

INTERNAL MONITORING REPORT

October 16, 2013

Policy: **1.1 Schooling**
Policy Category: **Ends**
Period Monitored: **October 18, 2012 – October 16, 2013**

This is my monitoring report on the Board of Education's Ends Policy 1.1 Schooling. This report is presented in accordance with the Board's monitoring schedule. I certify that the information is true and complete.

Chris Gdowski, Superintendent
October 10, 2013

POLICY WORDING:

Students enrolled in Adams 12 Five Star Schools shall have the knowledge, learning and life skills necessary to prepare them for further learning in the next grade level.

- a. Students shall demonstrate competent skills by meeting state mastery expectations of all Academic Standards.*
- b. Students shall obtain 21st century learning and life skills as described by the Colorado Department of Education and Department of Higher Education Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Definition.*
- c. Each year, a greater percentage of Adams 12 students shall score at the proficient or advanced achievement level.*
- d. Each year, a greater percentage of Adams 12 students will demonstrate adequate growth to catch up as compared to the state average (the state average being a minimum comparison) in reading, writing and math.*
- e. Each year, a greater percentage of Adams 12 students will demonstrate adequate growth to keep up as compared to the state average (the state average being a minimum comparison) in reading, writing and math.*

Each of the schools in Adams 12 Five Star Schools shall be in the Accredited with Distinction or Accredited with Performance Plan category. Any school not at the Accredited with Performance Plan category or higher shall demonstrate median adequate growth each year.

Using appropriate assessment data the policy interpretations shall include district, school and sub-group performance.

INTERPRETATION:

I interpret the following language:

- a. Students shall demonstrate competent skills by meeting state mastery expectations of all Academic Standards.*

to mean:

Evidence shall be presented to confirm that students meet the state mastery expectations in all content areas. State mastery expectations are interpreted to be the Content Standards as adopted by the Colorado Board of Education.

DATA REPORTED:

At the current time, the Colorado Department of Education has adopted content standards for all subject areas, and Adams 12 Learning Services has completed efforts to align district curriculum frameworks and units of study with the state’s revised standards. One aspect of this district work is the development of a standards-based grading system. For the 2013-14 school year, elementary, middle, and K-8 schools are implementing standards-based grading, and a high school is conducting a full school pilot. Once established in all district schools, which is planned for the 2014-15 school year, standards-based grading practices will provide evidence of students’ competency in meeting the state mastery expectations in all content areas.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The District’s performance has not yet complied with the standards. It is anticipated that the District’s system-wide implementation of a standards-based grading system will provide a consistent means of measuring student mastery of all academic standards in the 2014-15 school year. The 2014-15 grading data will provide a baseline for measuring current student mastery of the academic standards and the degree of improvement necessary in future school years.

INTERPRETATION:

I interpret the following language:

b. Students shall obtain 21st century learning and life skills as described by the Colorado Department of Education and Department of Higher Education Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Definition

to mean:

Colorado Department of Education has defined the standards for 21st Century Skills to be innovation, critical thinking and reasoning, information literacy, self-direction and collaboration. These skills are the synthesis of the essential abilities students must apply in a rapidly changing world. Consistent with CDE expectations, Adams 12 currently embeds these standards across the curriculum.

CDE is currently working to develop measures of students’ 21st Century Skills which are to be included in the new state assessment program beginning in the 2014-15 school year. At this time, state measures of Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness now include Graduation Rate, Disaggregated Graduation Rate, Dropout Rate and ACT scores as reported in the District Performance Framework (DPF).

The district shall earn a Meets or Exceeds State Expectations Rating for the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator on the DPF.

DATA REPORTED:

The 2013 DPF indicates that Adams 12 has received an “Approaching” rating on the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator. The District has received 7.5 of 16 points for this indicator on the 2013 DPF. A “Meets” rating would have required 10 of 16 points.

On the 2012 DPF, the District received 7.5 of 16 points for the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator. A benchmark of earning 9 of 16 points on the DPF was set in last year’s monitoring report for the 2013 DPF. That benchmark was not met.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The District’s performance has not complied with the standards. It is anticipated that the District’s ongoing implementation of the teaching and learning cycle, including an early alert system identifying likely non-graduates and students at risk of course failure, will result in compliance at the conclusion of the 2015-16 school year.

