

COLORADO ACCREDITATION PROGRAM

IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

Dwight Jones
Commissioner of Education



June 2007

cde

COLORADO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Pam Jo Suckla, Chairman
Slickrock 3rd Congressional District

Bob Schaffer, Vice-Chairman
Fort Collins 4th Congressional District

Elaine Gantz Berman
Denver 1st Congressional District

Randy DeHoff
Littleton 6th Congressional District

Evie Hudak
Westminster 2nd Congressional District

Peggy Littleton
Colorado Springs 5th Congressional District

Karen Middleton
Aurora 7th Congressional District

Gerry Difford
Assistant Commissioner

Ai Dam
Program Coordinator
Colorado Department of Education
Office of Educational Services
201 East Colfax Avenue, Room 206
Denver, CO 80203
(303) 866-6678
Dam_a@cde.state.co.us
www.cde.state.co.us

COLORADO ACCREDITATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GUIDELINES

| | |
|---|---|
| Colorado State Board of Education | 1 |
| Table of Contents..... | 2 |
| Colorado’s Historical Educational Reform Movement | 3 |
| Accreditation Implementation..... | 4 |
| Colorado Accreditation Program Indicators | 5 |
| Reasonable Progress Over Reasonable Time | 6 |
| CDE Process for Assessing District Compliance..... | 7 |

APPENDIX SECTION

| | |
|--|----|
| Accreditation Review Process | 8 |
| Disaggregated Groups..... | 9 |
| CDE Accreditation Contract Review Questions..... | 10 |
| Indicator A-Educational Improvement Plan | 12 |
| Indicator B-CSAP Goals | 13 |
| Indicator C-Closing Achievement Gaps..... | 14 |
| Indicator D-Value Added Growth | 15 |
| Indicator E-Other Curriculum Areas not Assessed by CSAP | 16 |
| Indicator F-School Accountability Report..... | 17 |
| Indicator G-Annual Report to the Public | 18 |
| Indicator H-Safe Schools Act..... | 19 |
| Indicator I-Colorado Basic Literacy Act..... | 20 |
| Indicator J-Educational Technology & Information Literacy/Recruitment & Retention of Teachers..... | 21 |
| Indicator K-Finance & Display of the United States Flag..... | 22 |

REGIONAL MANAGERS & COORDINATORS

| | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Metro Region | Gerry Difford | 303-866-6872 | difford_g@cde.state.co.us |
| Metro Region | Ron Mitchell | 303-866-6778 | mitchell_r@cde.state.co.us |
| Metro Region | Sally Sherman | 303-866-6748 | sherman_s@cde.state.co.us |
| North Central Region | Michael Clough | 303-866-6762 | clough_m@cde.state.co.us |
| Northeast Region | Wendy Dunaway | 303-866-6995 | dunaway_w@cde.state.co.us |
| Northwest Region | John Condie | 303-866-6630 | condie_j@cde.state.co.us |
| Pikes Peak Region | Jackie Webb | 303-866-6608 | webb_j@cde.state.co.us |
| Southeast Region | Janice McDermott | 303-866-6764 | mcdermott_j@cde.state.co.us |
| Southwest Region | Jhon Penn | 303-866-6632 | penn_j@cde.state.co.us |
| Southwest Region | Judy Check | 303-866-6684 | check_j@cde.state.co.us |
| West Central Region | Jhon Penn | 303-866-6632 | penn_j@cde.state.co.us |

