It Takes A Team

School and Family

A child educated only at school is an uneducated child. ~George Santayana
Vision Statement

Through increased family partnerships, we envision:

- reduced dropout rates;
- reduced gaps in academic achievement and growth among student groups;
- increased number of students who continue into higher education following high school graduation or completion.
Role of SAC

School Accountability Committee

Advisory Committee

Make recommendations on Resource Allocation (Budget Priorities)

Make recommendations on school’s continuous improvement plan (UIP)

Quarterly review progress of school plan

Review Student Fees & the School Calendar
“Schools know what is essential, but it is very hard to “ignore the rest”, the endless bombardment of new programs and innovations that looks so good but distract us from those few, powerful actions and structures that are the soul of good schooling.”

- Schmoker, Focus: Elevating the Essentials (2011)
Role of DAC

District Accountability Committee

Advisory Committee

Provide recommendations on budget priorities

Make recommendations on the District Continuous Improvement Plan (DUIP)

Assist with family engagement practices for increasing participation

Review any charter school applications
Together... 

Coming Together is a Beginning; 
Keeping Together is Progress; 
Working Together is Success. 

-Henry Ford
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeline and Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017 Budget Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Part Budgeting Process: Student Based Budgeting for Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN/FEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY/JUN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tight budgets will persist

1. State Budget
2. Tabor Refunds
3. Structural Issues
State Budget

General Fund Operating $9.6B

- K-12 Education: 37%
- Higher Education: 9%
- Health Care: 26%
- Corrections: 8%
- Judicial: 5%
- Human Services: 9%
- Other: 6%

Source: FY 2015-16
State Budget

General Fund & Caseload Growth

Index FY 01 = 100

- Medicaid Caseload
- State Share School Finance
- Higher Education Enrollment
- Inflation
- CO Population
- K-12 Enrollment
- General Fund Operating Appropriations
- General Fund Revenue

TABOR Refunds and Referendum C

Bars Show Revenue Subject to TABOR

Referendum C Cap
Current TABOR Limit

Source: Colorado State Controllers Office and Legislative Council Staff
Structural Issues

Funding Challenges

- Hospital Provider Fee
- Transportation Required Funding
- Capital Construction: Required Funding
- K-12 Education: Negative Factor
- State Required Reserves
- TABOR Refunds
Relative State and Local Shares of School Finance, 1983 to FY 2015-16

Note: Prior to 1993, K-12 funding was done on a calendar year basis.
School Finance
School Finance

Current Bill (as introduced for 2016/2017)

1. State Formula
2. State Funding
3. State Assumptions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Formula</th>
<th>TOTAL PROGRAM FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount each school district receives through the funding formula prescribed in the <strong>School Finance Act.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on pupil counts and other “factors” outlined in the formula plus funding for at-risk and on-line students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funded with a <strong>mix of state (income and sales) and local (property) tax.</strong> Each district’s mix can be different.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current school finance is legislated by the state and was last revised in 1994.

State Formula

**SCHOOL FINANCE ACT**

- **Legislated each year with a new bill.**
- **Required to fund inflation and growth.**
- **Kindergarten funded at .58 of an 1.0 FTE.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Funding is adjusted annually for inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and adjusted by factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel &amp; non-personnel costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool used to balance State Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces what would otherwise be funded if School Finance Act was applied as intended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017 is $830M in total with $77M for Jeffco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy down decreased in 2015/2016 and 2016/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Formula

TOTAL PROGRAM Funding

Funded Pupil Count (Oct 1) \times \text{Per Pupil Funding Amount} + \text{At-Risk Pupil Funding} + \text{On-line Pupil Funding}
The two sources of revenue that combine to equal **Total Program Funding**.
Received through property tax collections at the county level and a portion of specific ownership tax.

- Property valuations are set by the county assessor
  - Assessed value for residential property equals 7.96% of the actual value of the property (commercial property is 29%)

- A set (or frozen) mill is levied by districts
  - A mill is one-tenth of one percent (.001)
The **difference** between the amount of local share revenue that districts generate (property tax & and specific ownership tax) and the amount of the Total Program Funding.

