



Colorado Department of Education
FY 2013-14 Budget Request
Strategic Plan

October 15, 2012

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Table of Contents

Introduction And Statutory Authority	1
I. Vision & Mission Statement	2
II. Summary of Goals and Objectives	3
III. Strategic Plan
Goal 1-Successful Students.....	..4
Goal 2-Great Teachers and Leaders.....	12
Goal 3-Outstanding Schools and Districts.....	15
Goal 4-Best Education System in the Nation.....	18
IV. Appendix.....	20

INTRODUCTION AND STATUTORY AUTHORITY

As a *dynamic service agency*, CDE provides leadership, resources, support, and accountability to the state's 178 school districts, 1,780 schools, and over 130,000 educators to help them build capacity to meet the needs of the state's approximately 840,000 public school students. CDE also provides services and support to boards of cooperative educational services (BOCES), early learning centers, state correctional schools, facility schools, the state's libraries, adult/family literacy centers, and General Education Development (GED) testing centers reaching learners of all ages. CDE operates the Colorado Talking Book Library which provides supports for people who have vision, print, and reading disabilities. In addition, CDE provides structural and administrative support to the Colorado School for the Deaf and the Blind and the Charter School Institute.

As the administrative arm of the State Board of Education, CDE is responsible for implementing state and federal education laws, disbursing state and federal funds, holding schools and districts accountable for performance, licensing all educators, and providing public transparency of performance and financial data. CDE serves students, parents, and the general public by protecting the public trust through ensuring adherence to laws, strong stewardship of public funds, and accountability for student performance.

As a *learning organization*, CDE actively partners with districts, schools, educators, families, and community agencies to assess needs, foster innovation, identify promising practices, learn from each other, and disseminate successful strategies to increase student achievement and ensure college and career readiness.

As a *change agent*, CDE seeks to continually advance and improve the state's education system to prepare all learners for success in a rapidly changing global workplace. CDE sets a clear vision for increasing student and overall system performance and holds itself and the state's schools and districts accountable for results.

Statutory Authority – The statutory authority for the Colorado Department of Education is established in Section 24-1-115 of the Colorado Revised Statutes.

I. VISION AND MISSION STATEMENT

Vision Statement

All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in a globally competitive workforce.

Mission Statement

The mission of CDE is to shape, support, and safeguard a statewide education system that prepares all students for success in a globally competitive world.

Narrative of the Department's Vision and Mission

The vision and mission guide the work of the department. CDE's strategic plan focuses the department on achieving its mission by creating an aligned statewide education system from the classroom all the way to the statehouse. We have set clear goals related to student achievement, educator effectiveness, school/district performance, and state agency operations – all aimed at aligning efforts toward preparing students for success after high school.

We believe that the strategies for accomplishing our goals are tightly connected to our effective implementation of several key pieces of education reform legislation, namely Colorado's Achievement Plan for Kids (S.B. 08-212), Colorado's Accountability Act (S.B. 09-163), Colorado's Educator Effectiveness Act (S.B. 10-191), and the READ Act (H.B. 12-1238). The strategies in our strategic plan specifically relate to accomplishing key implementation milestones for each of these laws. We believe the power is in the integration and connection of these pieces of legislation that collectively raise the bar for students, educators, and schools/districts. We are increasing the rigor and relevance of what we are teaching and assessing through the Colorado Academic standards adopted pursuant to S.B. 08-212. At the same time, we are increasing accountability and support to teachers to help them be more effective in teaching this more rigorous content through high quality evaluations connected to student growth, as outlined in S.B. 10-191. We will be ensuring through the READ Act that students gain the necessary literacy skills that are the gateway to success throughout school and life. And, we are implementing a comprehensive accountability system that holds schools and districts accountable for growth and continuous improvement, as envisioned in S.B. 09-163.

Our budget requests for 2013-14 are directly tied to the state's implementation of these reforms. Specifically, the department is requesting funding for the augmentation of the state's new assessment system. In addition, the department is requesting funds to strengthen implementation of the state's school and district accountability and improvement planning required under SB09-163.

II. SUMMARY OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The department has four overarching goals with specific objectives tied to each of them. The objectives drive the performance measures, benchmarks, strategies and action plans of the department. As noted earlier, the goals and objectives aim to build an aligned education system (student, educator, schools/districts, state) focused on better results for all students.

Successful Students

- 1. Prepare students to thrive in their education and in a globally competitive workforce.**
 - a. Ensure every student is making adequate growth to graduate from high school postsecondary and workforce ready.¹
 - b. Increase achievement for all students and close achievement gaps.
 - c. Ensure students graduate ready for postsecondary and workforce success.
 - d. Increase national and international competitiveness for all students.

Great Teachers and Leaders

- 2. Ensure effective educators for every student and effective leaders for every school and district.**
 - a. Increase and support the effectiveness of all educators.
 - b. Optimize the preparation, licensure, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.
 - c. Eliminate the educator equity gap.

Outstanding Schools and Districts

- 3. Build the capacity of schools and districts to meet the needs of Colorado students and their families.**
 - a. Increase performance for all districts and schools.
 - b. Turnaround the state's lowest performing districts and schools.
 - c. Foster innovation and expand access to a rich array of high quality learning options for all students.

Best Education System in the Nation

- 4. Build the best education system in the nation.**
 - a. Lead the nation in policy, innovation, and positive outcomes for education.
 - b. Operate with excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness to become the best SEA in the nation.
 - c. Attract and retain outstanding talent to CDE.