COLORADO'S HISTORICAL EDUCATIONAL REFORM MOVEMENT

LEGISLATURE

- H.B. 93-1313 Content Standards: Anchor for educational reform
- H.B. 96-1139 The Colorado Basic Literacy Act
- 1997 Colorado Student Assessment Program – 4th grade reading and writing
- H.B. 98-1267 Colorado Accreditation Act – accredit school districts by contract
- S.B. 99-154 Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs
- S.B. 00-133 School Safety Issues
- S.B. 00-186 School Report Cards, CSAP grades 3 through 10 and the 11th grade ACT
- S.B. 01-80 Bullying Policies requires for schools
- S.B. 01-98 Modifies 00-186 (School Accountability Reports)
- S.B. 01-129 Data Collection/Grant funds for preschool-summer school-unsatisfactory schools-BOCES funding (17 to 22)
- S.B. 00-186 Value-Added Longitudinal Growth
- 01-1014 House Joint Resolution-Closing the Learning Gap
- 01-Amendment 23 (S.B. 204 & S.B. implement) (H.B. 1262 – funding for textbooks, categoricals, and at-risk)
- H.B. 01-1303 School Improvement Grant Program
- S.B. 01-222 Capital Construction
- H.B. 01-1292 Character Education
- H.B. 01-1348 CSAP-A
- H.B. 01-1365 Science & Technology Ed. Center Grant Program
- S.B. 03-248 School Finance Accreditation Indicator
- S.B. 03-254 Closing the Achievement Gap Program and Commission
- H.B. 04-1124 SAR – AYP Indicator
- H.B. 04-1217 SAR – Parental Questions
- H.B. 04-1433 Longitudinal Student Academic Growth

Federal Legislation-ESEA
"No Child Left Behind Act"
Bipartisan Majorities 2001

COLORADO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

- 1999 Adopted Accreditation Rules based on H.B. 98-1267 – Accredit School Districts
- 2000 Adopted Performance-Based Licensure Standards for Colorado Teachers beginning 7-1-00 requires the Commission on Higher Education, in conjunction with the State Board of Education, to review each teacher preparation program and ensure that it meets the statutory requirements.
- 2000 SBE Resolution Concerning Character Education
- 2001 Adopted Revised Accreditation Rules aligned with S.B. 00-186
- 2001 Amendment 23 SBE support position for – Closing the Learning Gap – the Central Element of Educational Accountability in Colorado – Categorical Funding, etc.
- 2003 Adopted Amended Accreditation Rules to include the School Finance Indicator (K) SB 03-248
- 2004 SB Adopted Rules for the Administration of Colorado Cyber Schools

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Educational Services and Service Teams implement rules and regulations adopted by Colorado State Board of Education. Provide technical assistance and general services to assist school districts and schools to be successful in advancing academic achievement for all students and closing the achievement gap.

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

July 2001-2007 – Accreditation Contract (Educational Plan to improve student achievement)
Colorado Accreditation Program Indicators – Districts accredit schools and focus on learning and results
Reasonable Progress over Reasonable Time (Value-Added Longitudinal Growth)

ACCREDITATION

The purpose of this Implementation Guide is to assist school districts in implementing S.B. 186 and State Board of Education adopted Rules and district accreditation contracts which are consistent with S.B.186 and S.B. 98.

These implementation guidelines are designed to be used by all regional service teams and to be shared with district leaders to provide for the equitable implementation of the accreditation process.

The accreditation process is a driving force in creating a new vision for potential Colorado school reform. Goals such as the following can deepen insight and stimulate meaningful educational advancement.

The accreditation process focuses on:

- Improving achievement for all students.
- Considering each district's progress in relation to higher expectations for all students.
- Using data to improve academic achievement for all students.
- Ensuring fairness by using comparisons of data between similar districts.
- The teaching and learning variables that research and best practices have demonstrated to be the most effective.

Standards based accreditation closes the circle of standards based curriculum, standards based instruction, standards based assessment, and standards based accountability.

The Colorado Department of Education and the Office of Educational Services is dedicated to assist districts in their commitment to greater achievement for all students through the use of the accreditation guidelines.

