

Guidance: Using Colorado School/District Performance Frameworks in an Educator's Body of Evidence for Evaluation



Introduction

The State Board Rules for evaluating an educator's performance related to student academic growth (5.01 {E} {3 &7}) outline specific requirements for districts. To meet the requirements, many Colorado school districts are considering how they will use data from the School Performance Framework (SPF) or District Performance Framework (DPF) as a collective measure of student learning (MSL) in an educator's body of evidence for evaluation. The main reasons to incorporate the accountability frameworks into educator evaluation systems are that they:

- Are readily available, collective measures that describe the performance of students in their school/district. This may serve as a way to focus the whole school on improvement areas and create a shared sense of accountability.
- Easily satisfy the legislative requirement to include Colorado state summative assessment results, when available.
- Easily satisfy the legislative requirement to include Colorado growth data when available.

When districts use SPF/DPF data as measures of student learning, they need to do so in an informed and thoughtful way, cognizant of the pros/cons of different methods (some of which are listed below). It will also be important to learn from the ways in which the data is used to inform future use. Ultimately, districts have the authority to determine the measures of student learning that are included in their evaluation system as long as they follow the guidelines outlined in rule(5.01 {E} {3 &7}) and law S.B. 10-191. This guidance is intended to support districts in helping them think through their decisions about how, and if, to use school/district performance framework data as measures of student learning, but the choice rests with the districts.

If a district decides to use the SPF/DPF ratings or data included in an SPF/DPF in an educator's evaluation, CDE highly recommends:

- Thoroughly understanding the SPF reports.
 - a. A [webinar](#) has been created to support districts/BOCES in their understanding of SPF reports and includes an overview of the accountability system, performance frameworks, framework changes from the prior year, and accountability timelines. It is important to understand both the frameworks in general and the unique aspects of an individual school's SPF. Additional information concerning the performance frameworks including resources are available at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/performanceframeworks>
 - b. If you are a small school or district, be sure to read [Revisiting N Size- An Analysis by The Center for Assessment](#), which describes the relationship between the performance framework data and small systems. (An executive summary is available).

Consideration

The School and District Performance Frameworks were designed to provide a comparable and consistent way to measure the performance of Colorado's public schools and districts, in an effort to identify those schools/districts with the greatest need, in order to direct support and interventions. Performance is determined by three indicators: academic achievement, academic growth, and post-secondary workforce readiness. **These frameworks were designed for school and district accountability purposes. Thus, districts need to think carefully about how to use the SPF/DPF data for educator evaluations.**



- c. If you are a school or district with high poverty/minority/ELL populations, you should read [A Demographic Review of School and District Performance Framework Outcomes by The Center for Assessment](#), which describes the relationship between the performance framework data and systems with high proportions of at-risk students. (An executive summary is available).
- Thoroughly understanding the benefits and concerns listed in the tables below.
 - Ensuring stakeholder input and perspective is collected and incorporated in decisions to use the metrics for educator evaluation purposes.

In this document, CDE identifies several approaches that a district might use to incorporate data from the SPF/DPF in an educator's evaluation as a **collective** attribute. Each of the approaches has multiple benefits and concerns associated with it, which are listed in the table below. Additionally, there are two other methodologies that districts may be using. CDE has included the benefits and concerns around these additional methodologies as well for informational purposes. There are other approaches for how the data from the SPFs/DPFs may be used beyond those described in this document, but these are the most readily identifiable or common approaches likely to be employed in Colorado school districts.

A few general considerations apply across all of the following scenarios.

- The decisions around the weight given to any SPF/DPF data should consider the educator's potential to impact the results based on their time in the school/district and the content/grades taught.
- As more weight is given to measures from the SPF/DPF in the educator evaluation (as for any collective measure), it "masks" high and low performing teachers within the school/district and makes it harder to distinguish between the two.
- Metrics associated with each performance indicator (Academic Growth percent of point earned) and sub-indicators (e.g. the schools MGP for math) are more sensitive to changes in individual educators' instructional practice than the overall SPF ratings. As a result, the school and district performance indicators or sub-indicators may be more appropriate to use in educator evaluation than the aggregated SPF ratings.
- Think about the unintended consequences of using the SPF/DPF data selected.
- Decisions around how to use the SPF data may also depend on the school's size. Use of SPF data (especially 1-year results) may not be appropriate for very small schools because they tend to have more volatile year-to-year results. Small districts or schools should consider using data included in the 3 year SPF for more reliable results.
- Multi-year data, while more stable, will not be as sensitive as one year results in reflecting changes in educator practice within a school or district.
- During the transition to new state assessments, the consistency of the ratings and data available from year to year should be considered. As transition decisions are made, this document will be updated to reflect the available data. It is also important to consider changes to the scoring rubric for the overall indicators and sub-indicators included within the performance framework reports.
- For educators working in Alternative Education Campuses (AEC), it may be more appropriate to use the AEC SPF instead of the regular SPF.