¹ "Postsecondary and workforce readiness" describes the knowledge, skills, and behaviors essential for high school graduates to be prepared to enter college and the workforce and to compete in the global economy. For a full description of "postsecondary and workforce ready," visit:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdegen/downloads/PWRdescription.pdf>.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal 1: Prepare students to thrive in their education and in a globally competitive workforce.

The performance measures selected for the objectives related to this goal are the same measures we hold our schools and districts accountable for in their accountability performance frameworks. They are also the measures the U.S. Department of Education holds us accountable to monitor and meet. We believe strongly that if we are to have an aligned system, we need to be examining at the state level the same performance framework measures we monitor at the district and school level.

Objective 1a. Ensure every student is making adequate growth to graduate from high school postsecondary and workforce ready.

Strategies for Objective 1a
School Readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase access to quality programs that foster early learning, school-readiness, and family literacy so students enter school ready to learn.• Assess, monitor, and improve student readiness for school by identifying and supporting districts with implementation of school readiness assessments.
High Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase student achievement in all content areas by supporting districts in implementing the Colorado Academic and English Language Proficiency Standards and by supporting early childhood providers in implementing Colorado's early learning guidelines.• Improve students' literacy skills by supporting district implementation of Colorado's READ Act.
Powerful, aligned assessment system <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assess student mastery by designing and implementing a comprehensive assessment system accessible to all students.

Performance Targets for Objective 1a: Student Proficiency and Adequate Growth

The targets for this objective were determined by examining historical trend data from 2006-07 to 2010-11 for both student proficiency (are students where they need to be) and student adequate growth (are students making progress). Change over time was examined and a stretch goal of three times the five-year growth trend was applied. In cases where there was a decline in numbers or more growth was needed in order for subpopulations to catch up, the performance benchmarks were based on management decisions to increase performance between three and seven percentage points.

Chart 1: Percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science on state assessment

(includes student results for CSAP/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
Reading										
Elementary	68.8%	69.4%	69.5%	69.2%	69.3%	70.7%	69.7%	70.0%	70.4%	70.8%
Middle	65.2%	67.1%	67.0%	69.0%	67.3%	68.7%	68.9%	70.5%	72.1%	73.8%
High	67.6%	67.5%	69.5%	68.6%	65.1%	68.9%	66.2%	67.3%	68.4%	69.5%
Writing										
Elementary	54.8%	54.8%	55.2%	53.7%	56.5%	54.1%	57.8%	59.0%	60.3%	61.5%
Middle	56.0%	56.0%	57.8%	56.5%	57.3%	57.2%	58.3%	59.2%	60.2%	61.2%
High	50.0%	49.0%	51.2%	49.1%	49.7%	50.6%	50.5%	51.2%	52.0%	52.7%
Math										
Elementary	67.7%	67.8%	67.7%	69.0%	68.8%	69.0%	69.6%	70.4%	71.2%	72.0%
Middle	50.3%	49.9%	54.3%	52.9%	54.3%	54.4%	57.4%	60.5%	63.5%	66.6%
High	32.7%	34.7%	33.3%	35.6%	34.9%	35.8%	36.5%	38.1%	39.7%	41.4%
Science										
Elementary	42.1%	43.7%	44.9%	46.9%	46.8%	48.6%	50.4%	53.9%	57.4%	61.0%
Middle	52.4%	48.6%	49.3%	48.9%	49.9%	49.3%	50.6%	51.4%	52.1%	52.9%
High	49.2%	46.9%	51.1%	48.2%	48.5%	50.3%	49.2%	50.0%	50.7%	51.5%

Chart 2 Performance Targets for Objective 1a: Percent of students making adequate growth to catch up and keep up on path to proficiency²

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
READING										
Elementary	64.1%	65.9%	65.6%	67.6%	64.4%	66.8%	64.6%	64.8%	65.1%	65.3%
Middle	65.0%	64.3%	65.8%	66.2%	62.3%	64.0%	63.3%	64.3%	65.2%	66.2%
High	71.6%	68.0%	72.1%	69.0%	67.0%	69.6%	68.3%	69.6%	70.8%	72.1%
WRITING										
Elementary	55.9%	56.2%	58.6%	55.0%	60.3%	55.8%	63.5%	66.8%	70.1%	73.3%
Middle	51.5%	48.9%	52.1%	48.3%	50.3%	48.7%	51.1%	51.8%	52.6%	53.3%
High	52.5%	49.1%	52.6%	49.0%	50.6%	49.3%	51.3%	52.1%	52.8%	53.6%
MATH										
Elementary	53.3%	47.7%	54.4%	50.6%	54.5%	51.0%	55.4%	56.3%	57.3%	58.2%
Middle	37.7%	37.8%	39.0%	39.0%	38.9%	38.9%	39.8%	40.6%	41.5%	42.4%
High	32.2%	33.0%	32.2%	33.5%	34.3%	34.0%	35.8%	37.4%	39.0%	40.6%