As a benchmark for measuring adequate progress toward the goal of compliance with the “Meets or Exceeds” performance standard for the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator at the conclusion of the 2015-16 school year, the number of framework points earned on the 2014 DPF will increase from 7.5 out of 16 points to 8.5 out of 16 points for the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator.

INTERPRETATION:

I interpret the following language:

c. Each year, a greater percentage of Adams 12 students shall score at the proficient or advanced achievement level.

to mean:

The percent of students scoring Proficient and Advanced at each level in each TCAP content area, as indicated in the DPF, will increase from the previous year.

DATA REPORTED:

Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced on TCAP Assessments

	Reading		Writing		Math		Science	
	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
Elementary	66.3	66.5	47.8	48.2	69.1	69.4	45.7	46.5
Middle	65.0	64.3	51.8	52.0	53.8	54.0	49.2	51.2
High	64.4	65.7	44.4	46.4	33.7	33.8	44.1	51.0

Elementary – Percentage Proficient and Advanced increased in 4 of 4 areas
 Middle – Percentage Proficient and Advanced increased in 3 of 4 areas
 High – Percentage Proficient and Advanced increased in 4 of 4 areas

A benchmark of increasing the percentage of students scoring Proficient and Advanced in 9 of 12 areas was established last year for the 2013 DPF. That benchmark was met as the percentage increased in 11 of 12 areas.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The District’s performance has complied with the standards, as it surpassed the desired level of performance set in last year’s monitoring report. In the 2013-14 school year, the District will make reasonable progress toward meeting the policy standard at all levels and all content areas in the 2015-16 school year if it improves in 10 of the 12 assessments.

INTERPRETATION:

I interpret the following language:

d. Each year, a greater percentage of Adams 12 students will demonstrate adequate growth to catch up as compared to the state average (the state average being a minimum comparison) in reading, writing and math.

to mean:

The percentage of students catching up at each level in each TCAP content area, as reported in the Growth Summary, will increase from the previous year at a rate greater than the state average.

DATA REPORTED:

Percent of Students Catching Up as Compared to the State

Reading

	Adams 12			Colorado		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Elementary	35	37	+2	38	38	0
Middle	28	27	-1	33	31	-2
High	24	25	+1	27	27	0

Writing

	Adams 12			Colorado		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Elementary	32	38	+6	35	38	+3
Middle	19	21	+2	23	26	+3
High	12	14	+2	15	16	+1

Math

	Adams 12			Colorado		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Elementary	23	22	-1	23	23	0
Middle	10	10	0	12	13	+1
High	3	3	0	4	5	+1

The change in the percentage of students catching up exceeded the change for the State in none of 9 areas in 2012. In 2013, the change in the percentage of students catching up exceeded the change for the State in 4 of 9 areas. A benchmark for 2013 was to increase the number of areas in which the percentage of students catching up exceeded the change for the State to 3 of 9 areas. That benchmark was met.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The District’s performance has complied with the standards, as it surpassed the desired level of performance set in last year’s monitoring report.

In the 2013-14 school year, the District will make reasonable progress toward meeting the policy standard at all levels and all content areas in the 2015-16 school year if it improves in 6 of 9 areas.

INTERPRETATION:

I interpret the following language:

e. Each year, a greater percentage of Adams 12 students will demonstrate adequate growth to keep up as compared to the state average (the state average being a minimum comparison) in reading, writing and math.

to mean:

The percent of students keeping up at each level in each TCAP content area, as reported in the Growth Summary, will increase from the previous year at a rate greater than the state average.

DATA REPORTED:

Percent of Students Keeping Up as Compared to the State

Reading

	Adams 12			Colorado		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Elementary	76	77	+1	79	78	-1
Middle	75	77	+2	78	79	+1
High	87	89	+2	89	90	+1

Writing

	Adams 12			Colorado		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Elementary	69	73	+4	73	74	+1
Middle	61	66	+5	65	71	+6
High	74	77	+3	77	80	+3

Math

	Adams 12			Colorado		
	2012	2013	% Change	2012	2013	% Change
Elementary	64	66	+2	62	65	+3
Middle	54	55	+1	56	58	+2
High	68	69	+1	68	71	+3

The change in the percentage of students keeping up exceeded the change for the State in 1 of 9 areas, in 2012. In 2013, the change in the percentage of students keeping up exceeded the change for the State in 4 of 9 areas. A benchmark for 2013 was to increase number of areas in which the percentage of students keeping up exceeded the change for the State to 4 of 9 areas. That benchmark was met.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The District's performance has complied with the standards, as it met the desired level of performance set in last year's monitoring report.

