

2012 District Accreditation Ratings

State Board of Education Meeting
November 14, 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 will make the final determination of the school plan types in December.

Purposes

- For all districts and schools, provide a statewide comparison that highlights where they are doing well and where they can improve.
- 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.

Accreditation Ratings & Plan Types

- Accreditation ratings for districts:
 - Accredited with Distinction
 - Accredited
 - Accredited with Improvement Plan
 - Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan
 - Accredited with Turnaround Plan

Requests to Reconsider / Appeal to SBE

- Districts had until Oct. 15 to submit additional evidence for the Commissioner's consideration.
- Local board of education may submit appeal to the State Board of Education
 - Within 10 days of final notification from CDE
 - State board office coordinates with local school board to schedule the hearing

2010, 2011, and 2012 District Results

- The percentage of districts Accredited with Distinction increased from 2010, while the percentage of districts Accredited with Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan has remained the same.

Accreditation Rating	2010		2011		2012	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Accredited w/Distinction	14	7.7%	18	9.9%	19	10.4%
Accredited	97	53.6%	94	51.9%	87	47.8%
Accredited w/ Improvement Plan	46	25.4%	45	24.9%	52	28.6%
Accredited w/Priority Improvement Plan	17	9.4%	17	9.4%	19	10.4%
Accredited w/Turnaround Plan	7	3.9%	7	3.9%	5	2.8%
Total	181		181		182	

2011 to 2012 DPF Changes

- 80% of districts received the same plan type in 2012 as they did in 2011

Change in Accreditation Rating from 2011 to 2012		
	# of districts	% of districts
Moved down 2 levels	1	0.6%
Moved down 1 level	19	10.5%
Stayed the same	145	80.1%
Moved up 1 level	16	8.8%
Total	181	

- Includes only districts for which complete DPF records exist for both 2011 and 2012.

Districts Accredited with Distinction

Top 19 districts with over 80% of DPF points

ACADEMY 20

ASPEN 1

CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12

COTOPAXI RE-3

EADS RE-1

HAXTUN RE-2J

HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1

KIOWA C-2

LEWIS-PALMER 38

LITTLETON 6

MOFFAT 2

NORTH PARK R-1

OURAY R-1

PARK COUNTY RE-2

PLATEAU RE-5

RIDGWAY R-2

STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2

SWINK 33

TELLURIDE R-1

Districts Accredited with Priority Improvement Plans

District Name	2010 Final Accreditation Category	2011 Final Accreditation Category	2012 Final Accreditation Category	Turnaround or Priority Status
CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
JULESBURG RE-1	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
BRANSON REORGANIZED 82	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 1
MANZANOLA 3J	Accred. with Improvement	Accredited	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 1
DENVER COUNTY 1	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
LAKE COUNTY R-1	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 1
PRITCHETT RE-3	Accredited	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 1
GREELEY 6	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 1
MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
WELD COUNTY S/D RE-8	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 2
MAPLETON 1	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 2
WESTMINSTER 50	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
PUEBLO CITY 60	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 2
MONTE VISTA C-8	Accred. with Improvement	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 2
SHERIDAN 2	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
ROCKY FORD R-2	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
ENGLEWOOD 1	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3
IGNACIO 11 JT	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. w/Priority Improvement	Year 3

Districts Accredited with Turnaround Plans

District Name	2010 Final Accreditation Category	2011 Final Accreditation Category	2012 Final Accreditation Category	Turnaround or Priority Status
AGUILAR REORGANIZED 6	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Turnaround	Year 3
KARVAL RE-23	Accred. with Priority Impr.	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Year 4
ADAMS COUNTY 14	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Year 3
MOUNTAIN BOCES	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Year 4
VILAS RE-5	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Accred. with Turnaround	Year 4

Implications

- All districts and all schools submit an improvement plan using the Unified Improvement Plan template in January and April 2012.
- 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. 22-11-209. Removal of accreditation

- (1) If at the end of five consecutive years, a district's priority or district turnaround status has not improved, the Department may recommend to the Commissioner and the State Board that the State Board remove a school district's or the institute's accreditation if:
 - (a) The school district or the institute is accredited with turnaround plan and the department determines that the school district or the institute has failed to make substantial progress under its turnaround plan; or
 - (b) The school district or the institute has been in the accredited with priority improvement plan category or lower for five consecutive school years; or
 - (c) (I) The school district or the institute has substantially failed to comply with the provisions of article 44 of this title, concerning budget and financial policies and procedures, or article 45 of this title, concerning accounting and financial reporting; and
(II) The school district or institute has not remedied the noncompliance within ninety days after receipt of notice from the department; and
(III) Loss of accreditation is required to protect the interests of the students and parents of students enrolled in the district public schools or the institute charter schools.

C.R.S. 22-11-209. Removal of accreditation

(2) (a) If the department recommends removing accreditation pursuant to this section, the commissioner shall assign the state review panel to critically evaluate the school district's or the institute's performance and to recommend one or more of the following actions:

If the recommendation applies to a school district:

- (A) That the school district be reorganized pursuant to article 30 of this title, which reorganization may include consolidation;
- (B) That a private or public entity, with the agreement of the school district, take over management of the school district or management of one or more of the district public schools;
- (C) That one or more of the district public schools be converted to a charter school;
- (D) That one or more of the district public schools be granted status as an innovation school pursuant to section [22-32.5-104](#) or that the local school board recognize a group of district public schools as an innovation school zone pursuant to section [22-32.5-104](#); or
- (E) That one or more of the district public schools be closed