COLORADO ACCREDITATION INDICATORS

| | | ACCREDITATION CATEGORIES | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Accreditation Report Indicators | | Accredited | Accreditation Watch | Accreditation Probation | Non-Accredited |
| A. | <p><u>Educational Improvement Plan 4.01 (1) (A)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High & attainable student achievement goals • Research-based instructional strategies • Standards-based instruction • State & local assessments of student achievement • Parent & community participation • Other accreditation contract requirements <p>Go to Page 12</p> | Meets 2.01 (4) Accreditation Contract requirements | * | ** | After one year on probation, failure to meet state accreditation indicators or show adequate growth on Colorado Department of Education approved improvement plan. |
| B. | <p><u>CSAP Goals 4.01 (1) (B)</u></p> <p>District established CSAP goals of longitudinal growth on district weighted score indices</p> <p>Go to Page 13</p> | Show progress toward achievement of goals in reading, writing, and math | * | ** | |
| C. | <p><u>Closing Achievement Gaps 4.01 (1) (C)</u></p> <p>District established goals for closing learning gaps and advancing high achieving groups as measured by disaggregated student performance data</p> <p>Go to Page 14</p> | Show that student groups below grade level have increased <u>more than one year</u> for each year in school | * | ** | |
| D. | <p><u>Value-Added Growth 4.01 (1) (D)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show students' growth in district weighted score indices over time • NWEA, Terra Nova, or other CDE approved assessments, and Sanders and other analyses <p>Go to Page 15</p> | Show <u>one year's growth</u> in a year's time | * | ** | |
| E. | <p><u>Other Curriculum Areas Not Assessed by CSAP 4.01 (1) (E)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 16</p> | Standards are in place and being implemented and that performance is being assessed | * | ** | |
| F. | <p><u>School Accountability Report 4.01 (1) (F)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 17</p> | Evidence of Compliance | * | ** | |
| G. | <p><u>Annual Report to the Public 4.01 (1) (G)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 18</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |
| H. | <p><u>Safe Schools Act 4.01 (1) (H)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 19</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |
| I. | <p><u>Colorado Basic Literacy Act 4.01 (1) (I)</u></p> <p>Implement ILP (Individual Learning Plan) process and increase proficiency in reading, as assessed by CSAP results and other grades 1-3 reading tests</p> <p>Go to Page 20</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |
| J. | <p><u>Educational Technology & Information Literacy/ Recruitment & Retention of Teachers/Contextual Learning 4.01 (1) (J)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 21</p> | Show evidence of planning and progress | * | ** | |
| K. | <p><u>Finance and the United States Flag 4.01 (1) (K) Principal Professional Development CRS 22-11-201(4) (IV)</u></p> <p>Go to Page 22</p> | Evidence of compliance | * | ** | |

*4.01 (2) Accredited: Accreditation Watch = A school or district is placed on Accreditation Watch if it does not meet one of the accreditation indicators described in 4.01 (1) (a) through (i). A district that is placed on accreditation watch shall provide an improvement plan to the Department within 90 days of receiving written notice of its lack of compliance. The Department shall approve or deny the plan within 30 days of receiving it.

**Accreditation Probation = After one year of Accreditation Watch, if progress continues to be insignificant after one year on accreditation watch.

EVALUATING DISTRICT PROGRESS USING THE ACCREDITATION INDICATORS

The accreditation indicators cover all the major parts of the accreditation process required by the accreditation rules (1 CCR-301-1). These rules can be found on the CDE web site at www.cde.state.co.us/accreditation.

In evaluating a district's progress, the concept of Reasonable Progress over Reasonable Time applies in the following ways:

1. A district must show evidence of progress/compliance in each of the eleven areas listed in A through K on page 5 of these guidelines.
2. Progress will be measured using 2001-2002 as the baseline year.
3. Progress will be based on growth in student achievement from year to year, and in terms of the district's goals.
4. District goals should be specific, measurable, attainable, research based, and time phased for all students.
5. The concept of "preponderance of the evidence" is used in each of the eleven "Accreditation Indicators." "Preponderance of the evidence" means that the weight of the evidence falls heaviest toward demonstrating growth and progress.

