planning template in the plans they submit in 2010-2011. In the 2011-2012 year, all districts and schools will be required to use the Unified Improvement Planning template. When using ESEA dollars in new ways, care must be taken to avoid supplanting local dollars. Furthermore, districts must target federal dollars – including Title I funds that have been set aside – on activities that address the missed targets (e.g., AYP, highly qualified teachers, AMAOs). Any questions should be directed to the Office of Federal Programs Administration at CDE.

Q. How does the Unified Improvement Plan align with other requests for budgets, for example the consolidated application?

The Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) documents the planning process. While resources are identified for the major improvement activities in the UIP, it is not a true budget. The UIP and related budgets should be aligned, however. For example, CDE will review the Consolidated Application to ensure that it is aligned with the approved UIP. The budget should build upon the activities named in the UIP and provide additional detail about the associated expenses.

Q. When will districts and schools know what their targets are?

A. The draft school performance framework released in April 2010 provides districts with access to preliminary results using 2008-09 data. School-specific reports were shared to prompt familiarity with the framework and to obtain feedback. The performance framework reports that will be released in August 2010 will reflect actual 2009-10 data. The State Board will set state targets soon thereafter. Districts and schools are expected to set individualized targets using the Unified Improvement Plan template. (Note that the state's Unified Improvement Plan template is required in 2010-2011 for districts or schools that will need to adopt a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan. All other districts or schools will be required to use the Unified Improvement Plans in the 2011-2012 year.) Targets should be ambitious and attainable, and relay how they will lead the district or school to meeting or exceeding state expectations.

[District and School Performance Frameworks](#)

Q. How will schools that have only non-CSAP grades (K-2) be evaluated on the new school performance framework?

A. Schools that have only non-CSAP grades (K-2) will not receive a school performance framework report from CDE at this time. The department invites districts with a strong evaluation system in place for these schools to share their evaluation methodology with the department as we consider a K-2 performance framework.

Q. How will Alternative Education Campuses be evaluated on the new school performance framework?

A. Schools that are designated as Alternative Education Campuses will receive a school performance framework report as all other schools do, with data on each of the performance indicators. However, the Department will

incorporate the results of the a unique framework for Alternative Education Campuses when determining which type of plan the Alternative Education Campus should implement. For more information about how plan types will be assigned to Alternative Education Campuses, please visit the following URL:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/OPP/AEC.htm>.

Q. Will Alternative Education Campuses be evaluated on the new district performance framework?

A. The district performance framework report will roll up data at the student level rather than at the school level. As such, all students, including those attending Alternative Education Campuses, will be included on the district performance framework.

Q. Will charter schools within a district be held accountable in the same way as non-charter schools in that district?

A. The State’s school performance framework will be applied uniformly to charter and non-charter schools. Districts are free to evaluate their schools, for accreditation purposes, in a manner that is consistent with, but may go beyond, the State’s evaluation framework. Districts may choose to evaluate their charter schools in a manner that is different from the way that their non-charter schools are evaluated. This should be clarified in the contracts negotiated between districts and their charter schools.

Q. How does the postsecondary and workforce readiness (PWR) indicator apply to schools that serve only grades K-8?

A. The measures that the State will initially use to evaluate performance on the PWR indicator (ACT scores, graduation rates and dropout rates) only apply to high schools.

Q. Are there any auxiliary items included on the school performance framework? Will they be assurances in the framework, as in the past, or are they scored?

A. At the school level, safety and finance components are not reported on the department’s school performance framework report. At the district level, the safety and finance components will be assurances. These data will, however, be reported on *SchoolView* for each school and district.

Q. Is CELA included in the performance frameworks?

A. At this point, CELA results are excluded from the performance frameworks. CDE anticipates incorporating English language proficiency data into future versions of the performance frameworks.

Q. Why do schools and districts have a 1-year performance framework report and a 3-year performance framework report?

A. Schools receive results for two sets of school performance framework reports:

- (1) The most recent year of data (2009)
- (2) The most recent three years of data (2007-2009)

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) is the one that will actually be official for the school: the scenario under which the school has ratings on a higher number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings on an equal number of indicators, the one under which it received higher points overall.