- State funding is necessary if local share does not fully fund Total Program.
- Funded from the state via income tax and sales and use tax
What is Jeffco’s split?

Jeffco PPR
39% Local
61% State

State Aid

Local Taxes

Mill Levy Overrides per Pupil

Funding Level per pupil

State Funding

Revenue per Pupil

Assessed Value (AV) per Pupil

Jeffco’s split is 39% Local and 61% State.
State Funding

Per Pupil: Colorado vs. National Average

Source: National Center for Education Statistics
### Mill Levy Overrides (MLO)
- MLO is additional revenue outside of the Total Program Formula
- Limited to 25% of Total Program
- Is not included in the total for the local share and, therefore, does not affect the amount of state share funding

### Capital Projects – Bond Mill levies
- Proceeds and expenditures from debt authorization in separate capital fund
- Bond mill revenue flows to debt service fund for repayment of debt
### Mill Levy Overrides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$35.8 Million ($45 Million authorized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$38.5 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$39 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **$113.3 Million**

Note: Mill levies continue unless changed by election.
HISTORY OF BOND LEVIES

Bond Levy

1998  –  $265 Million
2004  –  $323.8 Million
2008  –  Defeated
2012  –  $99 Million

Note: Bond levies end with repayment of the debt.
## COMPARISONS TO OTHER DISTRICTS

### Comparisons Per Pupil Revenue, Mill Levy and Bond

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>State Per Pupil Funding 15/16</th>
<th>Mill Levy Override Per Pupil 15/16</th>
<th>Outstanding Bonds Per Pupil 14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>90,234</td>
<td>$7,612</td>
<td>$1,608</td>
<td>$16,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffco</td>
<td>86,708 (2\textsuperscript{nd})</td>
<td>$7,126 (4\textsuperscript{th})</td>
<td>$1,307 (5\textsuperscript{th})</td>
<td>$5,160 (6\textsuperscript{th})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>66,896</td>
<td>$7,050</td>
<td>$504</td>
<td>$5,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Creek</td>
<td>54,695</td>
<td>$7,265</td>
<td>$1,547</td>
<td>$9,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>31,247</td>
<td>$7,234</td>
<td>$2,125</td>
<td>$18,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton</td>
<td>15,780</td>
<td>$7,040</td>
<td>$1,825</td>
<td>$8,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marijuana tax revenue is directed at education through a grant process:

- State of Colorado Best Grant Program
- Jeffco has not been awarded a Best Grant since marijuana tax revenue was directed at this fund. If Jeffco were to be granted dollars, Jeffco’s required funding match would be 76%.

Other Grant Programs
- Student Re-Engagement – $420K (April 2016) used to provide social/emotional support and drug prevention education to students.
- School Health – $73,803 (July 2016) used to help with dropout prevention

Property values increasing, but school funding is not due to the funding formula.
DISTRICT FUNDS Summary 2016/2017

2016/2017 Total Appropriation by Fund

- General Fund: $698,537,409 (69%)
- Capital Project Funds: $71,953,517 (7%)
- Debt Service Fund: $49,199,435 (5%)
- Special Revenue Funds: $98,905,696 (10%)
- Enterprise Funds: $40,592,292 (4%)
- Internal Service Funds: $48,820,349 (5%)

2016/2017 Total Appropriation by Fund
For routine operations

Funded by property taxes, Specific Ownership Taxes, state and other general revenues

Used to manage all resources that are not legally, or by sound financial management, required to be managed in another fund.

Most significant fund in relation to the district’s overall operations.

### DISTRICT FUNDS General Fund/Operating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Adopted 2016/2017</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$698,537,409</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRICT FUNDS General Fund/Operating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Adopted 2016/2017</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$698,537,409</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Adopted 2016/2017</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Project Funds</td>
<td>$71,953,517</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>$49,199,435</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Revenue Funds</td>
<td>$98,905,696</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>$40,592,292</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Service Funds</td>
<td>$48,820,349</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School Funds</td>
<td>$73,445,189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT FUNDS Summary

- **Capital Project Fund**
  - Includes revenue and expenditures from annual transfers from the General Fund
  - Includes (Capital Reserve Fund) and bond proceeds (Building Fund).

