COLORADO
Department of Education

Revisions to the 2016 District and School Performance Framework

The table below summarizes the major revisions to the District and School Performance Framework reports for the fall 2016 release, based on wide stakeholder input and State Board of Education decisions. A full report of the Accountability Work Group input process and recommendations is posted here: http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/recommendations-from-the-awg-for-the-revised-colorado-dpfs-and-spfs. A summary of the State Board of Education decisions is available here: http://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/20160609sbehighlights.

This document organizes the changes by specific performance indicator. For more information, please contact Jessica Knevals at Knevals_j@cde.state.co.us or Dan Jorgensen at Jorgensen_d@cde.state.co.us.

Indicator/Sub-Indicator	2014 Performance Frameworks	2016 Performance Frameworks	Rationale
Academic Achievement	TCAP: student achievement reported by percentage proficient and advanced.	CMAS PARCC: student achievement reported by mean scale score.	Focus on achievement for all students and ensures greater data privacy for accountability reporting.
	No disaggregated groups reported for English language arts (ELA), math and science academic achievement.	Disaggregated groups reported for ELA, math, and science academic achievement with points assigned for each group.	Focuses on the importance of performance for historically disadvantaged student groups, and balances the removal of adequate growth (see below). Aligns with ESSA and state law.
	Bonus points not included for 3rd and 4th grade students previously identified with significant reading deficiencies.	Bonus points given for 3rd and 4th grade students previously identified with significant reading deficiencies based on their performance for CMAS PARCC ELA.	Implementing requirement under READ Act.
	TCAP 10th grade assessment was included.	10th grade assessment (PSAT) will not be included for 2016 (but will be in future years,	HB15-1323 required a new assessment for 10th grade. Timelines and processes for

Indicator/Sub-Indicator	2014 Performance Frameworks	2016 Performance Frameworks	Rationale
		and allowable for requests to reconsider).	the new data will lead to inclusion in 2017.
	Social studies assessment results were not included, but could be included for a request to reconsider.	No change: Social Studies not included in frameworks but can be submitted for request to reconsider.	The social studies assessment is given to schools on a 3-year rotating basis. As not all schools take the test every year, there is not consistent data available for all schools.
Academic Growth	Academic Growth and Growth Gaps reported separately.	Academic Growth and Growth Gaps combined into one Academic Growth performance indicator with additional points assigned for each disaggregated group.	Alignment and ease of understanding the frameworks.
	Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGPs) and Median Growth Percentiles (MGPs) included for determining rating.	Rating based on Median Growth Percentiles (MGPs) only.	Stakeholder feedback recommended separating MGPs from AGPs. Multiple years of data will allow for more accurate AGPs.
	Disaggregated student groups reported with points.	No change.	With the board's recommendation, CDE will proceed with developing accountability ratings for schools and districts as it has done in the past, assigning points based on the performance of English language learners, students eligible for free and reduced lunch, minority students, and

Indicator/Sub-Indicator	2014 Performance Frameworks	2016 Performance Frameworks	Rationale
			students with IEPs.
	English Language Proficiency Growth Included for current year.	2015 English Language Proficiency Growth Included	The 2015 ACCESS growth scores will be utilized within the performance frameworks due to various technical considerations surrounding the impact of testing modality in 2016.
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Matriculation rates not included.	Matriculation rate included (in the year after graduation, what percent of students enroll in 2- and 4- year institutions of higher education or a Career/Technical Education program).	HB15-1170 added the matriculation rate to the frameworks.
Participation	Two or more content areas below 95% resulted in lowering an overall accreditation or plan type rating.	Parent refusal will not factor into the 95% participation rate. School plan types will be noted with low participation. For example a school may receive a "Performance Plan: Low Participation" plan type. Schools and districts that do not meet the 95% participation requirement in two or more content areas	Required by February 2015 State Board of Education Motion.