The summary judgment about a district's accreditation status shall be made annually by the CDE regional managers, based on evidence of progress submitted by the district and gathered by the regional managers and regional coordinators.

CDE PROCESS FOR ASSESSING DISTRICT COMPLIANCE WITH ACCREDITATION INDICATORS

The basic steps for district accreditation are as follows:

- CDE regional managers and coordinators will review evidence of progress, success, and compliance with the eleven Accreditation Indicators.
- The Colorado Department of Education administers the accreditation process of each district. The district administers the accreditation process for each school.
- The CDE regional team prepares the annual written accreditation review. The review includes but is not limited to:
 - Progress of the district's educational improvement plan.
 - District's achievement data in reading, writing, and math.
 - District's achievement data showing reductions in learning gaps in reading, writing and math as measured by disaggregated CSAP data.
 - Compliance with State Board of Education rules and Colorado Revised Statutes.
 - Actions to be taken to meet the requirements of accreditation.
- During the academic year a collaborative, data-gathering, and on-going dialogue will take place between the school district and CDE.
- A district that meets state accreditation indicators will retain the status of "Accredited."
- Based on evidence of progress submitted by the district and gathered by the regional managers and coordinators, a decision shall be made concerning a district's accreditation status.
- CDE regional managers and regional coordinators will provide assistance to schools and school districts to implement the accreditation rules. Additionally CDE will provide technical assistance and broker resources to support districts.

APPENDIX SECTION

ACCREDITATION REVIEW PROCESS

Information Gathering/Body of Evidence

1. District and school profile
 - School and district improvement plans
 - CSAP data and local assessment data
 - Other Indicators of student growth
 - Individual school and district demographic data and other local circumstances
 - Review of district accreditation contract goals

Review of School and District Information: On-going Review and Monitoring

2. Regional managers and coordinators
 - School and district on-site visits with district administration and other staff
 - Review of student achievement data
 - "Closing the learning gap" discussions
 - Accreditation contract content discussions

Communication/Interaction Reasonable Progress over Reasonable Time

CDE: Technical Assistance

3. Regional manager and service team members will be a support system for assistance to schools and districts in accordance with Colorado State Board of Education rules and/or school and district requests for technical assistance.

Written Annual Review/Accreditation

4. The CDE "Annual Assessment Review" will summarize: (1) achievement pursuant to the accreditation contract goals; (2) Colorado Accreditation Program requirements; (3) evidence of compliance; (4) best practices/what works; and (5) accreditation status determined.

Accreditation Status Hearing/Appeal Process

5. First, appeal to Assistant Commissioner, Office of Educational Services; second, appeal to Commissioner or designee.

Identify Best Practices/What Works

6. - Comprehensive school reform models
- Professional development models/practices
- Technology as instructional tool
- Library/media collaboration
- Contextual learning programs

Accreditation categories:

1. Accredited
2. Accredited: Accreditation Watch
3. Accredited: Accreditation Probation
4. Nonaccredited

DISAGGREGATED GROUPS

Districts will be asked to identify differences in performance of the groups listed below when 16 or more students exist in a category.

Further, districts will be asked to set their own goals for closing existing learning gaps and increasing overall proficiency, including advancement of high achieving students.

| Ethnicity/Program/Gender | Number | Sub-Group Population |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Race/Ethnicity | 5 categories | White Non-Hispanic, Hispanic, African American, American Indian & Asian/Pacific Islander |
| Exceptional Child | 1 category | GT |
| English Language Learners | 1 category | |
| Gender | 2 categories | Male/Female |
| Disability | 3 categories | For Students with IEPs: CSAP performance scores CSAPA performance scores No Scores |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | 1 categories | For free and reduced lunch approved students |
| Migrant | 1 category | Students identified as migrant |

CDE ACCREDITATION CONTRACT REVIEW QUESTIONS

State Board of Education Rule 2202-R

2.00 The Accreditation Contract

Accreditation Contract is the Educational Improvement Plan.