In the 2013-14 school year, the District will make reasonable progress toward meeting the policy standard at all levels and all content areas in the 2015-16 school year if it improves in 6 of 9 areas.

INTERPRETATION:

I interpret the following language:

Each of the schools in Adams 12 Five Star Schools shall be in the Accredited with Distinction or Accredited with Performance Plan category. Any school not at the Accredited with Performance Plan category or higher shall demonstrate median adequate growth each year.

to mean:

Schools Accredited with Improvement Plan, Priority Improvement Plan or Turnaround plan shall have a Median Growth Percentile equal to or greater than the state.

DATA REPORTED:

School Level	School	Accreditation Status	Growth Exceeded State?
Elementary	Centennial	Improvement	No
	Coronado Hills	Improvement	Yes
	Federal Heights	Priority Improvement	No
	Hillcrest	Turnaround	No
	Leroy Drive	Priority Improvement	No
	Malley Drive	Improvement	No
	McElwain	Improvement	Yes
	North Mor	Improvement	No
	North Star	Priority Improvement	No
	Riverdale	Priority Improvement	No
	Rocky Mountain	Improvement	No
	Stukey	Improvement	No
Thornton	Priority Improvement	Yes	
K-8	STEM Launch	Priority Improvement	No
Middle	International School at Thornton Middle	Priority Improvement	No
	Northglenn	Improvement	No
	Shadow Ridge	Improvement	No
	Silver Hills	Improvement	No
High	Northglenn	Improvement	No
	Thornton	Improvement	No
Charter	COVA	Priority Improvement	No
	Westgate	Improvement	Yes

Of the schools whose accreditation ratings were Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround, 4 of 22 (18.1%) made growth exceeding the average growth percentile of the State.

A benchmark for 2013 was to increase percentage of schools on Improvement, Priority Improvement or Turnaround exceeding the growth percentile of the State to 25%. That benchmark was not met.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The District's performance has not complied with the standards. It is anticipated that the District's ongoing implementation of the teaching and learning cycle and standards-based grading system will result in compliance by the conclusion of the 2015-16 school year.

As a benchmark in measuring adequate progress toward the goal of compliance with this standard in the 2015-16 school year, 30% of schools on Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround will demonstrate growth greater than the growth percentile of the State in 2014.

INTERPRETATION:

I interpret the following language:

Using appropriate assessment data the policy interpretations shall include district, school and sub-group performance.

to mean:

District level data has been included in this Monitoring Report.

School level data shall be provided in the following Monitoring Reports: 1.1.1 Preschool and Elementary, 1.1.2 Middle School, and 1.1.3 High School and Transition Services.

All district and school Performance Frameworks are accessible at:

<http://www.schoolview.org/performance.asp>

All district and school Growth Summaries are accessible at:

<http://www.schoolview.org/ColoradoGrowthModel.asp>

Sub-group performance is interpreted to be that reported by CDE on the District/School Performance Frameworks for Reading, Writing and Math. For each of the following subgroups, data is provided to indicate if Adequate Median Growth is met for each of the following subgroups:

- Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible
- Minority Students
- Students with Disabilities
- English Language Learners
- Students Needing to Catch Up

The district shall earn a Meets or Exceeds State Expectations Rating for Academic Growth Gaps on the DPF.

DATA REPORTED:

On the 2013 DPF, Adams 12 received an “Approaching” rating in regard to State expectations for closing Academic Growth Gaps and earned 51.7% of the points for this indicator. Data supporting this rating is included in the attached DPF. The District needed 62.5% of the points for this indicator to receive a “Meets” rating.

On the 2012 DPF, Adams 12 received an “Approaching” rating in regard to State expectations for closing Academic Growth Gaps and earned 51.1% of the points for this indicator.