² Growth data is not available for science

Performance measure 1a. Student Achievement: Percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Appropriated	2013-14 Request	
Percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school (includes student results for CSAP, CSAP-A, Lectura and Escritura)	Benchmark	N/A	Reading			
			Elm 69.7%	Elm 70.0%	Elm 70.4%	
			Mid 68.9%	Mid 70.5%	Mid 72.1%	
			High 66.2%	High 67.3%	High 68.4%	
			Writing			
			Elm 57.8%	Elm 59.0%	Elm 60.3%	
			Mid 58.3%	Mid 59.2%	Mid 60.2%	
			High 50.5%	High 51.2%	High 52.0%	
			Math			
			Elm 69.6%	Elm 70.4%	Elm 71.2%	
			Mid 57.4%	Mid 60.5%	Mid 63.5%	
			High 36.5%	High 38.1%	High 39.7%	
	Science					
	Elm 50.4%	Elm 53.9%	Elm 57.4%			
	Mid 50.6%	Mid 51.4%	Mid 52.1%			
	High 49.2%	High 50.0%	High 50.7%			
	Actual	Reading			N/A	N/A
		Elm 69.3%	Elm 70.7%			
		Mid 67.3%	Mid 68.7%			
		High 65.1%	High 68.9%			
		Writing				
		Elm 56.5%	Elm 54.1%			
		Mid 57.3%	Mid 57.2%			
		High 49.7%	High 50.6%			
Math						
Elm 68.8%		Elm 69.0%				
Mid 54.3%		Mid 54.4%				
High 34.9%		High 35.8%				
Science						
Elm 46.8%	Elm 48.6%					
Mid 49.9%	Mid 49.3%					
High 48.5%	High 50.3%					

Performance measure 2b. Student Growth: Percent of students making adequate growth to catch up and keep up on the path to proficiency.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Appropriated	2013-14 Request		
Percent of students making adequate growth to catch up and keep up on path to proficiency	Benchmark	N/A	Reading				
			Elm 64.6%	Elm 64.8%	Elm 65.1%		
			Mid 63.3%	Mid 64.3%	Mid 65.2%		
			High 68.3%	High 69.6%	High 70.8%		
			Writing				
			Elm 63.5%	Elm 66.8%	Elm 70.1%		
			Mid 51.1%	Mid 51.8%	Mid 52.6%		
			High 51.3%	High 52.1%	High 52.8%		
			Math				
	Elm 55.4%	Elm 56.3%	Elm 57.3%				
	Mid 39.8%	Mid 40.6%	Mid 41.5%				
	High 35.8%	High 37.4%	High 39.0%				
	Actual		Reading			N/A	N/A
			Elm 64.4%	Elm 66.8%			
			Mid 62.3%	Mid 64.0%			
High 67.0%			High 69.6%				
Writing							
Elm 60.3%			Elm 55.8%				
Mid 50.3%			Mid 48.7%				
High 50.6%			High 49.3%				
Math							
Elm 54.5%	Elm 51.0%						
Mid 38.9%	Mid 38.9%						
High 34.3%	High 34.0%						

Evaluation of progress toward targets for Objective 1a (2011-12 to 2012-13): The state’s TCAP proficiency scores remained steady with slight increases in some areas. State proficiency targets were achieved for elementary and high school reading, high school writing, and high school science. The state held steady for the most part in all other areas. Student adequate growth targets were met in reading for all school levels. Student adequate growth declined for all grade levels in writing and held steady or declined in math. The state is disappointed that performance targets in many areas were not met. We acknowledge that the strategies outlined for this objective are still in the early implementation stage and their impact has yet to be realized. As these strategies are rolled out, the state is working with districts through the unified improvement planning process to help districts identify root causes of performance challenges and implement plans to address them.

Objective 1b. Increase achievement for all students and close achievement gaps.

Strategies for Objective 1b

- Increase the performance of the state’s **lowest performing schools and districts** by providing them with targeted interventions and support to close achievement gaps.
- Increase performance **of students with disabilities** by launching the state’s “reinventing special education” request for proposal to work with specific districts to close achievement gaps of students with disabilities.
- Increase performance of **students who are English language learners** through targeted supports to districts and by seeking legislative changes to the state’s English Language Proficiency Act.
- Improve performance of **students from low-income families** by assisting districts in maximizing the return on investment of their federal and state funds targeted to meet the needs of these students.
- Increase the academic growth of **students who are gifted**.

Performance measure 1b: Student Achievement Sub-populations - The performance measures for this objective examine the performance of student subpopulations, namely free and reduced lunch students, minority students, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. The percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school is examined for each student population with benchmarks set. Because of the magnitude of this data, it is presented in the appendix.

Evaluation of progress toward targets for Objective 1b (2011-12 to 2012-13): The charts in the appendix show that performance: 1) increased for all subjects and school levels for students eligible for free and reduced lunch with the exception for elementary writing, achieving targets in four areas; 2) increased or held steady for all subjects and school levels for minority students, with the exception of a slight decrease in elementary writing, one target was met high school reading; 3) increased or held steady for students with disabilities in all subjects and school levels with the exception of elementary writing and all school levels for science, achieving targets in elementary math and high school reading; 4) held steady or increased performance for students learning English in all subjects and school levels with the exception for middle school reading and math, achieving targets in high school reading and writing and elementary science. Despite overall positive progress, the forward movement is not enough to close achievement gaps. The state is working with districts to address these gaps through the unified improvement planning process. Please note: Some targets were adjusted upward from last year’s submission to ensure closure of achievement gaps over time.

Objective 1c. Ensure students graduate ready for postsecondary and workforce success.

Strategies for Objective 1c

Postsecondary and workforce ready supports

- Decrease dropout rates and increase graduation rates by assisting districts in providing more effective postsecondary and workforce readiness services (e.g., credit recovery, academic and career counseling, concurrent enrollment, multiple pathways to exit, expanded learning opportunities, GED prep, ACT prep, remediation courses).
- Improve students’ planning for academic and career success by supporting successful district implementation of individual career and academic plans (ICAPs).