- **Debt Service Fund**
  - Manages the accumulation of resources for the payment of general long-term debt (principal, interest and related costs).
• **Special Revenue Funds**
  - Account for revenues that are legally and managerially restricted to expenditures for particular purposes.
  - For example, grant dollars are accounted for here.

• **Enterprise Funds**
  - Used to manage operations financed in a manner similar to a private business.

• **Internal Services Funds**
  - Used to manage the cost of goods or services provided to other departments and schools on a cost-reimbursement basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Auditor’s Fiscal Health Indicators</td>
<td>3 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABOR — 3 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy — 4 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFOA Best practice — 8 to 16 percent of expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL FUND Reserves 2014/2015

TWO-PART Budgeting Process

- **For Schools**
  Entering second year of **Student Based Budgeting (SBB)**

- **For Departments**
  Implementing a new process **Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO)**

These processes work in unison to better align the district’s budget with its strategic plan and long term financial plan.
“Furthermore, the flexibility provided to schools and teachers offers them the opportunity to devise innovative solutions that might not be possible in a top-down budget coming from the district office. In student-based budgeting, school-level priorities drive budgeting and not the other way around.”

See more at: http://reason.org/news/show/student-based-budgeting-helps-princ#sthash.vlDC85oq.dpuf

“Holding all else constant, a school district that allocated 50 percent of its FY2011 budget to weighted student formula, where money follows the student, is nearly 10 times more likely to close achievement gaps than a district that only allocated 20 percent of its FY2011 budget to weighted student formula.”

2013 Weighted Student Formula Yearbook
SBB Purpose

- Defined expectations – school autonomy within established guidelines
  - To provide the opportunity for principals, with input from all stakeholders, to make
    - site-specific
    - student-based
decisions on the deployment of resources to obtain the greatest student achievement outcomes.
BUDGETING FOR SCHOOLS: Central to Local

- From a Central Perspective
  - Number of resources dictated to schools and small discretionary dollar amounts for FFE and supplies
  - Decisions for staffing apply to all—no local flexibility

- To a School Perspective
  - Desire to meet local needs and wants
  - Ability to adjust with changing student populations
  - Adapt and innovate timely
BUDGETING FOR SCHOOLS: Central to Local

Education Center
- Staffing
- Resources
- Support Functions

Schools

Defined Expectations
Defined Accreditation
Allocation of Revenues

Budget reporting
Improvement Plans
Innovation requests

Education Support Services
COST OF INCREASE in SBB

- $25/Student $1.8M
- $50/Student $3.7M
- $100/Student $7.3M
### WHY BUDGETING FOR OUTCOMES (BFO)

After research and careful consideration, the budget staff believes using BFO, a modified priority based budgeting approach, for departments will yield greater results than any of the other models.

- Better aligns our processes with the Board’s Ends, strategic planning goals and long term financial plan.
- Creates a departmental process that supports SBB.
- Promotes efficiencies and presents a focus on the district’s already established goals.
- Enables the district to continually evaluate the success of achieving defined goals.
The key objective of BFO is to identify the best uses of our district’s limited resources and to create a budget to maximize those resources.

Other objectives of BFO:

- Budgeting priorities change with changes in the strategic plan.
- Focuses on programs that directly contribute to the success of the strategic plan.
- Takes into consideration future needs of the district.
Manageable with existing staff and resources

- Student Based Budgeting
- Our Processes
- Board Ends
- Strategic Planning Goals
- Long Term Financial Plan

Budgeting for outcomes aligns with our processes, which aligns with our student-based budgeting to operate within the long term financial plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFO FIRST YEAR ACCOMPLISHMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly identified priorities of the district based on community values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successfully completed the BFO process with 4 groups; Custodial Services, Educational Research &amp; Design, Facilities Services, and Security and Emergency Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered with Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) for implementation assistance and develop best practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepted into the Alliance for Excellence in School Budgeting, which provides the district access to tools and networking opportunities surrounding Best Practices in School Budgeting program.
BFO SECOND YEAR GOALS

- Successfully roll out BFO district wide, including General Fund and other funds by teaming with district leadership.
- Assist district leadership with focusing on long term goals by creating 3-5 year business plans.
- Demonstrate financial stewardship of allocated budget district wide, through strong performance measures.
Family-School Partnerships
Welcome!

