

Considerations, Key Questions, and Reports for Requests to Reconsider

Considerations

Supplementary Evidence

CDE values other data as supplementary evidence for a school's performance, but it does not supplant state data results with other results.

- If the district/school shows negative trends in achievement, growth, growth gaps and/or postsecondary and workforce indicators, then the supplementary evidence will hold less weight than state data.
- If there is insufficient state data (due to insufficient N counts for public reporting or lack of K-2 data in the DPF/SPF reports, for example), then the supplementary evidence will hold greater weight.
 - However, if supplemental assessment data reveals positive trends or strong performance in early grades, but then the statewide assessment data reveals negative trends or poor performance in later grades, then it is unlikely that the supplementary evidence will outweigh the state data results.
 - Likewise, if supplemental assessment data reveals positive trends or strong performance in some subjects, but then the statewide assessment data reveals negative trends or poor performance in other subjects, then it is unlikely that the supplementary evidence will outweigh the state data results.

Inputs vs. Outputs/Outcomes

Student performance outputs and outcomes, rather than inputs, are the primary consideration.

- Factors such as school culture (e.g., attendance and discipline data), curriculum, and professional development are important factors in the evaluation of schools, as they are crucial conditions for improving student achievement. However, when student achievement and growth are unsatisfactory, input measures should not compensate for the lack of performance. A school's higher performance on input measures should show commensurate increases in output performance measures. It may be that the impact is lagged, in which case the district's/school's subsequent performance framework reports should show improvements in future years.

Key questions

Direction and Duration

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements across all key performance indicators over at least the most recent three years?

Does the school demonstrate fidelity of implementation of its major improvement strategies over at least the most recent three years?

Achievement

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements in achievement over at least the most recent three years?

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements in achievement across all content areas over at least the most recent three years?

- Does the data suggest any instructional weaknesses?

Growth and Growth Gaps

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements in growth over at least the most recent three years?

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements in growth across all disaggregated student groups over at least the most recent three years?

- Does the data suggest any instructional weaknesses?

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements in postsecondary results over at least the most recent three years (by cohort and/or 5-, 6- and 7-year rates)?

- If low graduation rates, does the school provide evidence of re-engaging students or furthering their progress towards Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness over a longer period of time?

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements in postsecondary results across all disaggregated student groups over at least the most recent three years (by cohort and/or 5-, 6- and 7-year rates)?

Closing Growth and Achievement Gaps

Does the school demonstrate consistent improvements in closing growth and achievement gaps?

School Levels

Does the school demonstrate the above components across all school levels (elementary, middle, high)?

Do early literacy and mathematics results demonstrate that the school is achieving or progressing adequately to foster success in later grades?

Do early literacy and mathematics results correlate with CSAP/TCAP performance?

Supplemental Assessments

Do supplemental assessments suggest performance different from what CSAP/TCAP data presents?

For elementary schools, do DIBELS, DRA, or PALS results correspond to 3rd grade CSAP/TCAP achievement?

Participation Rates

Was the participation rate met in all areas?

Was the participation rate met for any additional assessments submitted through this process?

A request to reconsider the participation rates may be made if students were unable to test due to emergency medical conditions. For students who have suffered significant medical emergencies which prevent them from attending school and participating in the assessment during the entire testing window (including make-up dates), a district may request that they be removed from participation calculations entirely (denominator and numerator). Documentation that such students have been determined by a medical practitioner to be incapacitated to the extent they are unable to participate in the appropriate State assessment must be included with the appeal.

CDE will consider issues of N count (i.e., exception for smaller districts/schools) in reviewing Requests to Reconsider based on participation rates.

Additionally, a request to reconsider the participation rate may also be made for districts that exceed the 1% COAlt proficiency cap. Records that exceed the 1% COAlt proficiency cap will be counted as non-

participants. If the district can provide the following evidence, CDE may approve for the records to be counted as participants.