The following questions will be reviewed in each district contract. Upon review it shall be noted that each question has been addressed and that the district is in compliance with the requirements in sections 2.00 and 2.01 of the accreditation rules.

CDE regional managers may ask for further information and documentation from districts on these issues if necessary.

2.01 (1) Process to accredit schools in the district

&

- 2.01 (4) (g) Questions What is the process?
Who will be involved?
What is the timeline?
When would you report results for all schools?

Colorado Accreditation Indicators A, B & C (See Implementation Guidelines, page 5.)

2.01 (4) (a) District content standards and performance levels

Provide evidence

2.01 (4) (b) District standards, goals & requirements

Identification of areas in which one or more of the principals of the public schools require further training or development, and provision or identification of professional development programs to assist the identified principals in improving their skills in the identified areas. HB 06-1001

Provide evidence

2.01 (4) (c) Assessments to measure achievement and specification of acceptable performance levels

Provide evidence

2.01 (4) (d) Evidence that district standards meet or exceed state model content standards

Provide evidence

- 2.01 (4) (e) **Evidence that the district assessments are comparable to CSAP**
What districts assessments are used and how do they compare to CSAP?
- 2.01 (4) (f) **Goals and strategies to improve graduation and attendance rates**
and
Identify and reduce consistent patterns of low academic achievement
What are the goals?
What are the strategies?
- 2.01 (4) (g) **Periodic reviews of each school on a cycle**
What is your review cycle?
- 2.01 (4) (h) **Recognition of high performing schools**
What are the recognition strategies?
and
Intervention for unsatisfactory performance
What are the intervention strategies?
- 2.01 (4) (i) **Procedures for corrective action cycles**
When initiated?
What procedures?
- 2.01 (4) (j) **Goals and processes for informing and involving parents and families**
What are the goals and processes?
- 2.01 (4) (k) **Assurance that schools will participate in assessments**
Provide assurance statement
- 2.01 (4) (l) **Assurance Statement – Assurances that policies are in place and being implemented**
Provide evidence

Accreditation Checklist

Indicator A – Educational Improvement Plan

This indicator assesses the district completion and implementation of an Educational Improvement Plan. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. District improvement plan is annually created, reviewed and/or updated. | |
| 2. District improvement plan contains high measurable student achievement goals/objectives including, but not limited to, closing the achievement gaps, graduation rates and attendance. | |
| 3. District improvement plan includes standards based research strategies to improve the student achievement of all students. | |
| 4. District improvement plan includes multiple student achievement assessments. | |
| 5. District improvement plan provides the foundation for the development and implementation of a school improvement plan, including the accreditation of each school. | |
| 6. District improvement plan is developed and/or reviewed through the systematic participation of key stakeholders, including accountability committee(s). | |
| 7. Other requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recognition of high performing schools - intervention process including, but not limited to, a corrective action cycle for low performing schools. | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence show that the district has a viable and aligned District Improvement Plan?

Indicator B – CSAP Goals

This indicator assesses district CSAP goals and performance over the time period of the accreditation contract. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. The district’s goals for improving CSAP performance are well-defined and implemented in the schools. There is evidence showing progress in meeting these district goals. | |
| 2. The weighted index data is increasing, showing improving student achievement. | |
| 3. The CSAP longitudinal data is utilized to improve instruction and student achievement. | |
| 4. The Board of Education, Accountability Committees, faculty, staff and administration review CSAP goals. | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence indicate growth in student achievement?