Tracie Apel
Communications Specialist - Outreach
tapel@jeffco.k12.co.us
303-982-6831
FSP Chair

Lisa Papke
Board Appointee - Parent
DAC FSP Subcommittee Chair
lisa.papke@comcast.net
720-936-5472
Who is here tonight?
GOALS for this session:

Review Family-School Partnerships for DAC

What is this subcommittee all about?

Review Six Standards:

What are the standards and where did they come from?

Something to ponder:

_def - think about (something) carefully, especially before making a decision or reaching a conclusion._

What standard will your SAC focus and/improve on?
Family engagement is not a single event. It is a shared responsibility in which regular, two-way communication ensures that the student is on track to meet grade level requirements.

~Heather Weiss
Harvard Graduate School of Education
1. What is the FSP for the DAC?
SB 13-193 is all about increasing family engagement in public schools. This includes (but not limited to):

- Publicizing opportunities to serve on School Accountability Committees;

- Assisting the school district in implementing the Family Engagement policy adopted by the local school board;

- Identifying an employee of the district to act as the point of contact for parent engagement training and resources.
Family-School Partnership Subcommittee of DAC

- Currently reviewing district policies as they relate to Family-School partnerships.

- Goal is to streamline policies and create a common language to work with so as to start with relevant purpose and accountability.

- Currently in the process of sending proposals to the district whose leadership team will review along with all district policies.

- Will present to the full DAC the recommendations with the district taking the responsibility for compliance.
Tracie’s role as it relates to SB 13-193 and the DAC

- Using the “hub and spoke” model: serving as the hub to connect those charged with family engagement in the district.
- Sharing DAC information to SAC chairs and other related parties.
- Provide materials and resources to those charged with family engagement in the district.
- Provide regular communication via a newsletter connecting those responsible for family engagement in the district.
Family-School Partnerships

Newsletter

September 26, 2016

**Important Dates September**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 26th</th>
<th>September 27th</th>
<th>September 28th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAGC</td>
<td>SEAC General Meeting</td>
<td>DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening for parents with James Webb, PhD.</td>
<td>Ed Center, Boardroom, 5th Floor 5:30 - 7:30 pm</td>
<td>Fall Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Center, Boardroom, 5th Floor 6:30 pm</td>
<td>Ed Center, Boardroom, 5th Floor 5:30 - 7:30 pm</td>
<td>Ed Center, Boardroom, 5th Floor 5:30 - 7:30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submit best practices to subcommittee/Tracie Apel so items can be incorporated into newsletter.

Share successes and items to improve on with others charged with family engagement.

Be willing to collaborate as practical with others involved in family engagement.
Perspective on Relative Impact of Family Engagement Strategies on Student Learning

Lower Impact
- Celebrations
- Potlucks
- Performances and showcases
- Fundraisers
- Parent help on administrative tasks
- Family support services
- Generic School Newsletters

Higher Impact
- Goal-setting talks
- Home Visits
- Parent help on learning projects
- Modeling of learning support strategies
- Regular, personalized communication
- Classroom observations
- Positive phone calls home
- Interactive homework
- Parent-Teacher conferences
- Back to school night
- Parent training events
- Goal-setting talks
- Weekly data-sharing folders
- Family support services
2. What are the six standards?
Can you name them????
The Six Standards

National Standards for Family-School Partnerships

- Welcoming All Families
  STANDARD 1
- Speaking Up for Every Child
  STANDARD 4
- Communicating Effectively
  STANDARD 2
- Sharing Power
  STANDARD 5
- Collaborating with Community
  STANDARD 6
- Supporting Student Success
  STANDARD 3

PTA.org/excellence
How are Standards 1-3 evident at your school?

**Welcoming All Families**
Families are active participants in the life of the school, and feel welcomed, valued, and connected to each other, to school staff, and to what students are learning and doing in class.

~Create a welcoming climate.
~Build a respectful, inclusive school community.