Q. Can a district choose to use only the 1-year or only the 3-year school performance framework report?

A. By default, CDE will select only one of the two sets of results as the official report that determines the school's plan assignment (the one under which the school has ratings on a higher number of performance indicators, or, if it has ratings on an equal number of indicators, the one under which it received higher points overall). However, just as with any district accreditation framework, districts have up until October 15 to submit additional indicators and measures of school performance. As such, districts can choose to use the 3-year performance framework to determine their schools' accreditation categories and report that to the state. In this case, the district will need to clarify when and if this results in a misalignment in plan type assignments. District frameworks must always meet or exceed the state's framework.

Q. When three years of data are used, are the three years combined, averaged, or is each year considered individually?

When using 3 years of data, the way the data is rolled up depends on the performance indicator:

Academic Achievement and Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness:

The school performance framework report uses a weighted average of the three one-year values for the three most recent years. For example, if a school had 5 out of 10 students proficient in writing in 2007, 3 out of 4 students proficient in 2008, and 1 out of 3 students proficient in 2009, the framework calculation does not just take the straight average of .50, .75 and .33. Those averages are weighted by the number of students in each denominator so that the final percentage accurately reflects the proficiency profile of that school over that three-year period.

This dataset reflects all students enrolled before October 1, who tested in a school in any one of the three years (2007, 2008 and 2009). Students that were continuously enrolled in a school for all of these years would have their data from all of those years in the same dataset. In other words, the same students may be represented multiple times within the data set.

Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

The school performance framework report uses a three-year rollup of data that combines all the data, from those three years, into one "pile" from that school, and performs calculations on that dataset just as if it had been a single year of data. For example, the set of the school's student growth percentiles from all grades in 2007, 2008 and 2009 in mathematics are put into one data set and ordered; the middle value of that data set is the school's three-year median growth percentile.

Likewise, the adequate median growth percentile for a school is based on the adequate growth percentiles of all its students, for a given time period. Those values themselves are based on multiple years of past data and multiple years that students have before them, to catch up or keep up.

This dataset reflects all students enrolled before October 1, who tested in a school, in any one of the three years (2007, 2008 and 2009). Students that were continuously enrolled in a school for all of these years would have their data, from all of those years, in the same dataset. In other words, the same students are represented multiple times within the dataset.

Q. Is adequate growth calculated based on one, two, or three years of data?

A. The adequate growth percentile for a school is based on the adequate growth percentiles of all its students for a given time period. Those values themselves are based on multiple years of past data, and the potentially multiple years that students have before them to catch up or keep up.

Q. Will the adequate growth percentiles be subject-specific? Are we going to see many more schools not making adequate growth in math as opposed to reading and writing?

A. Median growth percentiles and adequate growth percentiles are reported on the school performance framework report by content area, so you can easily see what a school’s growth was, and what the level of overall growth would have had to be for its typical (median) student to reach or maintain proficiency. If some content areas provide greater challenges, either because they represent more difficult subjects or because the standards have been set higher, then the difference between observed and adequate growth will be greater for those areas. For example, the preliminary run of the school performance framework report indicates that the adequate growth percentiles for high schools in mathematics are high; this suggests that few students are on track to reach the high standards set for high school mathematics, especially with a limited number of years in which to “catch up.” Although few high schools might attain adequate growth in mathematics, this reflects the current reality of the situation.

Q. Why was adequate growth added to the performance frameworks?

A. This change was required by law. The department recognizes that students/schools/districts start at varying achievement levels, and that measuring growth is critical to evaluating how well the state, district, or school is doing at improving academic outcomes. However, measuring growth alone, without any indication of if that growth is sufficient in moving students towards the state’s end goal of proficiency for all students in order to attain postsecondary and workforce readiness does not tell us how meaningful the growth is. Measuring the adequate growth needed on the performance framework reports allows for the department to arrive at an evaluation of the amount of growth a school/district made with its students, whether that growth was good enough for the typical student to catch up or keep up, and how that growth compares to that of other districts and schools.

Q. What are the exclusion rules used in the performance frameworks?

A. October 1 New to School is the exclusion rule currently implemented. If a student was not enrolled by October 1 in the school where he/she took CSAP later that spring, his/her data are not included in that school’s performance framework report calculations.