Indicator C – Closing Achievement Gaps

This indicator assesses performance in closing achievement gaps. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. The district’s goals for closing achievement gaps are well-defined and expect more than one year’s growth in a year’s time. | |
| 2. The weighted index scores show that achievement gap differences are closing. | |

| <p>3. NCLB’s AYP Progress Report</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AYP Progress Report (NCLB)</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="237 953 1432 1129"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="237 953 834 989">NCLB Goals</th> <th data-bbox="834 953 1432 989">Results</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 989 834 1024">Number of NCLB AYP Goals</td> <td data-bbox="834 989 1432 1024"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1024 834 1060">Number of Goals Achieved</td> <td data-bbox="834 1024 1432 1060"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1060 834 1096">Percentage of Goals Achieved</td> <td data-bbox="834 1060 1432 1096"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1096 834 1129">Number of NCLB Goals not Achieved</td> <td data-bbox="834 1096 1432 1129"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | NCLB Goals | Results | Number of NCLB AYP Goals | | Number of Goals Achieved | | Percentage of Goals Achieved | | Number of NCLB Goals not Achieved | |
|--|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| NCLB Goals | Results | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of NCLB AYP Goals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Goals Achieved | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of Goals Achieved | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of NCLB Goals not Achieved | | | | | | | | | | |

AYP information located at the following address:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeunified/NCLBProfiles0506/index.asp>

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence indicate achievement gaps are closing?

Indicator D – Value Added Growth

This indicator assesses performance using data from CSAP and other district assessment systems. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. The district is measuring student performance in a manner which demonstrates a year's growth. | |
| 2. Longitudinal data indicates improvement in the number of students demonstrating a year's growth. | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence show the students are achieving a year's worth of growth or more in reading, writing and math?

Indicator E – Other Curriculum Areas Not Assessed by CSAP

This indicator assesses achievement in other curriculum areas. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. The district has standards in place and is implemented in other curriculum areas not tested by CSAP. | |
| 2. The district assesses achievement in other curriculum areas of art, civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, music, physical education, and science. | |
| Art | |
| Civics | |
| Economics | |
| Foreign Language | |
| Geography | |
| History | |
| Music | |
| Physical Education | |
| Science | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence indicate that the district has a plan in place with time frames to improve student achievement in other curriculum areas?

Indicator F – School Accountability Report

This indicator assesses distribution of the SAR. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. The district distributed the SAR in a timely manner. | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence indicate that the district has distributed the SAR?

Indicator G – Annual Report to the Public

This indicator assesses distribution and required components of the annual report to the public. The following report includes state reporting requirements. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. The Annual Report was distributed in a timely manner | |
| 2. The Annual Report included: (a) Assessments (CSAP), aggregated, grade and subject area, disaggregated by all student groups | |
| (b) Advanced Placement information | |
| (c) Trend data for CSAP and for the 3 rd grade literacy assessment | |
| (d) Numbers of expelled and suspended students | |
| (e) Graduation Rates | |
| (f) Dropout Rates | |
| (g) Percentage of students not taking CSAP | |
| (h) Attendance Rates | |
| (i) Graduation Requirements | |
| (j) Evidence of a safe, civil learning environment | |
| (k) Number and identity of schools in each accreditation category; i.e. Accredited, Watch, Probation, Not Accredited. | |
| (l) The district's high achievement goals and their plan to improve achievement. | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence show that all required components are included in the annual report and that it was widely distributed in a timely manner?

Only districts receiving Title 1 funds must report NCLB requirements. For districts choosing to include their NCLB reporting requirements as part of the same annual report to the public, please review the requirements detailed via the following link for federal reporting requirements:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/NCLB/downloads/rc_checklist.pdf or contact the Office of Special Services.