**Communicating Effectively**
Families and school staff engage in regular, two-way, meaningful communication about student learning.

~Share information between school and families.
~Communication should be two-way and ongoing.

**Supporting Student Success**
Families and school staff continuously collaborate to support students’ learning and healthy development both at home and at school, and have regular opportunities to strengthen their knowledge and skills to do so effectively.

~Share information about student progress.
~Support learning by engaging families.
How are Standards 4-6 evident at your school?

**Speaking up for every Child**
Families are empowered to be advocates for their own and other children, to ensure that students are treated fairly and have access to learning opportunities that will support their success.

- Understand how the school system works.
- Empower families to support their own and other children’s success in school.

**Sharing Power**
Families and school staff are equal partners in decisions that affect children and families and together inform, influence, and create policies, practices, and programs.

- Strengthen the families’ voice in shared decision making.
- Build families’ social and political connections.

**Collaborating with the Community**
Families and school staff collaborate with community members to connect students, families, and staff to expanded learning opportunities, community services, and civic participation.

- Connect the school with community resources.
- Have the school give back to the community.
3. What standard will your SAC focus on this year? How to decide?
Data Points for Goal Setting

- Make Your Voices Heard Survey
- Family-School Partnership Survey
- Other surveys your school already employs to improve communication
Questions??
Thank You for Coming!!
RESOURCES:

National Standards for Family-School Partnerships: http://www.pta.org/nationalstandards

SAC/DAC Training Materials - CDE: https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/trainingmaterials

Promising Practices - CDE: https://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/promising_partnership_practices_2016


Newsletter Submissions: Email Tracie Apel at tapel@jeffco.k12.co.us

Contact Information:

DAC Sub-Committee Chair
Lisa Papke
lisa.papke@comcast.net
720-936-5472

FSP Liaison/Communications
Tracie Apel
tapel@jeffco.K12.co.us
303-982-6831
Making Sense of State Accountability in Colorado
DAC School Accountability Committee
Fall Update 2016
Julie Oxenford O’Brian
Session Outcomes

Participants will...

- Understand the purpose and key components of school accountability in Colorado.
- Describe how school accountability has changed for the 2016-17 school year.
- Identify the data the state uses to “rate” school performance.
- Preview soon to be released School Performance Framework (SPF) reports.
- Access State Accountability Resources (including school performance data).
K-12 System Mission

All students will exit Colorado’s K-12 education system ready for postsecondary education and workforce success.

--Colorado’s Achievement Plan for Kids (SB 08-212)
State Accountability Purposes

• Focus attention on maximizing student progress toward postsecondary and workforce readiness, and post-graduation success.

• Annually publicly report on school and district performance (transparent, building public understanding).

• Hold schools/districts accountable for performance on common statewide performance indicators and associated measures/metrics.

• Employ a differentiated approach to school support and intervention based on performance and need
  o Higher performance results in greater autonomy
  o Lower performance results in greater support and intervention
Major Components

• State School Performance Framework Reports coming soon)
  
  Note: not provided in fall 2015 because of the state assessment transition.

• Annual State “Plan Type Assignments”
  
  o Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, Turnaround
  
  o Initially State Identified
  
  o District option to submit “Request to Reconsider”

• District “accreditation” of schools (State Performance Indicators +)

• School Continuous Improvement Plans publicly posted each spring)

• Accountability Clock
  
  o Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan Types
  
  o Not more than 5 consecutive school years
  
  o District must restructure or close the school
Accountability Changes for 2016-17

Performance-Based Accountability 1.0

Legislation (HB15-1170)

Stakeholder Feedback (TAP, AWG, Superintendent & Advisory Council)

Standards Implementation and State Assessment Transition

Performance-Based Accountability 2.0
Key School Performance Framework Changes

2014

- **Academic Achievement**
  - TCAP Percent Proficient & Advanced
  - No disaggregated groups
  - No “bonus points” for READ Act
  - 10th grade assessment included

- **Academic Growth**
  - Growth Gaps reported separately
  - Adequate Growth Percentiles and Median Growth Percentiles
  - Disaggregated groups reported under Growth Gaps Indicator

- **Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness**
  - Matriculation rates not included