A benchmark for 2013 was to increase the percentage of framework points earned to 58% of points possible in for the Academic Growth Gaps Indicator. That benchmark was not met, as 51.7% of the points were earned.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The District's performance has not complied with the standards. It is anticipated that the District's ongoing implementation of the teaching and learning cycle and standards-based grading system will result in a "Meets" or "Exceeds" rating for this indicator at the conclusion of the 2015-16 school year.

As a benchmark in measuring adequate progress toward the goal of compliance in the 2015-16 school year, the percentage of framework points earned will increase from 51.7% of points possible in 2013 to 56% of points possible in 2014 for the Academic Growth Gaps Indicator.

The Board acknowledged receipt of a monitoring report as of October 16, 2013 for the period October 18, 2012 through October 16, 2013 of the Superintendent concerning Ends Policy 1.1 Schooling, and the Board found the superintendent's interpretations were reasonable and supported by data that was relevant, justified and complete.

Accredited with Improvement Plan

This is the district's official accreditation rating, which is based on the 1 Year District Performance Framework. Districts are designated an accreditation category based on the overall percent of points earned for the official year. The official percent of points earned is matched to the scoring guide below to determine the accreditation category. Additionally, failing to meet finance, safety, test administration and/or test participation assurances will result in a lower accreditation category.

Accreditation Category	Framework Points Earned
Accred. w/Distinction	at or above 80%
Accredited	at or above 64% - below 80%
Accred. w/Improvement Plan	at or above 52% - below 64%
Accred. w/Priority Impr. Plan	at or above 42% - below 52%
Accred. w/Turnaround Plan	below 42%

Framework points are calculated using the percentage of points earned out of points eligible. For districts with data on all indicators, the total points possible are: 15 points for Academic Achievement, 35 for Academic Growth, 15 for Academic Growth Gaps, and 35 for Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

Performance Indicators	Rating	% of Points Earned out of Points Eligible ²	
Academic Achievement	Approaching	58.3%	(8.7 out of 15 points)
Academic Growth	Meets	63.1%	(22.1 out of 35 points)
Academic Growth Gaps	Approaching	51.7%	(7.8 out of 15 points)
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Approaching	46.9%	(16.4 out of 35 points)
Test Participation³	Meets 95% Participation Rate		
TOTAL		55.0%	(55.0 out of 100 points)

² Districts may not be eligible for all possible points on an indicator due to insufficient numbers of students. In these cases, the points are removed from the points eligible, so scores are not negatively impacted.

³ Districts do not receive points for test participation. However, districts are assigned one accreditation category lower than their points indicate if they do not (1) meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area (reading, writing, math, science and COACT), or (2) for districts serving multiple levels (elementary, middle and high school grades, e.g., a 6-12 school), meet at least a 95% participation rate in all or all but one content area when individual content area rates are rolled up across school levels (elementary, middle and high school grades).

Finance⁴ Meets Requirements

Safety⁴ Meets Requirements

⁴ Districts do not receive points for finance and safety assurances. However, districts that do not meet requirements in at least one area default to Accredited with Priority Improvement (or remain Accredited with Turnaround Plan) until they meet requirements.

Test Participation Rates

Content Area	% of Students Tested				Participation Rating				Students Tested				Total Students			
	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall	Elem	Middle	High	Overall
Reading	99.3%	98.8%	97.6%	98.7%	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	9960	9883	5784	25627	10033	9999	5925	25957
Mathematics	99.3%	98.9%	97.8%	98.8%	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	9964	9891	5795	25650	10032	10004	5927	25963
Writing	99.3%	98.7%	97.6%	98.7%	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	9958	9877	5785	25620	10033	10003	5929	25965
Science	99.3%	98.4%	97.7%	98.5%	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	3338	3321	2858	9517	3362	3376	2926	9664
Colorado ACT	-	-	98.0%	98.0%	-	-	Meets	Meets	-	-	2477	2477	-	-	2528	2528

¹ Data in this report is based on results from: 2012-13

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile
Reading	2	4		Approaching	9660	66.45	32
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	9657	69.37	44
Writing	2	4		Approaching	9654	48.24	34
Science	2	4		Approaching	3261	46.52	45
Total	8	16	50%	Approaching			

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	6130	51	33	Yes
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	6153	51	46	Yes
Writing	3	4		Meets	6134	51	44	Yes
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2		Approaching	2432	43	-	-
Total	10	14	71.4%	Meets				

Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	2313	47	47	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	2588	52	42	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	530	45	76	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	1283	54	48	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2002	52	66	No
Mathematics	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	2323	48	60	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	2602	51	56	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	540	35	80	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	1294	53	59	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	1700	50	80	No
Writing	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	2320	47	60	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	2596	51	53	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	538	41	80	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	1287	51	57	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	3322	51	64	No
Total	32	60	53.3%	Approaching				

Academic Achievement	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	% Proficient/Advanced	District's Percentile
Reading	2	4		Approaching	9580	64.26	29
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	9585	53.97	62
Writing	2	4		Approaching	9575	52.04	35
Science	3	4		Meets	3211	51.2	61
Total	10	16	62.5%	Meets			

Academic Growth	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	N	Median Growth Percentile	Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	3	4		Meets	9090	46	29	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	9109	43	63	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	9100	43	48	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1	2		Approaching	752	48	-	-
Total	8	14	57.1%	Approaching				

Academic Growth Gaps	Points Earned	Points Eligible	% Points	Rating	Subgroup N	Subgroup Median Growth Percentile	Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile	Made Adequate Growth?
Reading	11	20	55%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	3313	43	50	No
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	3813	45	43	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	811	42	85	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	1773	49	52	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2975	45	71	No
Mathematics	9	20	45%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	3311	41	79	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	3820	43	74	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	827	39	99	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	1769	48	76	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	3651	41	93	No
Writing	8	20	40%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	1	4		Does Not Meet	3329	39	69	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	3829	42	62	No
Students with Disabilities	1	4		Does Not Meet	820	38	93	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	1778	45	67	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	4161	43	78	No
Total	28	60	46.7%	Approaching				

<i>Academic Achievement</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>	<i>District's Percentile</i>
Reading	2	4		Approaching	5614	65.69	30
Mathematics	3	4		Meets	5625	33.8	55
Writing	2	4		Approaching	5615	46.36	44
Science	3	4		Meets	2768	51.01	56
Total	10	16	62.5%	Meets			

<i>Academic Growth</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
Reading	3	4		Meets	5285	49	18	Yes
Mathematics	2	4		Approaching	5302	44	90	No
Writing	2	4		Approaching	5293	49	58	No
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	1.5	2		Meets	555	51	-	-
Total	8.5	14	60.7%	Approaching				

<i>Academic Growth Gaps</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Subgroup N</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Subgroup Median Adequate Growth Percentile</i>	<i>Made Adequate Growth?</i>
Reading	13	20	65%	Meets				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	3	4		Meets	1487	48	44	Yes
Minority Students	3	4		Meets	2302	50	36	Yes
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	386	48	98	No
English Learners	3	4		Meets	1136	54	47	Yes
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	1887	49	81	No
Mathematics	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	1503	42	99	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	2307	41	97	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	388	46	99	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	1141	41	98	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2954	45	99	No
Writing	10	20	50%	Approaching				
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	2	4		Approaching	1489	45	83	No
Minority Students	2	4		Approaching	2308	47	77	No
Students with Disabilities	2	4		Approaching	385	48	99	No
English Learners	2	4		Approaching	1137	49	84	No
Students needing to catch up	2	4		Approaching	2723	49	93	No
Total	33	60	55%	Approaching				

<i>Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness</i>	<i>Points Earned</i>	<i>Points Eligible</i>	<i>% Points</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Rate/Score</i>	<i>Expectation</i>
Graduation Rate: 4yr/5yr/6yr/7yr	2	4		Approaching	2949/2933/3176/2979	69.9/72.1/70/67%	80%
Disaggregated Graduation Rate	1.5	4	37.5%	Approaching			
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible	0.25	1		Does Not Meet	1100/1088/1117/915	57/61.6/58.4/52.9%	80%
Minority Students	0.5	1		Approaching	1196/1172/1215/1214	69.5/70.6/66.2/64%	80%
Students with Disabilities	0.25	1		Does Not Meet	250/233/281/251	47.2/48.1/52/48.2%	80%
English Learners	0.5	1		Approaching	379/416/426/444	67.8/69.2/64.3/62.8%	80%
Dropout Rate	2	4		Approaching	22299	4.2%	3.6%
Colorado ACT Composite Score	2	4		Approaching	2477	19.3	20.0
Total	7.5	16	46.9%	Approaching			

Graduation and Disaggregated Graduation Rates

The District Performance Framework reports use the 4-, 5-, 6- and 7-year graduation rates for the district and disaggregated student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities and English learners).