Indicator H – Safe Schools Act

This indicator assesses completion and implementation of the Safe Schools Act. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. The district has a Safe School Plan for all schools and it is implemented. | |
| 2. The district has policies for conduct and discipline codes, and they are implemented in all district schools. | |
| 3. The district's discipline code includes a specific policy concerning bullying prevention which includes staff and student education. | |
| 4. The local Board of Education adopted general policies and procedures for dealing with students who causes a disruption in the classroom, on school grounds, in a school vehicle, or at school activities. | |
| 5. The district has a mechanism for students to report anonymously on conduct that concerns them. | |
| 6. All schools in the district have a threat assessment team to evaluate threats of violence reported by students, teachers, school staff or law enforcement personnel. | |
| 7. Each school in the district has an effective violence prevention program that meets the needs of that school. | |
| 8. The district has an emergency crisis plan tailored to meet the particular safety concerns at each of the district's schools. | |
| 9. District is in compliance with the Gun-Free Act, the public law 017-110 section 4141. | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence show compliance with the Safe Schools Act?

Indicator I – Colorado Basic Literacy Act

This indicator assesses implementation of the Colorado Basic Literacy Act. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. How are you tracking the 3 rd through 10 th grade cohort group? | |
| 2. Which of the five components of reading instruction seems to be holding your ILP students back? | |
| 3. How is the transitioning of students on ILPs handled from building to building? | |
| 4. What is the correlation between your students on ILPs and the number of students scoring “Unsatisfactory” on CSAP? | |
| 5. What assessments are you using for initial screening, progress monitoring, and outcome? | |
| 6. What interventions are being used for students below grade level at primary, intermediate, and secondary? | |

CBLA information may be accessed at the following site:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/action/CBLA/index.htm>

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence show that data is being used to improve instructional practices for increased student achievement?

Indicator J – Educational Technology & Information Literacy/Recruitment & Retention of Teachers/Contextual Learning

This indicator assesses completion and implementation of district’s plan for Educational Technology and Information Literacy, Retention and Recruitment of Teachers, and Contextual Learning. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Yes/No | Evidence |
|---|--------|----------|
| <p>1. <u>Educational Technology & Information Literacy</u> The district’s plan for Educational Technology and Information Literacy links to the district’s plan and relates directly to student achievement. The plan has been approved by and is on file at CDE.</p> | | |
| <p>The district’s Educational Technology and Information Literacy plan includes policies and procedures to prevent students from accessing inappropriate material on the Internet.</p> | | |

*Technology and Information Literacy staff at CDE will provide evidence of compliance to be included in the Annual Accreditation Report.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>2. <u>Recruiting and Retaining Teachers</u> The district has a plan to recruit, develop and retain quality, licensed teachers.</p> | | |
| <p>3. <u>Contextual Learning</u> The district is implementing contextual learning.</p> | | |
| <p>4. <u>Drop Out Rate & Attendance</u> The district has implemented a plan to maintain/increase high attendance and graduation rates</p> | | |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence show that the district is engaged in effective planning and implementation of its plans for Educational Technology and Information Literacy; Recruitment and Retention; Contextual Learning; and maintaining high attendance and graduation rates?

Indicator K – Finance, The United States Flag, and Principal Professional Development

This indicator assesses whether the district is in compliance with budgeting, accounting and reporting requirements. The body of evidence to be reviewed for this indicator includes the following:

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|--|--|
| 1. The district has provided evidence of compliance with the budgeting, accounting and reporting requirements. | Evidence of compliance will be gathered by the CDE Finance Unit. |
| 2. The district has provided an assurance in their accreditation contract that the district is in compliance with the budgeting, accounting, and reporting requirements of SB -03-248. | |

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|--|--|
| 1. The district has provided evidence of compliance by adoption of a school district policy to ensure that the right of school district employees and students to display reasonably the flag of the United States is not infringed. | Evidence of compliance will be a copy of the adopted school district policy. |

| Compliance Components | Evidence |
|---|---|
| 1. The district has provided evidence of compliance by identifying areas in which one or more of the principals requiring further training or development and provision or identification of professional development programs to assist the identified principals in improving their skills in the identified areas. | Evidence of compliance will be evidence of district-determined professional development for principals. |

Judgment: Does the weight of the evidence show that the district has met the requirement of an auditor’s report from the district, state, CDE Finance Unit, and the assurance statement in the Accreditation Contract is adopted? **Does the district have the required policy of the United States flag and show evidence of providing district-identified professional development to the principals?**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT COLORADO ACCREDITATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

1) What is the purpose of the Annual Assessment Review?