Indicator/Sub-Indicator	2014 Performance Frameworks	2016 Performance Frameworks	Rationale
		will receive a lowered rating. For example, a plan type would say: "Improvement Plan- Decreased Due to Participation."	
Achievement/Growth/Matriculation Targets	Targets were set by the State Board in 2010 and reaffirmed annually.	The State Board of Education approved the following targets at the June 2016 Board meeting: The approved targets are below: • *Exceeds* expectations – Achievement at or above the 85th percentile of schools • *Meets* expectations – Achievement between the 50th and 85th percentiles of schools • *Approaching* expectations – Achievement between the 15th and 50th percentiles of schools • *Does not meet* expectations – Achievement below the 15th percentile of schools The final targets will be posted [here]().	Due to new assessments and changes in measures, it was time to review the targets.
Graduation Targets	District and schools with a graduation rate of 90% or	At the June 2016 Board meeting, the State Board of	With the pause in accountability, and changes

Indicator/Sub-Indicator	2014 Performance Frameworks	2016 Performance Frameworks	Rationale
	above earned an *exceeds* expectations rating. Graduation rates of 80-89.9% earned schools a *meets* expectations rating, while those falling between 65-79.9% were *approaching* expectations and those less than 65% earned a *does not meet* expectations rating.	Education approved new targets for the high school and district graduation rates. Districts and schools with a graduation rate of 95.0% or above will earn an *exceeds* expectations rating. Graduation rates of 85-94.9% will earn districts and schools a *meets* expectations rating, while those falling between 75-84.9% will be *approaching* expectations and those less than 75% will earn a *does not meet* expectations rating.	in performance on graduation rates, it was time to revisit the graduation targets. The initial proposed targets based on the 15th, 50th and 85th percentiles of school were a dramatic shift from the prior targets, and thus were revised as noted in the previous cell.
Dropout Targets	Districts and schools with a dropout rate of 1% or less earned an *exceeds* rating. Dropout rates at or below the state average but above 1% earned a *meets* rating, while those falling at or below 10.0% but above the state average were *approaching* expectations and those above 10.0%, earned a *does not meet* rating.	At the June 2016 Board meeting, the State Board of Education approved new targets for the high school dropout rates. Districts and schools with a dropout rate of 0.5% or less will earn an *exceeds* expectations rating. Dropout rates at or below 2% but above 0.5% will earn a *meets* expectations rating, while those falling below 5% but above 2% will be *approaching* expectations and those above 5% will be assigned a *does not meet* rating.	With the pause in accountability, and changes in performance on dropout rates, it was time to revisit the targets. The initial proposed targets based on the 15th, 50th and 85th percentiles of school were a dramatic shift from the prior targets, and thus were revised as noted in the previous cell.

Indicator/Sub-Indicator	2014 Performance Frameworks	2016 Performance Frameworks	Rationale
Weighting	Indicators at the elementary and middle school levels were weighted 25% achievement and 75% growth (including adequate growth). Indicators at the high school and district level were: 15% achievement, 50% growth (including adequate growth), and 35% postsecondary and workforce readiness.	At the June 2016 State Board of Education meeting, the board recommended the following weighting for indicators at the elementary and middle school levels: 40% achievement and 60% growth (no adequate growth). The board recommended the following new weightings for indicators for high school and district ratings: 30% achievement, 40% growth, and 30% postsecondary and workforce readiness.	With the removal of adequate growth percentiles for 2016, it is important to re-visit the weighting of the indicators.
Overall Ratings	Cut-points for the different school plan types and district accreditation ratings were specified for elementary, middle and high schools, and districts.	Overall ratings will be aligned with the 2014 distributions of school and district plan types. (The specific cut-points may need to be adjusted to align the distributions).	With the changes to the frameworks, the distribution of the percent of points earned changed. Thus it was important to re-set cut-points for the ratings, using the State Board of Education's recommended direction.
Future Changes		For future frameworks, an additional indicator for school quality and student success will be added.	Per the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) an indicator of school quality or student success will need to be in place by the 2017-18 school year (for the 2018

Indicator/Sub-Indicator	2014 Performance Frameworks	2016 Performance Frameworks	Rationale
			frameworks).
	Used the CO ACT composite score as the metric for reporting on the college entrance exam.	Will continue to use the CO ACT composite score for reporting in 2016. For 2017, the SAT was selected as the college entrance exam. Additionally, PSAT results will be included.	HB15-1323 required the department to go through a competitive procurement process for an 11th grade college entrance exam and SAT was chosen.