This District's Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate Overall Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	60.5	63	66.2	67
	2010	61.7	68.4	70	
	2011	65.3	72.1		
	2012	69.9			

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	49	53.8	56.9	52.9
	2010	53.7	63.1	58.4	
	2011	58.4	61.6		
	2012	57			

Minority Student Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	55.2	58.4	63.1	64
	2010	55	63.8	66.2	
	2011	61	70.6		
	2012	69.5			

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	41.8	44.9	49.5	48.2
	2010	47.8	56.2	52	
	2011	44.9	48.1		
	2012	47.2			

English Learners Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	51.2	54.9	63.4	62.8
	2010	49.6	63.4	64.3	
	2011	62.1	69.2		
	2012	67.8			

Overall Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	60.5	63	66.2	67
	2010	61.7	68.4	70	
	2011	65.3	72.1		
	2012	69.9			
	Aggregated	64.3	67.8	68.2	67

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	49	53.8	56.9	52.9
	2010	53.7	63.1	58.4	
	2011	58.4	61.6		
	2012	57			
	Aggregated	54.9	60	57.8	52.9

Minority Student Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	55.2	58.4	63.1	64
	2010	55	63.8	66.2	
	2011	61	70.6		
	2012	69.5			
	Aggregated	60	64.1	64.6	64

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	41.8	44.9	49.5	48.2
	2010	47.8	56.2	52	
	2011	44.9	48.1		
	2012	47.2			
	Aggregated	45.5	49.9	50.9	48.2

English Learners Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	51.2	54.9	63.4	62.8
	2010	49.6	63.4	64.3	
	2011	62.1	69.2		
	2012	67.8			
	Aggregated	57.1	62.2	63.9	62.8

Colorado calculates "on-time" graduation as the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. A student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. The formula anticipates, for example, that a student who entered ninth grade in fall 2006 would graduate with the Class of 2010.

For the 1-year DPF, districts earn points based on the highest value among the following: 2012 4-year graduation rate, 2011 5-year graduation rate, 2010 6-year graduation rate and 2009 7-year graduation rate (the shaded cells in the tables on the left). For the 3-year DPF, districts earn points based on the highest value among the following: aggregated 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 4-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009, 2010 and 2011 5-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009 and 2010 6-year graduation rate, or 2009 7-year graduation rate. For each of these rates, the aggregation is the result of adding the graduation totals for all available years and dividing by the sum of the graduation bases across all available years. For both 1-year and 3-year DPFs, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized here and on the Performance Indicators detail page.

Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the District Performance Framework Report

Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide			Rating	Point Value	Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points		
Academic Achievement	<i>The district's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:</i>				TCAP	16 (4 for each content area)	15		
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all districts (using 2009-10 baseline).			Exceeds	4				
	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all districts (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3				
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all districts (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2				
Academic Growth	<i>Made AGP</i>	<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>	<i>No AGP</i>		TCAP	14 (4 for each subject area and 2 for English language proficiency)	35		
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.	• at or above 65.	Exceeds	4 2				
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.	• below 65 but at or above 50.	Meets	3 1.5				
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.	• below 50 but at or above 35.	Approaching	2 1				
Academic Growth Gaps	<i>Made AGP</i>	<i>Did Not Make AGP</i>			TCAP	60 (4 for each of 5 subgroups in 3 subject areas)	15		
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.		Exceeds	4				
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.		Meets	3				
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching	2				
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	<i>Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate: The district's graduation rate/disaggregated graduation rate was:</i>				Overall	Disaggr.	16 (4 for each sub-indicator)	35	
	• at or above 90%.				Exceeds	4			1
	• at or above 80% but below 90%.				Meets	3			0.75
	• at or above 65% but below 80%.				Approaching	2			0.5
	• below 65%.				Does Not Meet	1			0.25
	<i>Dropout Rate: The district's dropout rate was:</i>								
	• at or below 1%.				Exceeds	4			
	• at or below the state average but above 1% (using 2009-10 baseline).				Meets	3			
	• at or below 10% but above the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).				Approaching	2			
	• above 10%.				Does Not Meet	1			
	<i>Colorado ACT Composite Score: The district's average Colorado ACT composite score was:</i>								
	• at or above 22.				Exceeds	4			
	• at or above the state average but below 22 (using 2009-10 baseline).				Meets	3			
• at or above 17 but below the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).				Approaching	2				
• below 17.				Does Not Meet	1				