Postsecondary and workforce ready indicators

- Develop and adopt statewide high school graduation guidelines that allow students multiple ways to demonstrate postsecondary and workforce readiness.
- Assist in piloting the endorsed diploma criteria in selected districts to provide students with an avenue to guaranteed entrance to the state’s higher education system.
- Partner with postsecondary and workforce entities to ensure alignment of higher education admissions policies and workforce competencies with Pre-K-12 standards.

Performance measure 1c: Graduation Rate (using best of 4, 5, 6, or 7 year graduation rate) Baseline began in 2009-10 - The state moved to a new graduation rate calculation beginning in 2009-2010 (prior year’s data is not comparable). The new calculation includes examining the 4, 5, 6, or 7 year graduation rates from districts. This more inclusive number provides a more accurate picture of graduation rates, capturing students who transfer and those who graduate after the 4th year. The state is targeting a graduation rate of 80% for all students by 2014-15.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13 Appropriated		2013-14 Request	
Graduation rate (using best of 4, 5, 6, or 7-year graduation rate) All - refers to all students FRL - refers to students who qualify for free and reduced lunch IEP - refers to students with individualized education plans per special education ELL - refers to English Language Learners	Benchmark	All	75.0%	All	76.0%	All	77.4%	All	78.7%
		FRL	62.5%	FRL	63.6%	FRL	65.3%	FRL	67.1%
		Min	62.2%	Min	63.3%	Min	65.0%	Min	66.8%
		IEP	63.5%	IEP	64.6%	IEP	66.3%	IEP	68.1%
		ELL	57.3%	ELL	58.5%	ELL	60.2%	ELL	62.0%
	Actual	All	77.1%	Not yet available*		N/A		N/A	
		FRL	66.1%						
		Min	66.0%						
		IEP	67.0%						
		ELL	58.8%						

*Graduation rates are collected through CDE’s End-of-Year Collection. The initial deadline for districts to submit this data is September 15th, which allows districts to include summer graduates and completers through the end of August. The department then engages in two “post processes;” the first of which involves the comparison of data within a district regarding historical dropouts and transfers, cross district comparisons, and any subsequent clean-up, and the second of which is a cross-district comparison to ensure, for example, that students are not inaccurately counted as a transfer when they have instead dropped out or that a dropout was not reported in a different district in the current year. Final graduation and dropout rates are released in January for the prior year.

Please note: Targets were adjusted from last year to align to federal 80% graduation rate target.

Performance measure 1c: ACT Scores – Increase student ACT scores as a measure of college readiness. The benchmarks set for this objective were determined by examining historical trend data from 2006-07 to 2010-11 (see chart 3 below) for all students. Change over time was examined and a benchmark of three times the five-year growth trend was applied. In cases where there was a decline in numbers, the benchmarks were based on management decision to drive desired increase.

Chart 3: ACT Composite Scores

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
All Students	19.7	20.1	20.0	20.0	19.9	20.0	20.1	20.2	20.4	20.5
FRL	16.4	16.9	16.7	16.9	16.9	17.1	17.2	17.5	17.9	18.2
Minority	17.3	17.7	17.3	17.3	17.8	*	18.2	18.6	19.0	19.3
Disability	14.4	14.8	14.6	14.6	14.4	14.6	14.7	15.1	15.5	15.9
ELL	15.5	16.0	15.9	15.9	16.0	16.1	16.3	16.7	17.0	17.4

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Appropriated	2013-14 Request			
ACT Scores All - refers to all students FRL - refers to students who qualify for free and reduced lunch Dis - refers to students with disabilities ELL - refers to English Language Learners	Benchmark	N/A	All	20.1	All	20.2	All	20.4
			FRL	17.2	FRL	17.5	FRL	17.9
			Min	18.2	Min	18.6	Min	19.0
			Dis	14.7	Dis	15.1	Dis	15.5
			ELL	16.3	ELL	16.7	ELL	17.0
	Actual	All	19.9	All	20.0	N/A	N/A	
		FRL	16.9	FRL	17.1			
		Min	17.8	Min	*			
		Dis	14.4	Dis	14.6			
		ELL	16.0	ELL	16.1			

*At time this document was submitted, 2012 ACT number was still being verified.

Evaluation of progress toward targets for Objective 1c: At the time of the last report to OSPB, the 2010-11 data for graduation rates was not available. The state’s 2010-11 actual graduation rates exceed the 2011-12 targets for all subpopulations. We will examine 2011-12 data to see if targets for this goal need to be reset. The state made gains in ACT scores for all students, coming close to targets in many areas. The strategies being implemented to support college/career readiness appear to be having an impact.

Objective 1d. Increase national and international competitiveness for all students.

Strategies for Objective 1d

(Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)

- The strategies articulated for Objectives 1 a-c are intended to help the state achieve this objective.

Performance measure 1d. NAEP proficiency (national comparison) - The state has set benchmarks to increase scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a national, biannual test. Historical performance on the NAEP is reflected in the chart below.