2016

- **Academic Achievement**
  - CMAS PARCC Mean Scale Score
  - Disaggregated Groups for ELA, Math and Science
  - Bonus points for previously on READ plan
  - No 10th grade results included

- **Academic Growth**
  - Growth and Growth Gaps combined in one indicator
  - Median Growth Percentiles only
  - Disaggregated groups reported with points under Growth Indicator

- **Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness**
  - Matriculation rates included (one year post-graduation enrollment in 2- and 4- year IHEs or Career/Technical Education programs)

http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/performanceframeworksresources
Focus = Big Ideas

How they are Measured
School Performance Framework (2016-17)

Performance Indicators

Definitions

For which students

Academic Achievement
Degree to which students have met learning objectives in the Colorado Academic Standards
All, Previously on READ Plan, ELs, FRL, Minority, SPED

Academic Growth
Degree of progress students are making towards CAS and PWR
All, ELs, FRL, Minority, SPED

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness
Graduates demonstrate knowledge/skills for postsecondary, career pathways, lifelong learning and citizenship
All, Els, FRL, Minority, SPED

How they are Measured
# School Performance Framework (2016-17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>State Measures and Metrics</th>
<th>Local Measures and Metrics (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Academic Achievement
- Degree to which students have met learning objectives in the Colorado Academic Standards
- All, Previously on READ Plan, ELs, FRL, Minority, SPED
- CMAS for ELA, Math, and Science (Mean Scale Score)
- NWEA MAP MEAN RIT scores, DIBELS % at Benchmark

## Academic Growth
- Degree of progress students are making towards CAS and PWR
- All, ELs, FRL, Minority, SPED
- Colorado Growth Model for CMAS for ELA, Math, & for ACCESS for ELLs (Median Growth Percentile)
- MAP RIT Score Gain, Change in % at Benchmark fall to spring

## Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness
- Graduates demonstrate knowledge/skills for postsecondary, career pathways, lifelong learning and citizenship
- All, ELs, FRL, Minority, SPED
- Dropout, Average Colorado ACT Composite, Matriculation, Graduation
- CTE Participation Rate, Concurrent Enrollment Rate, FAFSA Completion
Performance Information in the SPF

- Overall Plan Type Assignment: Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, Turnaround
- Performance “rating” by Indicator: Exceeds, Meets, Approaching, Does Not Meet (state expectations)
- Detailed performance by indicator:
  - Academic Achievement
  - Academic Growth
  - Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (High Schools Only)
**Preliminary Plan Type**

- **Performance Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>% Pts Earned</th>
<th>Weighted Pts Earned/Pts Eligible</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>9 / 30</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Growth</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>26.2 / 40</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary &amp; Workforce Readiness</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>18.1 / 30</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the plan type the school is required to adopt and implement, which is based on the data associated with the version type indicated on the upper right-hand corner of this report. Please see the scoring guide at the end of this report for information on the data included with each version. Schools are assigned a plan type based on the overall percent of points earned. The official percent of points earned is matched to the scoring guide to determine the plan type. Failing to meet the accountability participation rate of 95% on more than one assessment will reduce the overall plan type by one level. Framework points are calculated using the percentage of points earned out of points eligible.
### SPF: Academic Achievement

#### Academic Achievement Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
<th>Mean Scale Score</th>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
<th>Pts Earned/Eligible</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>719.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>718.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.25/1</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>719.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.25/1</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>718.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.25/1</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>n&lt;16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>720.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>720.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.5/1</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>720.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.5/1</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>720.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.5/1</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>n&lt;16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>524.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>514.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.25/1</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>524.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.25/1</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>526.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.25/1</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>n&lt;16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

|         |         |       | 11/33              |                  |                   |                     |             |

---

**Students**

**Content Areas**
### SPF: Academic Growth

#### Content Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Median Growth Percentile</th>
<th>Pts Earned/Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>4 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>.75 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>.5 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>.75 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities (n&lt;20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>6 / 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>.75 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>.75 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>.75 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities (n&lt;20)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP (2015)</td>
<td>English Language Proficiency (ELP)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1 / 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15.25 / 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Growth Rating

