

COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT ELEVEN

Mr. Michael Thomas, Superintendent

**District Accountability Committee
Full DAC Committee Meeting**

September 20, 2018

6:00 – 8:00 pm

**Tesla Opportunity Center – 2560 International Circle
Room 112/113**

1. Welcome/Introductions/Opening Remarks– Dr. Parth Melpakam, DAC Chair– 15 minutes
2. Early Warning System – Dr. Greg Ecks/Tom Hunt/Sonia Urban – 50 minutes
3. Charter School Review Update – Dr. Parth Melpakam, DAC Chair – 5 minutes
4. Accreditation Subcommittee Report – Lyman Kaiser – 10 minutes
5. Budget Subcommittee Report – Jan Rennie – 5 minutes
6. Training and SAC Support Subcommittee Report – Lyman Kaiser – 15 minutes
7. Membership Subcommittee Report – Dr. Wendy Chiado – 5 minutes
8. Miscellaneous – Dr. Parth Melpakam – 10 minutes

T & SS meetings, October 9, November 6, December 4, January 8, February 5, March 5,
April 2, May 7, Garden Level Conference Room

SAC Training, November 8, January 31, April 4, Tesla

DAC meetings, October 18, November 15, January 17, February 21, March 21, April 18, May 16, Tesla

2017 School Accreditation Ratings compared to 2018 Preliminary School Performance Framework Rating

School	2017 Accreditation Rating	2017 Percent of Points	2018 Preliminary SPF Rating (AEC Forecast)	2018 Percent of Points
Academy ACL	Distinction & Performance	86.8%	Performance	92.9%
Achieve Online	Performance	69.3%	Performance	74.2%
Adams	Priority Improvement (Yr 1)	40.6%	Improvement	50.7%
Audubon	Performance	63.5%	Improvement	45.0%
Bijou	Performance	71.0%	Performance	63.8%
Bristol	Performance	58.9%	Performance	73.6%
Buena Vista	Performance	72.1%	Performance	62.5%
Carver	Performance	70.9%	Performance	57.5%
Chipeta	Performance	77.2%	Performance	83.6%
CIVA	Performance	75.5%	Performance	73.2%
Columbia	Performance	63.5%	Performance	91.2%
Community Prep	Performance	76.1%	Performance	72.0%
Coronado	Performance	53.5%	Performance	62.7%
Doherty	Performance	56.8%	Performance	60.9%
Eastlake (LIFE SKILLS)	Improvement	48.4%	Improvement	48.4%
Edison	Performance	75.4%	Performance	69.9%
Freedom	Performance	58.0%	Performance	68.7%
Fremont	Performance	63.0%	Performance	53.8%
Galileo	Priority Improvement (Yr 1)	41.6%	Priority Improvement (Yr 2)	37.8%
GLOBE	Performance	65.8%	Performance	75.3%
Grant	Performance	54.4%	Performance	56.9%
Henry	Distinction & Performance	84.0%	Performance	78.2%
Holmes	Performance	63.0%	Performance	64.0%
Howbert	Improvement	49.7%	Performance	67.1%
Jack Swigert	Priority Improvement (Yr 1)	38.7%	Priority Improvement (Yr 2)	34.1%
Jackson	Improvement	48.5%	Performance	58.8%
Jenkins	Performance	55.3%	Performance	54.7%
Keller	Performance	60.4%	Improvement	43.8%
King	Performance	52.7%	Performance	63.6%
Madison	Improvement	41.2%	Performance	62.2%
Mann	Priority Improvement (Yr 1)	35.5%	Improvement	48.6%
Martinez	Performance	55.4%	Improvement	49.7%
McAuliffe	Improvement	43.7%	Improvement	48.7%
Midland	Improvement	45.7%	Improvement	50.8%
Mitchell	Priority Improvement (Yr 2)	42.1%	Priority Improvement (Yr 3)	40.8%
Monroe	Priority Improvement (Yr 2)	39.4%	Performance	57.5%
North	Turnaround (Yr 1)	32.8%	Performance	59.4%
Odyssey ECCO	Improvement	45.7%	Performance	61.7%
Palmer	Improvement	52.8%	Performance	64.3%