Chart 4 Percent of students scoring proficient and above on NAEP

	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Reading 4th	37%	37%	36%	40%	39%
Math 4th	34%	39%	41%	45%	47%
Reading 8th	36%	32%	35%	32%	40%
Math 8th	34%	32%	37%	40%	43%

Performance Measure	Outcome	2007	2009	2011 Appropriated	2013 Request		
Percentage of students scoring proficient and above on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) R4 - reading 4th grade M4 - math 4th grade R8 - reading 8th grade M8 - math 8th grade	Benchmark	N/A	N/A	N/A	R4	41%	
					M4	49%	
					R8	43%	
					M8	45%	
					Actual	R4	36%
	M4	41%	M4	45%		M4	47%
	R8	35%	R8	32%		R8	40%
	M8	37%	M8	40%		M8	43%
	N/A						

National Comparison: When compared to other states and Washington DC, Colorado scored higher than most states on the percentage of students who scored proficient and above on the NAEP mathematics and reading tests for 2011. Chart 5 shows Colorado’s performance is indeed ranked higher than most states. This chart provides the ranking of Colorado performance on the NAEP mathematics and reading tests compared to 49 states and Washington DC for 2011.³

Chart 5 Colorado’s Rank of Average Scale Scored on NAEP by Subject and Grade Level, 2011

	Grade 4	Grade 8
Mathematics	13	8
Reading	17	8

Evaluation of performance targets for Objective 1d: NAEP is administered biannually. We will have evaluation data following the 2013 administration.

³ Source: National Center for Education Statistics; National Assessment of Education Progress, Colorado

Goal 2: Ensure effective educators for every student and effective leaders for every school and district.

CDE is assisting districts with implementation of S.B. 10-191 which will require districts to report annually on the effectiveness of their educators. We do not have baseline statistics for educator effectiveness performance measures, as districts will not begin implementing the new educator evaluation systems and submitting reports on those systems until 2013-14. We are building the reporting tools and systems to collect, monitor, and report on these performance measures. We have identified the performance measures and set benchmarks to guide implementation as described below.

Objective 2a. Increase and support the effectiveness of all educators.

Strategies for Objective 2a	
Evaluation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement S.B. 10-191 (including: rules, pilots, trainings, resources, metrics). Develop an electronic system that enables districts to input and report educator evaluation data and connect that data to professional development. Implement the educator/student data link and common course codes. Establish a system for capturing and reporting educator effectiveness metrics and support districts in using the metrics to improve their human capital systems.
Support system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain a dynamic, web-based educator resource bank that provides training materials, resources, and tools to support increased educator effectiveness. Leverage SchoolView for connecting teachers to resources aligned to their needs and the individual needs of all of their students. Provide targeted training and technical assistance based on educator needs and district performance data to help educators improve the performance of all students.

Performance Targets for Objective 2a: Because the department is implementing legislation for which no outcome baseline data currently exists (in other words, educator effectiveness ratings), the current performance targets are geared toward outputs related to developing and implementing the state model evaluation system that will eventually lead to outcome data.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
				Appropriate	Request
Number of districts provided full training on the state model educator evaluation system	Benchmark	N/A*	27	150	50 (in depth follow up)
	Actual	N/A*	42	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
				Appropriate	Request
Number of educators who have received full training in the state model system and can provide training to the educators in their district	Benchmark	N/A*	462	1600	2000
	Actual	N/A*	600	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
				Appropriate	Request
Number of "CDE approved" training programs for evaluators	Benchmark	N/A*	N/A	2	10
	Actual	N/A*	1 (CDE)	N/A	N/A

*Training did not begin on the educator evaluation system until the summer of 2011.

Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 2a: *The department exceeded its target of training 27 districts in the pilot districts and reached more educators than originally targeted. This outreach was possible due to regional trainings and the ability to accommodate heightened demand for the training.*

Note: Once the department has data on the number of districts implementing the state model system and district educator effectiveness ratings, we will provide performance measures and targets for such areas as: number of districts implementing a robust evaluation system, number of districts with educator effectiveness rating distributions that are correlated with student achievement, number of evaluators certified, number of districts reporting the use of evaluation systems as influencing their human capital decisions, and percentage of educators in each effectiveness rating.

Objective 2b. Optimize the preparation, licensure, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.

Strategies for Objective 2b
<p>Effectiveness-based System of Licensure, Educator Preparation, and Induction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease the cycle time for processing all completed license requests that do not require investigations to two weeks. • Revamp the state’s licensure and induction system to align to the state’s educator effectiveness system. • Develop and begin using metrics to report on educator preparation program effectiveness (including graduate effectiveness, retention rates, etc.). • Partner with the Department of Higher Education and other designated agencies in the authorization and reauthorization of educator preparation programs to better prepare teachers, leaders and other licensed school personnel.

Performance Targets for Objective 2b: Once districts are fully implementing the state’s new educator evaluation system in 2013-14, the department will be able to monitor effectiveness of educator preparation programs and new educators over time. Until such baseline data is available, the primary performance target for this objective pertains to decreasing licensure cycle time. The state processes approximately 30,000 applications a year.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
				Appropriated	Request
Average length of time it takes to process educator licenses (weeks)	Benchmark	20	4	2	2
	Actual	16	3	N/A	N/A

Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 2a: *The state exceeded its target for 2011-12. This was made possible by implementation of an e-licensure system, increased FTE to address bottlenecks, and focused implementation of LEAN business principles.*

Objective 2c. Eliminate the educator equity gap.

The educator equity gap is defined as the tendency of students who come from low-income families and minority students to have less experienced and less qualified teachers than their higher income or non-minority peers.