- Approaching
- Approaching
- Meets
- Meets
- Meets
- Does Not Meet
## SPF: Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

### Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWR Indicator</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Best Rate</th>
<th>Rate/Score</th>
<th>Pts Earned/Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3 / 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACT</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2 / 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>1.5 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculation</td>
<td>2-Year Higher Education Institution</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Year Higher Education Institution</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Education</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7yr</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>2 / 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6yr</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>.75 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6yr</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>.5 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7yr</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>.5 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>n &lt; 16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10.25 / 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating**

- Meets
- Approaching

Students

Measures
Scoring Guide

Cut scores for state rating determinations

---

### Scoring Guide for 2016 District/School Performance Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Measure/Metric</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Achievement</strong></td>
<td>The district or school's mean scale score was (2016 baseline):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above the 95th percentile</td>
<td>exceeds</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below the 95th percentile</td>
<td>meets</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above the 75th percentile</td>
<td>approaching</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below the 75th percentile</td>
<td>does not meet</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Growth</strong></td>
<td>Median Growth Percentile was:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above 85%</td>
<td>exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below 85% but at or above 50%</td>
<td>meets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below 50% but at or above 35%</td>
<td>approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below 35%</td>
<td>does not meet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Postsecondary and</td>
<td>Matriculation Rate (of all schools in 2015):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Readiness**</td>
<td>at or above 25%</td>
<td>exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above 20% but below 25%</td>
<td>meets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above 17% but below 20%</td>
<td>approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below 17%</td>
<td>does not meet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate (total for 4.8-8.0, 7-year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above 95%</td>
<td>exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above 85% but below 95%</td>
<td>meets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at or above 75% but below 85%</td>
<td>approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below 75%</td>
<td>does not meet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Academic Achievement: Mean Scale Score by Percentile Cut-Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>English Language Arts High</th>
<th>Math High</th>
<th>Science High</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th percentile</td>
<td>722.3</td>
<td>724.1</td>
<td>724.2</td>
<td>721.8</td>
<td>717.1</td>
<td>718.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile</td>
<td>739.5</td>
<td>741.1</td>
<td>739.8</td>
<td>736.6</td>
<td>734.6</td>
<td>737.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85th percentile</td>
<td>757.3</td>
<td>754.9</td>
<td>754.9</td>
<td>751.9</td>
<td>748.1</td>
<td>749.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Cut-Points for Each Performance Indicator

#### Achievement: Growth Postsecondary Readiness

- 36 total points (8 for each subject for all students and 4 for each subject by disaggregated groups; 1 per group)
- 38 total points (8 for each subject for all students and 4 for each subject by disaggregated groups; 1 per group)
- 4 for English language proficiency
- Below 37.5% meets

#### Total Framework Points

- 0% for all

### Cut-Points for Plan/Category Type Assignment

- District: Accredited (District or Performance Plan)
- School: Improvement
- High/District: Priority Improvement

### Version and Corresponding Data Utilized in Framework

- Version A: Default one-year calculations split by EMM levels
- Version B: One-year achievement and growth calculations split across EMM levels with three-year PWR calculations
- Version C: One-year achievement and growth calculations combined across EMM levels with one-year PWR calculation
- Version D: One-year achievement and growth calculations combined across EMM levels with three-year PWR calculation

---
School Accountability Committee Roles

• Make recommendations concerning the preparation of school Performance or Improvement plan (if either type is required).

• Publicize and hold SAC meeting to identify strategies to include in Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan (if required).

• Meet at least quarterly to discuss implementation of the school’s plan.
Key State Data Resources: Updated with 2016 Data

- CMAS administered by PARCC Math and ELA Achievement
  http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-englishmath-dataandresults

- CMAS Science and Social Studies Achievement
  http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/cmas-sciencesocial-dataandresults

- ACCESS for ELLs School Level Achievement
  http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/ela-dataandresults

- School Growth Summary Reports (updated 2016)
  http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/coloradogrowthmodel

- Colorado ACT
  http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/coact

- Colorado PSAT 10
  http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/psatdata

- To be updated soon: School Dashboard
  http://www.schoolview.org/dish/schooldashboard.asp