Some of the following approaches leverage Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) work. By building upon existing processes, schools and districts may be able to align both the UIP and the educator evaluation measures of student learning, helping educators see how they fit together. For further resources around the UIP target setting process, please visit: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/uiip/targetsetting>.



Approaches, Benefits, and Concerns for CDE Options for Use of SPF (and DPF) Data for Educator Evaluations

CDE Approaches for Use of SPF (and DPF) Data in Educator Evaluations

Approach	Change in Percent of SPF Points Earned	Academic Growth Ratings	Sub-Indicator SPF Data	Use of DPF data when SPF not available
<p>Example</p>	<p>The school looks for change in the percentage of SPF points earned by converting them to a 0 to 3 point scale with “expected” being the desired outcome:</p> <p><i>X Change in Percent of Points Earned= More than expected for MSL (3 points)</i> <i>Y Change in Percent of Points Earned = Expected for MSL (2 points)</i> <i>No Change in Percent of Points Earned= Less than Expected for MSL (1 points)</i> <i>-Z Change in Percent of Points Earned = Much Less than Expected for MSL (0 points)</i></p>	<p>The school converts the SPF indicator ratings directly onto the 0 to 3 point scale used for measures of student learning.</p> <p><i>Exceeds on SPF =More than expected for MSL (3 points)</i> <i>Meets on SPF =Expected for MSL (2 points)</i> <i>Approaching on SPF = Less than expected for MSL (1 point)</i> <i>Does Not Meet on SPF = Much less than expected for MSL (0 points)</i></p>	<p>The school has identified a priority performance challenge in reading and sets a target in the UIP as follows: <i>the percent of students proficient on CMAS reading will be 72% (the 50th percentile) in the current year, an increase from the 65% proficiency rate in the prior year.</i> The school uses the UIP target to anchor the “expected” category of the scale used for measures of student learning.</p> <p><i>At least 89% of students proficient or advanced in reading=More than expected for MSL (3 points)</i> <i>72% - 88% of students proficient or advanced in reading =Expected for MSL</i></p>	<p>For the options listed, if no SPF data are available, it may be meaningful to use DPF data in cases where the school N sizes are small. The specific elementary, middle or high school level of the DPF may be most appropriate for this option.</p>



			<p>(2 points) 65%-71% of students proficient or advanced in reading = Less than expected for MSL (1 point) Less than 65% of students proficient or advanced in reading = Much less than expected for MSL (0 points)</p>	
Approach	Change in Percent of SPF Points Earned	Use of Academic Growth Rating	Use of Sub-Indicator SPF Data	Use of DPF data when SPF not available
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a collective measure that is already provided by CDE and describes the performance of students in a school/district. • Ability to set custom targets for a school, at the discretion of the school and district, to reflect local areas of emphasis. • May serve as a way to focus the whole school on improvement areas. • May focus staff on a specific set of common goals, such as targets set through the UIP process. • May be easy to calculate with minimal investment of time required. • May provide a fairer measure for educators in low performing schools than using the overall SPF rating, as these growth and change options are less correlated with student demographic factors than the SPF overall rating, especially at the high school level. • Potentially more actionable measures than the overall SPF/DPF rating. 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The difference in scores across two points in time is more akin to a measure of change rather than a measure of status. • May include disaggregated growth data, if available. • Satisfies the legislative requirement to include Colorado growth data and state summative data, when available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes growth indicator ratings, which removes most of the impact of status scores. (Status scores are more highly correlated with student demographics compared to growth scores). • Satisfies the legislative requirement to include Colorado growth data and state summative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May include disaggregated growth data, if selected. • Leverages the existing UIP process for creating aligned targets. • Allows schools and districts to set the MSL targets and weights based on their local context. • May increase staff desire to participate in supporting and implementing the UIP in a meaningful way. • May satisfy the legislative requirement to include Colorado 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the school system is small, using the DPF allows the evaluations to still be connected to the state accountability measure(s). • If students frequently move between district schools and impact the N's included in the SPF, using the DPF may be a more appropriate measure.



		data, when available.	growth data and state summative data, when available.	
<p>Concerns and Considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This method diverges from the SPF rating system, which may cause confusion between how a school is rated and how teachers/principals are rated. • Requires district expertise in analyzing change score data and setting meaningful MSL targets. This includes recognizing where point assignments have changed within sub-indicators between years. • May be a challenge to get agreement from stakeholders on appropriate MSL targets. • Does not align well with the UIP process, since targets are not typically set on a change in performance framework points (lack of specificity). • For high schools, and districts, includes post-secondary workforce readiness indicators. These status measures are more highly correlated with student demographics than growth measures. Looking at the change in percent of points earned may mitigate this, but status measures may still account for some or all of the observed score change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some SPFs, especially for small systems, new schools or K-3 schools, may not have growth data. • Using one or more of the three broad indicator ratings may not be sensitive enough to measure change in an educator’s practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires the district to create clear guidance for setting targets in the UIP that are challenging but attainable. Targets should be set using a well-defined data inquiry process. • If the school has set a high number of performance targets in the UIP, additional time may be required to prioritize which UIP targets to include as measures of student learning. • In addition to targets set in the UIP, cut-points for the full 0 to 3 point scale would need to be developed for educator evaluation purposes. • There will be implications for UIP target setting as the state assessments transition. An added emphasis on the use of aligned local measures may be used during the transition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A greater disconnect may exist between the district rating and the impact of one teacher at the district level. • As more weight is given to the DPF in the educator evaluation, it provides less direct data on an individual teacher’s performance. • The overall cut-points, individual achievement cut-points and inclusion of more students in the DPF compared to the SPF may cause a disconnect between school and district performance ratings. • Depending upon how the data is used, elementary teachers could be accountable for secondary progress and vice-versa.