Cut-Points for Each Performance Indicator

	<i>Cut Point: The district earned ... of the points eligible on this Indicator.</i>	
Achievement; Growth; Growth Gaps; Postsecondary Readiness	• at or above 87.5%	Exceeds
	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%	Meets
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%	Approaching
	• below 37.5%	Does Not Meet

Cut-Points for Accreditation Category Assignment

	<i>Cut Point: The district earned ... of the total framework points eligible.</i>	
Total Framework Points	• at or above 80%	Distinction
	• at or above 64% - below 80%	Accredited
	• at or above 52% - below 64%	Improvement
	• at or above 42% - below 52%	Priority Improvement
	• below 42%	Turnaround

District Plan Type Assignments

	<i>Plan description</i>	
Accred. w/Distinction	The district is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.	A district may not be accredited with a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the State Board of Education is required to restructure or close the district. The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the district is notified that it is Accredited with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.
Accredited	The district is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.	
Accred. w/Improvement Plan	The district is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.	
Accred. w/Priority Impr. Plan	The district is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.	
Accred. w/Turnaround Plan	The district is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.	

1-year vs. 3-year Report

Districts receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated District Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more districts to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small districts may not have public data on the basis of a single year because of small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count. Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) will be the official accreditation category for the district: the one under which the district has ratings on a greater number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it earned a higher total percent of points. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available.

Reference Data for Key Performance Indicators

Academic Achievement

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a district's proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Districts	175	165	167	176	165	167	175	165	167	133	135	138
15th percentile	59.26	58.87	57.14	57.99	34.46	18.30	38.48	42.37	32.85	29.46	28.57	30.27
50th percentile	71.51	70.50	71.53	70.51	50.00	32.16	54.72	56.36	48.61	48.00	45.60	48.93
90th percentile	84.37	83.57	84.78	84.60	68.84	52.06	69.66	72.27	67.56	69.72	69.09	70.39

Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregate (2008-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Districts	181	182	183	181	182	182	181	182	183	172	175	179
15th percentile	60.45	56.61	57.63	56.84	36.37	17.78	41.44	41.85	33.82	32.93	30.02	31.43
50th percentile	72.19	69.22	71.31	70.37	49.11	30.51	55.78	56.80	49.70	47.50	46.81	49.18
90th percentile	85.16	81.53	83.80	83.42	65.33	48.02	71.02	70.87	67.71	66.52	65.86	67.31

Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

The Academic Growth Indicator measures academic progress using the Colorado Growth Model. This indicator reflects 1) normative (median) growth: how the academic progress of the students in this district compared to that of other students statewide with a similar content proficiency (CSAP/TCAP) score history or a similar English language proficiency (ACCESS) score history, and 2) criterion referenced (adequate) growth: whether this level of growth was sufficient for the typical (median) student in the district to reach or maintain a specified level of proficiency within a given length of time. For CSAP/TCAP, students are expected to score proficient or advanced within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. The median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the district met adequate growth (AGP). For 2012-13, Adequate Growth cannot be calculated for English language proficiency therefore English language proficiency growth is determined only by the median growth percentile.

	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP	No AGP
Exceeds	60-99	70-99	65-99
Meets	45-59	55-69	50-64
Approaching	30-44	40-54	35-49
Does Not Meet	1-29	1-39	1-34

The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator disaggregates the results of the Academic Growth Indicator, measuring the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English learners) and students needing to catch up.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator measures the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates, dropout rates, and mean Colorado ACT (COACT) composite scores.

State Mean Dropout Rate (2009-10 baseline)

	N of Students	Mean Rate
1-year (2009)	416,953	3.6
3-year (2007-09)	1,238,096	3.9

State Mean COACT Composite Score (2009-10 baseline)

	N of Students	Mean Score
1-year (2010)	51,438	20.0
3-year (2008-10)	151,439	20.1