Strategies for Objective 2c
<p>Transparency and Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide districts with useful reports on educator equity gaps through the SchoolView Data Center.• Assist districts in developing and implementing evidenced-based plans for addressing equity gaps.• Capture and disseminate promising practices for reducing educator equity gaps.• Explore opportunities to extend the reach of the best educators through expanded learning opportunities pilots.

Performance Measures Objective 1c: The state plans to use effectiveness ratings to identify and measure the educator equity gap. Until that metric is available, the state’s interim goal is to ensure all districts understand how to use educator experience and student growth data as a proxy measure for identifying the educator equity gap. The state will do this through the strategies outlined above.

Goal 3: Build the capacity of schools and districts to meet the needs of Colorado students and their families.

Objective 3a. Increase performance for all districts and schools.

Strategies for Objective 3a
<p>Robust, Single Statewide Accountability System that Drives Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a robust single system of state/federal school and district accountability. • Build greater capacity of districts to analyze and use data to engage in effective, continuous improvement efforts through the state’s unified improvement planning process.
<p>System of Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide targeted supports to schools and districts aligned to their needs by using data to guide the state’s services and investment of resources. • Assist districts in building healthy, safe, and positive learning environments for all students.
<p>Rural Service Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement a comprehensive plan to meet the unique needs of rural schools/districts. • Pilot innovative and effective models of expanded and blended learning in rural districts. • Disseminate the legislatively approved funding to help build the capacity of BOCES to provide strong regional services.

Performance Targets for Objective 3a: District accreditation ratings and school plan assignments

Increase the number of districts accredited with distinction from 10% (2009-10) to 15% or 27 districts (2014-15). Decrease the number of priority and turnaround districts from 15% (2009-10) to 10% or 18 (2014-15). Decrease the number of priority and turnaround schools from 12% (2009-10) to 6% or 109 schools (2014-15).

Districts are designated an accreditation category based on the overall score they earn on their district performance framework, which is a type of district annual report card of performance. There are five accreditation categories for districts: Accredited with Distinction; Accredited; Accredited with Improvement; Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan; and Accredited with Turnaround Plan. The highest rating is Accredited with Distinction. The lowest two ratings are Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan and Accredited with Turnaround Plan. Districts in the two lowest categories must move out of those categories within five years or face loss of their accreditation. For more information on the state’s accreditation ratings, please visit: <http://www.schoolview.org/performance.asp>.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Appropriated	2013-14 Request
Number of districts accredited with distinction	Benchmark	N/A	21	23	25
	Actual	18	19	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Appropriated	2013-14 Request
Number of districts accredited with priority improvement and turnaround	Benchmark	N/A	22	20	19
	Actual	23	25	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13 Appropriated	2013-14 Request
Number of schools assigned priority improvement and turnaround plan types	Benchmark	N/A	177	150	128
	Actual	221	163	N/A	N/A

Note: At the time this document was submitted, 2011-12 accreditation ratings were still being verified. These are preliminary numbers.

Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 3a: *The state increased by one the number of districts accredited with distinction, but did not meet the targeted increase. The state did not meet targets for decreasing the number for priority improvement and turnaround districts, increasing the number by two districts. Of note, the state did meet targets for decreasing the number of priority improvement and turnaround schools. CDE is working to strengthen district and school engagement in the unified improvement planning process to better identify root causes and build appropriate interventions. The state will reexamine these numbers once 2011-12 accreditation ratings are finalized.*

Objective 3b. Turnaround the state’s lowest performing districts and schools.

Strategies for Objective 3b

- Develop performance and fiscal partnerships with districts and schools in priority improvement and turnaround aimed at holding them accountable for increased performance.
- Define and implement a range of promising pathways for turnaround schools which support and push change in practices that will result in districts moving out of these statuses.
- Develop and implement Coordinated Support Teams in order to efficiently and effectively identify and provide targeted and successful support to turnaround and priority improvement districts.

Performance Target Objective 3b

The state’s annual goal is to ensure that 100% of districts and schools designated Turnaround or Priority Improvement are on track to move out of these categories within five years. The state will help districts and schools improve their performance through the strategies outlined above. The state is using the 2012-13 school year to establish baseline data for this metric.

Objective 3c. Foster innovation and expand access to a rich array of high quality learning options for all students.

Strategies for Objective 3c

- Support and enhance the quality of the state’s online, charter, and innovation schools.
- Implement the state’s Expanded Learning Opportunities strategic plan, including release and awarding of a request for proposal for districts to pilot expanded learning strategies.
- Expand blended learning in regions needing access to a wider range of learning opportunities.
- Examine potential policy changes to enhance expanded learning opportunities and digital learning using results from the digital learning study commissioned by H.B. 12-1124.

Performance Targets for Objective 3c: School improvement plan ratings

Increase the percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in the performing category on the school performance frameworks from 60% in 2010-11 to 80% in 2014-15. Decrease the percentage of these schools in priority improvement and turnaround from 25% in 2010-11 to 15% in 2014-15.

Schools are assigned an improvement plan rating based on the overall score they earn on their school performance framework, which is a type of school annual report card of performance. There are four improvement plan categories for schools: Performance; Improvement; Priority Improvement; and Turnaround. Performance is the highest rating; Priority Improvement and Turnaround are the lowest ratings.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
				Appropriated	Request
Percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in performing category on school performance framework	Benchmark	N/A	65%	70%	75%
	Actual	60%	69%	N/A	N/A

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
				Appropriated	Request
Percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in priority improvement and turnaround	Benchmark	N/A	23%	20%	18%
	Actual	25%	13%	N/A	N/A

Note: At the time this document was submitted, 2011-12 accreditation ratings were still being verified. These are preliminary numbers. Calculation does not include schools pending AEC rating or schools with insufficient data.

Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 3c: The state exceeded targets for increasing the percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in the performing category and decreasing the number of these schools in the priority improvement and turnaround categories. The state believes this is due in part to an increased focus on the part of charter authorizers and the state on quality improvement. The state will reexamine the numbers once 2011-12 accreditation ratings are finalized. The state will review the numbers for 2012-13 to see if this positive trend continues and will readjust targets appropriately.

Goal 4: Build the best education system in the nation.

Objective 4a. Lead the nation in policy, innovation, and positive outcomes for education.

Strategies for Objective 4a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform and advance statewide policies that enhance the state’s P-20 education system and that lead to more personalized learning opportunities for all students. • Help inform, build, and implement a robust school finance system for the state. • Lead the country in accountability measures and metrics, using the Colorado Growth Model data and English language proficiency growth.

Objective 4b. Operate with excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness to become the best SEA in the nation.

Strategies for Objective 4b
<p>Strategic Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement CDE’s system of aligned strategic, unit, project, and employee performance plans to meet required deliverables and reach performance targets. <p>Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement a strategic communications plan. • Support CDE units in their ability to communicate with coherency and consistency with the field and public. <p>Operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build a flexible student longitudinal data system that can accommodate and adapt to changes in the education system over time. • Decrease the reporting burden for districts. • Implement planned improvements to school finance reporting systems. • Implement the new grants management system

Performance Targets for Objective 4b: Strategic Direction Targets Achieved

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
				Appropriated	Request
Percentage of performance targets met on the strategic plan.	Benchmark	N/A	Baseline	80%	85%
	Actual	N/A	27%	N/A	N/A

Additional measures for operational excellence are monitored at the unit and project level.

Detailed project plans and relevant performance targets for the operational improvements noted in the above strategies are maintained at the unit level.

Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 4b: 2011-12 was used to establish baseline data for this goal. The baseline for this goal is 27% of the state’s strategic plan targets were met.

Objective 4c. Attract and retain outstanding talent to CDE.

Strategies for Objective 4c
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer and respond to findings from staff satisfaction survey. • Implement an aligned professional evaluation and growth plan process for at-will and classified staff and respond to requested refinements to the system based on 2011-12 roll out. • Develop and implement a CDE new employee orientation program. • Ensure consistency of job classifications and salary structure across the organization.

Performance Targets for Objective 4c: Staff Satisfaction and Retention Statistics

Performance Measure	Outcome	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2012-13 Appropriated	2013-14 Request
Percentage of employees who agree/strongly agree: 1) Satisfied with opportunities for career growth and advancement	Benchmark	N/A	N/A	1. 50% 2. 40% 3. 70%	1. 70% 2. 70% 3. 80%
	Actual	N/A	1. 39% 2. 35% 3. 62%	1. 40% 2. 38% 3. 65%	N/A
2) Have the capacity to act on innovative ideas					
3) Satisfied with the recognition they receive for their work					

*CDE administers the staff satisfaction in the fall of each year, as a result, we are able to report results for the current fiscal year. The four items selected for targeting were the lowest rated measures of the survey that staff agreed needed to be addressed.

Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 4c: The fall 2012 satisfaction survey shows slight positive movement but falls short of performance goals. CDE has implemented new growth and performance management plans for all employees, supervisor trainings, and employee recognition. We will be deepening implementation of these efforts in the coming year with the intent to drive increased employee satisfaction.

APPENDIX

Performance Measures and Benchmarks for Objective 1b Student Subgroups

Students Receiving Free and Reduced Lunch

Percent of students receiving free and reduced lunch scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school
(includes student results for CSAP/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Target	Target	Target	Target
READING										
Elementary	49.7%	50.3%	51.1%	52.1%	52.0%	54.3%	53.7%	55.5%	57.2%	58.9%
Middle	43.4%	46.0%	46.2%	50.5%	49.1%	51.2%	53.4%	57.7%	62.0%	66.3%
High	45.3%	44.0%	47.0%	48.2%	46.1%	51.2%	47.3%	48.6%	49.8%	51.1%
WRITING										
Elementary	35.1%	34.8%	36.0%	35.7%	38.4%	36.8%	40.9%	43.3%	45.8%	48.3%
Middle	34.6%	34.2%	37.1%	36.4%	38.4%	39.1%	41.3%	44.1%	47.0%	49.8%
High	26.5%	24.5%	27.8%	26.7%	28.9%	30.8%	30.6%	32.4%	34.1%	35.9%
MATH										
Elementary	49.5%	49.3%	49.9%	52.2%	52.1%	53.0%	54.2%	56.2%	58.2%	60.2%
Middle	28.6%	28.8%	33.5%	33.3%	35.6%	36.1%	40.8%	46.0%	51.3%	56.5%
High	12.9%	13.9%	13.4%	16.6%	16.8%	18.0%	19.6%	22.5%	25.3%	28.2%
SCIENCE										
Elementary	20.9%	21.5%	23.2%	26.2%	26.1%	28.2%	29.9%	33.8%	37.7%	41.5%
Middle	28.3%	23.7%	26.7%	27.8%	28.5%	29.0%	29.8%	31.0%	32.3%	33.5%
High	23.6%	24.1%	26.8%	25.8%	26.6%	29.0%	28.9%	31.1%	33.3%	35.6%