Q. What is the analysis used to determine the cut-points on the performance frameworks?

A. In the case of achievement level, the cuts are based on the empirical distribution. In the case of growth and growth gaps, both empirical and qualitative considerations were taken into account. In the case of ACT scores, the cuts were based both on Colorado’s empirical results as well as ACT’s reported criterion level for entry into college without need for remediation. In the case of graduation rates, both federal guidance and a consideration of Colorado’s state goals were used. In the case of dropout rate, a consideration of Colorado’s state goals was used.

Q. How does the school performance framework report handle varying N sizes?

A. N refers to the number of students included in each performance indicator and/or measure. In accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), each of the school performance framework report’s performance indicators and its measures requires a minimum N count in order for the data to be publicly reportable. The school performance framework report uses the minimum N counts below.

Performance Indicator: Measure	Minimum N
<i>Academic Achievement:</i> Reading, writing, mathematics, science	16
<i>Academic Growth:</i> Reading, writing, mathematics	20
<i>Academic Growth Gaps:</i> Reading, writing, mathematics by subgroup	20
<i>Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness:</i> Graduation rate, Dropout rate	1
<i>Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness:</i> Average Colorado ACT Composite Score	16
<i>(Test Participation Rate:</i> Reading, writing, mathematics, science)	20

If a school does not meet the minimum N for a metric, the data for that metric are not reported. The school will receive a rating of “N/A” for that particular metric, and the points earned will be 0 out of 0 eligible points.

If a school does not meet the minimum N count for any of the metrics within a performance indicator, the school is not eligible for the points in that indicator. This reduces the overall framework points for which the school is eligible, and the school earns 0 out of 0 framework points on that indicator. However, because the points are removed from both the points earned and the points eligible, the school’s score is not negatively affected. Note that:

- (1) If a school meets the minimum N count for at least one measure within a performance indicator, it will receive a rating on that performance indicator.
- (2) Although schools receive a 1-year and 3-year report of their data, only one of the two sets results in the official plan type assignment: it is the scenario under which the school has data on a higher number of the performance indicators, or, if it has data for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it received a higher total number of points.

Q. If student count (“N”) is correlated with median growth percentile, aren’t large schools disadvantaged in reaching growth rates above the 50th percentile?

A. The median student growth percentiles calculated by CDE are based on the observed data and are, as such, descriptions of reality. The median is an accurate portrayal of that school’s growth for all its students. There are numerous examples of large schools with growth percentiles well above as well as well below 50. Small schools have much more volatility in their data because of the potential influence of only a few data points, so they tend to have median student growth percentiles that are much more variable. For this reason it is important that the State now considers 3-year data aggregations on the school performance framework, mostly for the benefit of smaller schools whose data might be sparser or more volatile.

Q. How do we manage the disconnect that can occur within high school performance framework reports, where postsecondary measures such as graduation and dropout rates are weighted as heavily as growth, and the school is trending in different directions on these indicators? For example, what if a school has high graduation rates, but has declining performance in mathematics?

A. The performance framework rolls up statewide data in a way in that the department believes is most fair for all schools and that reflects growth and postsecondary and workforce readiness as the most important indicators of performance. The state’s performance framework is, however, a floor for state performance expectations, not a ceiling. Districts should adjust the state’s framework or adopt their own framework as they deem necessary to accurately accredit their schools. If doing so results in a misalignment in the type of plan assigned to the school, then the district should submit their proposed plan assignment and supporting evidence to the state by October 15. Conflicting data or trends in different directions may signal a starting point for deeper data analysis and root cause identification in the improvement planning process.

[Additional Resources](#)

Q. Will there be any training on the school performance framework report?

A. The department will conduct initial training on the school performance framework report along with training on unified planning and standards through May and June. Specific dates and locations, along with supporting materials, can be found online at <http://schoolview.org/learningcenter>.

Q. Where can I find additional resources?

A. Additional resources on SB-163, including a PowerPoint on SB-163 and templates of the school performance framework report, are available on the CDE website at:

- <http://www.cde.state.co.us/scripts/reforms/detail.asp?itemid=623952>, and
- <http://www.schoolview.org/learningcenter.asp>

The department also encourages district leadership to attend one of the regional trainings listed on the Learning Center for more in-depth information.