

2012 School Plan Type Assignments

State Board of Education Meeting
December 5th, 2012

Keith Owen, Ph.D.
Alyssa Pearson

Background

- The Education Accountability Act of 2009 (SB-163, section 22-11-208 and 22-11-210 C.R.S.) requires an annual review of district and school performance.
- All districts annually receive a District Performance Framework (DPF) report. This determines their accreditation rating.
- All schools annually receive a School Performance Framework (SPF) report. This determines their school plan types.
- For districts, the Department makes the final determination of the accreditation ratings. For schools, the Department makes a recommendation to the State Board. The State Board makes the final determination.

Purposes

- For all districts and schools, provide a statewide comparison that highlights performance strengths and areas for improvement.
- Identify those districts and schools that are the lowest-performing in relation to state goals and direct state support and intervention appropriately.
- Identify those districts and schools that are the highest-performing and learn from their practices and reward them.

School Plan Types

- Plan types for schools:
 - Performance Plan
 - Improvement Plan
 - Priority Improvement Plan
 - Turnaround Plan

Requests to Reconsider

- Schools had until Oct. 15 to submit additional evidence for the Commissioner's consideration.
- CDE reviews the requests to reconsider and weighs the additional evidence
- Districts accredit schools, and may use the district's additional information in their request

School Request to Reconsider Decisions

- 9 schools approved
 - CDE limited data
 - Small and new school issues
 - Participation rate challenges
- 3 schools denied
 - Additional data submitted did not support a higher rating
- Districts lowered ratings for 33 schools
 - District's performance framework
 - Fiscal assurances

2010, 2011, and 2012 School Results

- The percentage of schools assigned performance and improvement plans increased slightly, while those with Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans decreased.

School Plan Type Assignment	2010		2011		2012	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Performance Plan	1092	67.2%	1144	69.5%	1200	70.7%
Improvement Plan	337	20.7%	301	18.3%	332	19.6%
Priority Improvement Plan	130	8.0%	147	8.9%	126	7.4%
Turnaround Plan	67	4.1%	55	3.3%	40	2.4%
Total	1626		1647		1698	

2011 to 2012 SPF Changes

Change in School Plan Type Assignment from 2011 to 2012		
	# of schools	% of schools
Moved down 3 levels	1	.1%
Moved down 2 levels	13	.8%
Moved down 1 level	167	10.3%
Stayed the same	1245	77.0%
Moved up 1 level	161	10.0%
Moved up 2 levels	25	1.6%
Moved up 3 levels	4	.3%
Total	1616	

2011 and 2012 Alternative Education Campus Results

- 2012 AEC Results show an increase in the percent of schools with AEC Performance and Improvement Plans, a decrease with AEC Priority Improvement Plans, and a stable number with AEC Turnaround Plans.

School Plan Types	2011		2012	
	# of schools	% of schools	# of schools	% of schools
AEC: Performance Plan	25	33.3%	28	36.8%
AEC: Improvement Plan	19	25.3%	23	30.3%
AEC: Priority Improvement Plan	17	22.7%	14	18.4%
AEC: Turnaround Plan	11	14.7%	11	14.5%
Total	72		76	

Implications

- All schools and districts are required to submit an improvement plan annually.
- CDE reviews all Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans
- The plan includes:
 - Trends, Root Causes, Targets, Improvement Strategies, Resources, Interim Measures & Implementation Benchmarks

C.R.S. 22-11-210. Public schools

- (a) If a public school fails to make adequate progress under its turnaround plan or continues to operate under a priority improvement or turnaround plan for a combined total of five consecutive school years, the commissioner shall assign the state review panel to critically evaluate the public school's performance and determine whether to recommend:
- (I) With regard to a district public school that is not a charter school, that the district public school should be managed by a private or public entity other than the school district;
 - (II) With regard to a district or institute charter school, that the public or private entity operating the charter school or the governing board of the charter school should be replaced by a different public or private entity or governing board;
 - (III) With regard to a district public school, that the district public school be converted to a charter school if it is not already authorized as a charter school;

C.R.S. 22-11-210. Public schools

- (IV) With regard to a district public school, that the district public school be granted status as an innovation school pursuant to section [22-32.5-104](#); or
- (V) That the public school be closed or, with regard to a district charter school or an institute charter school, that the public school's charter be revoked.

The state review panel shall present its recommendations to the commissioner and to the state board. Taking the recommendations into account, the state board shall determine which of the actions described in paragraph (a) of this subsection (5) the local school board for a district public school or the institute for an institute charter school shall take regarding the public school and direct the local school board or institute accordingly.

Priority Improvement/Turnaround

- Some schools are “on the clock” for the first time. Others remain “on the clock” for the second or third year.

Number of Years on PI or TA*	Number of Schools
Year 1	70
Year 2	61
Year 3	60

*Beginning July 1, 2013

Public Data Access

- SchoolView: <http://www.schoolview.org/>
 - District and School Performance Frameworks are available on the Performance page
- Dynamic and interactive data platforms
 - Colorado Growth Model
 - SchoolView Data Center
 - SchoolView Data Lab