	<p>significant whereas large systems may only require very small changes to be significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For high performing schools, there may be little room in the frameworks to show increased points earned.			
--	--	--	--	--



Benefits and Concerns for Other Methodologies Districts May Be Using to include SPF data in Educator Evaluations

Benefits and Concerns for Other Methodologies Districts May Be Using to include SPF data in Educator Evaluations

Methodology	SPF Rating	DPF Rating	Percent of SPF Points Earned	Percent of DPF Points Earned
Example	<p>The district uses the official School Performance Framework (SPF) rating and converts it to a 0 to 3 point scale.</p> <p><i>Performance = 3 points</i> <i>Improvement = 2 points</i> <i>Priority Improvement = 1 point</i> <i>Turnaround = 0 points</i></p>	<p>The district uses the official District Performance Framework (DPF) rating and converts it to a 0 to 3 point scale. (The 5 DPF levels will need to be condensed to 4)</p> <p><i>Performance/Distinction = 3 points</i> <i>Improvement = 2 points</i> <i>Priority Improvement = 1 point</i> <i>Turnaround = 0 points</i></p>	<p>The district creates custom cut-points based on the percentage of points earned on the SPF that are different than the current cut-points for ratings used on the SPF.</p> <p><i>80% or more of points earned = 3 points</i> <i>60% or more, but less than 80% of points earned = 2 points</i> <i>40% of points earned, but less than 60% = 1 point</i> <i>Less than 40% of points earned = 0 points</i></p>	<p>The district creates custom cut-points based on the percentage of points earned on the DPF that are different than the current cut-points for ratings used on the DPF.</p> <p><i>80% or more of points earned = 3 points</i> <i>60% or more, but less than 80% of points earned = 2 points</i> <i>40% of points earned, but less than 60% = 1 point</i> <i>Less than 40% of points earned = 0 points</i></p>
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a collective measure that is already provided and is used to describe the performance of their school/district. • This may serve as a way to focus the whole school on improvement areas. • Satisfies the legislative requirement to include Colorado growth data and state summative data, when available. • Includes disaggregated growth data, when available. 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to calculate. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More flexibility to set custom targets for a school. • Potential for more differentiation in performance relative to the established SPF/DPF rating cut-scores. 	



Concerns

- The SPFs and DPFs were designed to measure student performance in schools and districts, for school and district accountability purposes, and not for educator evaluations.
 - The SPFs include achievement measures and, for high school, postsecondary and workforce readiness measures, not just growth. These status measures are more highly correlated with student demographics than growth measures.
 - **If growth measures are not available then the SPF/DPF rating may be based entirely on status measures.**
 - **May create a disincentive for educators to work in low performing schools/districts, as measured by the SPF/DPF.**
 - **More volatile in smaller schools/districts.**
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As the majority of schools in the state are given an Improvement or Performance rating (88%), most educators would receive an MSL rating of expected or more than expected for this indicator.• SPF ratings may not be sensitive enough to measure change in an educator’s practice.• Some SPFs are generated on a limited amount of data, especially if the school is small or doesn’t include many tested grades. Use caution in interpreting the SPF rating for these schools.• SPF ratings can be lowered for test participation rates and test administration violations, which may have little relationship to student achievement, academic growth, or educator practice. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As the majority of districts in the state are given an Improvement, Accredited or Distinction (92%) rating, most educators will receive an MSL rating of expected or more than expected.• DPF ratings may not be sensitive enough to measure change in an educator’s practice.• DPF ratings can be lowered for test participation rates, test administration violations, finance and safety assurances, which may have little relationship to student achievement, academic growth, or educator practice. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Diverges from the SPF/DPF rating system and is less comparable in how a school/district is getting rated and how teachers/principals are evaluated.• Requires the district to create clear guidance about what appropriate targets look like and how to ensure that targets do not appear arbitrary but are rather set using a well-defined data inquiry process.• May be a challenge to get agreement from stakeholders on appropriate targets |
|---|---|---|



Additional Resources and Further Assistance

For additional support, contact CDE's offices of Accountability and Data Analysis, Improvement Planning, or Educator Effectiveness.

[Accountability and Data Analysis](#)

- [Accountability Contacts](#)

[Educator Effectiveness](#)

- [Educator Effectiveness Contacts](#)

[Improvement Planning](#)

- [UIP Contacts](#)