2017 School Accreditation Ratings compared to 2018 Preliminary School Performance Framework Rating

School	2017 Accreditation Rating	2017 Percent of Points	2018 Preliminary SPF Rating (AEC Forecast)	2018 Percent of Points
Penrose	Performance	57.6%	Performance	70.3%
Queen Palmer	Improvement	46.0%	Improvement	50.0%
Rogers	Priority Improvement (Yr 1)	40.0%	Performance	63.2%
Roosevelt	Improvement	49.2%	Performance	57.8%
Rudy	Performance	58.1%	Performance	65.0%
Russell	Performance	72.0%	Performance	60.3%
Sabin	Turnaround (Yr 1)	33.0%	Improvement	45.6%
Scott	Distinction & Performance	80.2%	Performance	89.0%
Steele	Performance	73.9%	Performance	88.1%
Stratton	Performance	59.3%	Performance	66.8%
Taylor	Performance	61.5%	Performance	78.0%
<i>Tesla</i>	<i>Improvement</i>	47.3%	<i>Improvement</i>	<i>55.3%</i>
Trailblazer	Performance	58.6%	Performance	61.9%
Twain	Improvement	50.8%	Improvement	49.4%
West ES	Turnaround (Yr 1)	30.7%	Improvement	42.6%
West MS	Improvement	43.0%	Performance	70.1%
Wilson	Performance	54.5%	Improvement	49.1%

Notes: 1) State SPF ratings do not include "Distinction." D11 accreditation practice has been to provide a "Distinction & Performance" rating for schools that earn 80% or more of the points on their SPF. *Blue highlights* are used to indicate schools receiving 80% or more of the points. 2) Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) SPF ratings are calculated differently than traditional schools. AEC percent of points and SPF ratings have been forecast from available information. AEC schools are indicated in *italics* and forecasted points are indicated in *red*.

Last update: September 19, 3:46 p.m.

Accreditation Rating

Official Rating Based On: 1-Year DPF Report

Accredited with Improvement Plan: Meets 95% Participation

52.9/100

Distinction

Performance **52.9%**

Improvement

Priority Imp

Turnaround

Accreditation categories are based on the total percentage of points earned:

Accredited with Distinction:
74.0% - 100.0%

Accredited:
56.0% - 73.9%

Accredited with Improvement Plan:
44.0% - 55.9%

Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan:
34.0% - 43.9%

Accredited with Turnaround Plan:
0.0% - 33.9%

Insufficient Data: No reportable achievement or growth data.

The official accreditation rating is based on either the 1-year or multi-year framework as indicated in the right hand corner of the black title bar above. Districts are assigned an accreditation rating based on the overall percent of points earned on the official framework. The overall percent of framework points represents the percentage of points earned across all performance indicators. The official percent of points earned is matched to the scoring guide to determine the accreditation rating. Failing to meet the accountability participation rate of 95% on two or more assessments will reduce the overall accreditation category by one level. Please see the scoring guide at the end of this report for additional information.

Indicator Rating Totals

Performance Indicator	% Pts Earned	Weighted Pts Earned/Pts Eligible	Rating
Academic Achievement	49.1%	14.7/30	Approaching
Academic Growth	58.9%	23.6/40	Approaching
Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness	48.6%	14.6/30	Approaching

Assurances

	Rating
Accountability Participation Rate	Meets 95%
Finance	Meets Requirements
Safety	Meets Requirements

Test Participation Rates (Ratings are based on Accountability Participation Rate)

Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate**	Rating
English Language Arts	15,791	15,073	95.5%	519	98.8%	Meets 95%
Math	15,789	15,104	95.7%	519	98.9%	Meets 95%
Science	5,783	5,021	86.8%	563	96.2%	Meets 95%

Summary of Ratings by EMH Level

EMH Level	Performance Indicator	% Pts Earned	Weighted Pts Earned/Pts Eligible	Rating	% Pts by EMH	Rating
Elementary	Academic Achievement	57.6%	23.0/40	Approaching	61.6%	Accredited
	Academic Growth	64.3%	38.6/60	Meets		
Middle	Academic Achievement	45.8%	18.3/40	Approaching	50.5%	Improvement
	Academic Growth	53.6%	32.2/60	Approaching		
High	Academic Achievement	43.8%	13.1/30	Approaching	51.3%	Improvement
	Academic Growth	58.9%	23.6/40	Approaching		
	Postsecondary & Workforce ..	48.6%	14.6/30	Approaching		

(*) Not Applicable; (-) No Reportable Data | For additional information, reference the scoring guide on the last page of this report.

(^) Schools with an Insufficient State Data plan type will maintain their previously assigned year on the clock.

(**) The Accountability Participation Rate excludes Parent Excuses from the denominator, and includes in the numerator English Learners in their first year in the United States who were eligible to take the ELP assessment. SAT 11 results are excluded from 2018 participation rates.