Minority Students⁴

Percent of minority students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school

(includes student results for CSAP/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
READING										
Elementary	51.2%	52.2%	53.0%	53.2%	54.9%	57.0%	57.6%	60.3%	63.0%	65.8%
Middle	45.6%	49.0%	48.9%	52.7%	53.0%	54.1%	58.5%	64.0%	69.5%	75.0%
High	47.9%	47.1%	50.1%	50.2%	50.2%	55.0%	51.9%	53.7%	55.4%	57.1%
WRITING										
Elementary	38.1%	38.2%	39.1%	38.6%	42.6%	41.4%	46.0%	49.4%	52.8%	56.2%
Middle	37.9%	38.0%	41.2%	39.7%	43.4%	43.8%	47.4%	51.5%	55.5%	59.6%
High	30.0%	28.3%	31.5%	29.5%	33.4%	35.4%	36.0%	38.5%	41.1%	43.6%
MATH										
Elementary	51.3%	51.4%	52.1%	53.4%	55.0%	55.6%	57.8%	60.5%	63.3%	66.1%
Middle	31.7%	32.3%	37.2%	36.4%	40.2%	40.2%	46.5%	52.8%	59.2%	65.5%
High	15.5%	16.9%	16.5%	19.0%	20.8%	22.5%	24.8%	28.8%	32.8%	36.8%
SCIENCE										
Elementary	22.0%	23.0%	24.7%	26.8%	28.5%	31.0%	33.4%	38.3%	43.2%	48.1%
Middle	29.6%	25.5%	29.0%	29.4%	32.7%	32.9%	35.1%	37.4%	39.7%	42.1%
High	25.5%	26.3%	29.0%	27.2%	29.9%	32.1%	33.2%	36.4%	39.7%	43.0%

Students with Disabilities

Percent of students with disabilities scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school

(includes student results for CSAP/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
READING										
Elementary	32.2%	28.7%	27.9%	25.4%	25.3%	25.7%	27.0%	28.7%	30.5%	32.2%
Middle	26.1%	22.7%	22.9%	22.1%	20.7%	21.9%	23.4%	25.0%	26.5%	28.0%
High	25.8%	20.2%	22.0%	20.8%	19.2%	21.2%	20.8%	22.5%	24.1%	25.8%
WRITING										
Elementary	21.5%	18.1%	17.8%	16.0%	16.3%	14.8%	17.6%	18.9%	20.2%	21.5%
Middle	17.4%	14.8%	15.2%	13.8%	14.6%	14.6%	15.8%	17.1%	18.3%	19.6%
High	13.0%	9.5%	10.1%	9.3%	10.0%	10.0%	11.3%	12.5%	13.8%	15.0%
MATH										
Elementary	28.5%	28.5%	27.4%	26.9%	26.1%	30.1%	27.4%	28.6%	29.9%	31.1%
Middle	12.8%	11.9%	13.6%	12.2%	12.1%	16.3%	17.1%	17.9%	18.7%	19.5%
High	4.8%	5.4%	4.6%	5.3%	5.3%	7.0%	8.8%	10.5%	12.3%	14.0%
SCIENCE										
Elementary	19.0%	18.9%	18.3%	18.2%	16.8%	16.7%	20.5%	24.3%	28.0%	31.8%
Middle	20.0%	18.3%	18.2%	15.6%	15.3%	14.6%	16.5%	17.8%	19.0%	20.3%
High	15.8%	14.7%	16.1%	14.3%	14.4%	13.7%	15.7%	16.9%	18.2%	19.4%

⁴ Minority includes all students identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, two or more races, other, and Mexican-American/Chicano/Latino.

Students who are English Language Learners
Percent of students who are English language learners scoring at or above proficient in reading,
writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school
(includes student results for CSAP/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Target	Target	Target	Target
READING										
Elementary	38.9%	41.3%	41.7%	43.1%	43.5%	46.1%	46.9%	50.3%	53.7%	57.2%
Middle	32.2%	36.1%	36.9%	41.2%	41.9%	41.8%	49.1%	56.4%	63.6%	70.9%
High	33.3%	34.7%	37.5%	37.9%	37.7%	43.0%	41.0%	44.3%	47.5%	50.8%
WRITING										
Elementary	27.9%	28.3%	30.2%	31.0%	33.5%	34.4%	37.7%	41.9%	46.2%	50.4%
Middle	26.3%	26.6%	31.1%	29.8%	33.4%	35.3%	38.7%	44.0%	49.4%	54.7%
High	18.4%	18.1%	20.9%	18.6%	21.4%	24.4%	23.7%	26.0%	28.2%	30.5%
MATH										
Elementary	43.6%	44.7%	45.5%	47.3%	48.4%	49.0%	52.1%	55.7%	59.4%	63.1%
Middle	25.0%	26.3%	31.6%	31.4%	34.3%	34.0%	41.3%	48.3%	55.2%	62.2%
High	11.1%	12.1%	11.9%	13.9%	14.9%	16.8%	17.8%	20.6%	23.5%	26.3%
SCIENCE										
Elementary	12.5%	14.0%	15.4%	18.4%	17.9%	22.2%	22.0%	26.1%	30.1%	34.2%
Middle	20.0%	16.3%	19.6%	20.3%	22.8%	23.9%	24.9%	27.1%	29.2%	31.3%
High	15.1%	16.7%	19.1%	17.0%	18.9%	20.9%	21.7%	24.5%	27.4%	30.2%