

Identifying Sources Contributing to Different Ratings between the CDE and DPS School Performance Frameworks

The key differences between CDE and DPS' frameworks are that the DPS framework: 1) includes metrics not collected by the state; 2) evaluates growth using a broader definition, including measures that evaluate the growth of advanced students; and, 3) rates each metric based on two consecutive years of performance as compared to CDE's approach of using either one or three years of data. These differences largely account for why several schools receive lower ratings on the district's framework than on the state's framework. The information provided below provides more detail on these methodological differences that impact the ratings of each metric and key indicator.

1. The DPS framework includes measures that are not systematically collected at the state level but can serve as valuable indicators of postsecondary performance and school climate.

- **Additional Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Measures**

DPS uses a broader set of measures than the state to provide a comprehensive picture to stakeholders of postsecondary readiness in DPS high schools. These additional measures include: 1) enrollments in higher level courses such as Advanced Placement, IB, Accelerated and Post-Secondary Education Option courses; 2) the percentage of students passing the Advanced Placement and IB exams; 3) the percentage of students receiving a passing grade in higher level courses; and, 4) the percentage of students that are on track to graduation based on credit hours completed at each school site. CDE strongly encourages districts to use locally available measures of postsecondary readiness to supplement the broader state-wide measures used in the state's framework. These additional measures may provide a finer-grained lens for identifying priorities and root causes for school improvement purposes.

- **School Climate Measures**

Due to the strong research base supporting the interrelationship between high performance outcomes and strong school communities, the state encourages the inclusion of locally collected metrics to monitor levels of school engagement, satisfaction and demand. In the DPS framework, measures such as the type of wrap-around services made available to students (e.g., engagement centers and center-based program offerings), the level of retention taking place at each school site (re-enrollments) and the level of student and parent satisfaction with the school, serve to evaluate a school's capacity to attract, retain and motivate students. These measures related to various aspects of a school's climate are particularly important in informing this district's efforts to carefully monitor the well-being of schools experiencing declining enrollments.

2. The district and state's frameworks place considerable emphasis and weight on the growth indicator but evaluate growth using different approaches. The measures underlying growth in the state's framework evaluate the relationship of a school or a disaggregated group's median growth percentile relative to the growth percentile (referred to as the adequate growth percentile) that the

school or disaggregated group would have needed to achieve if the school were to reach proficiency in each content area. For the state's framework, different standards of rating a growth percentile are applied depending upon whether a school or a disaggregated group either met, or did not meet, the adequate growth percentile.

In contrast to the state's approach for evaluating growth, the district's growth indicator consists of a large body of measures to evaluate student progress over time, including: 1) the median growth percentile; 2) median growth percentile compared to similar schools; 3) catch-up growth; 4) keep-up growth; 5) AYP growth; 6) continuously enrolled growth; 7) CSAP-A growth; 8) gaps change; 9) CELA growth; 10) DRA/EDL growth; and, 11) DRA/EDL growth compared to similar schools. With the exception of measures associated with the Colorado Growth Model, these seven additional measures expand the definition of "growth" to include change scores of status measures from one year to the next and contribute to discrepancies in the growth indicator rating across the DPS and CDE frameworks.

Although these additional measures do not entirely align with the state's conception of growth, data from additional assessments do provide different perspectives for identifying areas displaying systematic patterns of low performance. Considering the complexity of factors that contribute to lower achievement in this school district, CDE supports this district's use of a broader set of performance measures to focus ongoing intervention efforts.

3. Overall, although accreditation and plan ratings are largely similar for most schools in the district, the approach used by the district to rate each measure creates some divergence between frameworks. The state rates performance on each measure using either one or three years of aggregated data, whereas the district considers each measure's rating for two consecutive years prior to making a rating determination. Although neither methodology represents a higher standard for rating each measure, these different approaches can yield divergent results in a few areas.

For every measure on the district's framework, the rating is contingent upon the performance rating earned in Year 1 relative to Year 2. The following presents an example of where the district's rating approach can create some divergence between the ratings earned by a school on a specific measure: In Year 2, John F. Kennedy High School attained a graduation rate just above 80% and earned a state rating of "meets" on this measure. Although the state's cut-points for the graduation rate stoplights are higher than the district's cut-points for graduation rates, JFK's lower graduation rate in Year 1 lowered the district's rating of this measure to an "approaching" on the DPS framework. In another case, for Montbello High School, the state's framework awarded a rating of "does not meet" for this schools' graduation rate, whereas the district's framework rated Montbello's graduation rate as "approaching" based on performance over two years.

In addition to the key points raised above, the final district accreditation rating for each school rests on the cut-points selected by the district to classify the performance of schools. For the district, these cuts are based largely on the distribution of total points earned by all district schools. Since these cuts are informed by the district's distribution, the placement of these cuts would invariably differ from cuts set by

CDE using information from the distribution of all schools in the state. This results in a higher proportion of schools identified in the lowest two categories of the DPS framework than in the CDE framework, though in some cases schools that score well on the DPS framework do not score as well on the CDE framework when compared to all schools statewide. However, despite these key differences identified between frameworks, the two frameworks have, overall, generated largely similar plan types for the majority of schools in the district.

DPS vs. distribution of schools based on initial plan type assignments