- Data demonstrating the incidence of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, such as December Count information (i.e. number of students with a disability label of SLIC, multiple, autism, deaf/blind, etc.).
- Data demonstrating the number and percent of students topping out of CoAlt, as defined by the following:
 - For reading- the number and percent of students scoring Novice, with all Level of Independence scores of 4.
 - For math- the number and percent of students scoring Novice, with all Level of Independence scores of 4.
- An explanation for why more than 1% of all students in the district require the alternate assessment.
- Documentation of:
 - The process for evaluating and determining eligibility for special education services as a student with significant cognitive disability.
 - The determination of eligibility for alternate assessments, including CoAlt, by the IEP team. Please include all factors of consideration besides the presence of a severe cognitive disability.
 - Local training for IEP Teams around eligibility criteria for alternate assessments.
 - Parent notification that their child will be assessed through the CoAlt and information about and implications of taking this assessment.
 - Number of students with IEPs taking the general assessment with and without accommodations and the percentage taking the alternate.
 - District professional development efforts around the appropriate use of accommodations.
 - Provision of a curriculum and modified instruction based on Colorado Academic Standards/Extended Evidence Outcomes for students taking the CoAlt (i.e., standards-based goals and objectives on alternate academic achievement standards).

Districts will be notified if their data show district overage of 1% of all and CoAlt tested students scoring proficient on the CoAlt. This appeal only applies to the district level as schools are not held to the 1% proficiency cap.

Key reports

While CDE values other assessment data as supplementary evidence for a school's performance, it does not supplant CSAP/TCAP results with other assessment results.

Interim and formative assessment data submitted by schools and districts should be presented in the form of official reports generated by the test vendor, or in the case of locally developed interim assessments, generated through the official reporting system (e.g., Edusoft). Additional criteria for submitting interim assessment data include:

- Testing administration date and the total number of test takers at the time of administration should be noted on each report.
- Growth data should reflect gains made using the beginning of the year as baseline and the end of the academic year as compared to national norms.

- For growth reports, the number of students enrolled between the two administration dates and the number of students taking the interim test during both periods should be noted.

For NWEA growth reports, please submit:

- NWEA District Summary Report by School
- NWEA School Growth Summary Report
- By subject and grade, what % of the target did the school meet?
- By subject and grade, what % of students meet the target?

Data should be presented in the following format (example data):

Measure	Grade	% of target	% of students meeting target
MAP language usage	2	92.1%	46.8%
MAP language usage	3	88.8%	45.5%
MAP language usage	4	147.5%	63%
MAP language usage	5	135.1%	65.9%
MAP math	1	112.1%	56.3%
MAP math	2	72.3%	34.8%
MAP math	3	118.7%	65.1%
MAP math	4	135.6%	71.7%
MAP math	5	122%	59.1%
MAP reading	1	98.9%	52.1%
MAP reading	2	83.8%	44.7%
MAP reading	3	102.4%	54.5%
MAP reading	4	147.5%	71.7%

For DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy Skills) reports, submit:

- Beginning of year histograms vs. end of year histograms
- Summary of Effectiveness Report: Does the school meet expected annual growth?
- Number of students included in the end of year report that were included in the beginning of the year report.

Reviews of DIBELS performance in Requests to Reconsider will be based on guidelines from a DIBELS technical adequacy report which indicates that:

- Approximately 95% of students at benchmark should remain benchmark, approximately 80% of students at strategic should move to benchmark, and approximately 80% of students at intensive should move to strategic or benchmark.
- Although the ultimate goal is to have all students achieving literacy goals, data on a large number of schools and districts indicates that it is not uncommon to see a 10-20% growth in the number of students at benchmark in kindergarten and first grade over the first two years of collecting data.

Data should be submitted in the following format (example data):

Measure	Grade	Result
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	1	Beginning of year not provided
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	2	57% to 67% on ORF 20% to 17% students strategic 24% to 15% students intensive

DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	3	49% to 61% on ORF 28% to 13% students strategic 23% to 27% students intensive
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	4	57% to 52% on ORF 18% to 27.5% students strategic 25% to 20% students intensive
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	5	55% to 55% on ORF 21.5% to 29% students strategic 23.5% to 15% students intensive