The purpose of the Annual Assessment Review is to produce a report on a district's progress relating to the accreditation indicators. Specifically, the review will evaluate the district's progress in relation to the goal of a year's growth over a year's time (more than a year's growth over a year's time for those students who are behind).

2) Who does the review?

Your regional manager or coordinator will complete the Annual Accreditation Report. Regional service personnel may assist in gathering information to complete the review.

3) Who should attend the review?

Department officials will meet primarily with district administrators and other appropriate personnel. Information gathered from individual schools may also be used to determine accreditation status.

4) What kinds of reports, plans, etc., will the district need to have available?

The district will need to have available any information that may be helpful in determining compliance with each of the Accreditation Indicators.

5) How will the results of the review be communicated to the district?

The results of the culminating review will be reported to each district in a formal written Annual Accreditation Report completed by the Regional Manager or Coordinator.

6) What is required of a district that has been identified to have significant deficiencies relating to the accreditation indicators?

The district will be placed on Accreditation Watch, still maintaining accreditation. The district will be required to present to the department of education a plan for improvement to remediate accreditation deficiencies.

7) How should my district best prepare for the review? How can I receive assistance to prepare properly for this review?

The district needs to use the Accreditation Checklist to collect evidence of compliance for each accreditation indicator. This evidence should be placed in a district notebook and given to the Regional Manager or Coordinator at the

Accreditation Review. A district can receive assistance by contacting its Regional Manager or Coordinator.

8) What happens if I disagree with the Accreditation Report?

When a district disagrees with the Annual Accreditation Report, the district can appeal first to the Assistant Commissioner, Office of Educational Services, then to the Commissioner of Education. Finally, the district can appeal to the State Board of Education.

9) How many school districts will receive a review each year?

All school districts will be reviewed annually.

10) What common types of problems might districts have?

Each district is unique, and potential problems cannot be generalized across the state. The department will work with each district individually to address its unique district circumstances.

11) What happens during a review? Will there be an on-site visit?

The meeting will consist of a review of all Accreditation Indicators and district student achievement data. Visits will occur within the district.

12) Can a district be rated exemplary as a result of the review?

2202-4.01 (2) (3) (4) The accreditation rules provide for only four categories, as follows: Accredited; Accredited-Accreditation Watch; Accredited-Accreditation Probation; and Non-accredited.

13) Will the results of the review be communicated to the state board and the commissioner?

The results of the review will be made available to the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education, as well as others who have an interest.

14) Who will pay the cost of the review?

There is no cost to the district for CDE's participation in the review process.

15) Will the review be held each year?

Yes.

16) What effect will there be on my district accreditation if one or more of my schools is not accredited?

The Annual Accreditation Review results will be determined by analyzing district data. The district is primarily responsible for accrediting schools within the district.

17) What things should be included in the accreditation contract?

A rubric for writing the next phase of accreditation contracts will be provided to districts prior to June 2007.

18) What happens if we fail to meet goals?

Procedures for dealing with failure to meet goals start with a district's improvement plan developed with the support of the Office of Educational Services.

19) How will the contract interface with the School Accountability Report (SAR)? How will the rating affect our accreditation?

The SAR will provide additional data for the Annual Accreditation Review. The accreditation rules and indicators determine the accreditation status of a district.

20) As a small district, our CSAP scores may vary according to the capability of a particular class. How will reduced scores be viewed? Will those reviewing the district look for long-term or short-term progress?

Regional Managers and Coordinators understand the difficulty that small districts have in relation to the varying sizes of classes. They will be looking for reasonable progress over reasonable time.

21) How does the district accredit its schools?

The accrediting of schools in a district is the responsibility of the district.

Revised, Ai – 06/11/07