1010: COLORADO SPRINGS 11

Level: Elementary - (1-Year)

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Subject	Student Group	Count	Participation Rate	Mean Scale Score	Percentile Rank	Pts Earned/Eligible	Rating
CMAS - English Language Arts	All Students	5,727	97.0%	739.6	50	6/8	Meets
	Previously Identified for READ Plan	969	95.4%	706.2	*	0/0	-
	English Learners	665	95.9%	721.9	13	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	3,440	97.2%	731.9	32	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	2,836	97.3%	732.6	34	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	603	91.2%	701.7	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
CMAS - Math	All Students	5,745	97.4%	736.0	54	6/8	Meets
	English Learners	679	99.0%	724.5	26	0.5/1	Approaching
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	3,457	97.9%	728.6	35	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	2,848	97.9%	729.4	37	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	606	91.5%	704.5	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
CMAS - Science	All Students	1,912	96.6%	589.6	43	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	247	98.5%	526.5	12	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	1,123	96.6%	563.4	27	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	972	97.1%	562.0	27	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	194	89.8%	488.9	2	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
TOTAL		*	*	*	*	20.75/36	Approaching

ACADEMIC GROWTH

Subject	Student Group	Count	Median Growth Percentile/Rate	Pts Earned/Eligible	Rating
CMAS - English Language Arts	All Students	3,561	49.0	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	412	50.0	0.75/1	Meets
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	2,135	47.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	1,777	47.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	328	38.0	0.5/1	Approaching
CMAS - Math	All Students	3,595	52.0	6/8	Meets
	English Learners	438	53.0	0.75/1	Meets
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	2,165	51.0	0.75/1	Meets
	Minority Students	1,801	51.0	0.75/1	Meets
	Students with Disabilities	334	47.0	0.5/1	Approaching
ELP	English Language Proficiency (ELP)	837	50.0	3/4	Meets
	On Track to EL Proficiency	837	75.9%	0/0	Approaching
TOTAL		*	*	18/28	Meets

This page displays the performance indicator data for the elementary school level. Data are based on results from 2017-18, unless otherwise noted.

Academic Achievement: reflects the mean scale score for the identified subject and student group based on 2018 assessment results. The participation rate displayed with the achievement results includes Parent Excuses in the denominator and does not apply the exemption for English Learners in their first year in the United States.

Academic Growth: reflects the median student growth percentile for the identified student group based on 2018 CMAS growth results for Math and English Language Arts. English Language Proficiency growth results for 2018 are included for points. The On-Track to EL proficiency metric is reported for informational purposes only in 2018 and will be included for points in 2019.

For additional information regarding Academic Achievement and Academic Growth points, cut-points, and ratings reference the scoring guide at the end of this document.

(*) Not Applicable; (-) No Reportable Data

Preliminary 2018 District Performance Framework

1010: COLORADO SPRINGS 11

Level: Middle - (1-Year)

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Subject	Student Group	Count	Participation Rate	Mean Scale Score	Percentile Rank	Pts Earned/Eligible	Rating
CMAS - English Language Arts	All Students	5,056	95.1%	736.5	41	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	528	96.6%	720.1	9	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	2,941	95.5%	728.4	23	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	2,425	95.6%	728.8	24	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	512	92.3%	701.2	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
CMAS - Math	All Students	5,077	95.2%	725.9	35	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	553	98.0%	712.4	8	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	2,961	95.5%	717.6	17	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	2,444	95.8%	717.3	17	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	510	92.1%	693.7	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
CMAS - Science	All Students	1,635	94.3%	568.4	36	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	156	96.0%	474.7	2	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	934	94.2%	535.5	18	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	821	95.1%	537.6	19	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	155	88.8%	454.9	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
TOTAL		*	*	*	*	16.5/36	Approaching

ACADEMIC GROWTH

Subject	Student Group	Count	Median Growth Percentile/Rate	Pts Earned/Eligible	Rating
CMAS - English Language Arts	All Students	4,615	48.0	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	511	48.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	2,697	46.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	2,236	47.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	406	44.5	0.5/1	Approaching
CMAS - Math	All Students	4,517	43.0	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	516	38.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	2,669	41.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	2,202	39.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	406	40.5	0.5/1	Approaching
ELP	English Language Proficiency (ELP)	206	54.0	3/4	Meets
	On Track to EL Proficiency	206	59.2%	0/0	Meets
TOTAL		*	*	15/28	Approaching

This page displays the performance indicator data for the middle school level. Data are based on results from 2017-18, unless otherwise noted.

Academic Achievement: reflects the mean scale score for the identified subject and student group based on 2018 assessment results. The participation rate displayed with the achievement results includes Parent Excuses in the denominator and does not apply the exemption for English Learners in their first year in the United States.

Academic Growth: reflects the median student growth percentile for the identified student group based on 2018 CMAS growth results for Math and English Language Arts. English Language Proficiency growth results for 2018 are included for points. The On-Track to EL proficiency metric is reported for informational purposes only in 2018 and will be included for points in 2019.

For additional information regarding Academic Achievement and Academic Growth points, cut-points, and ratings reference the scoring guide at the end of this document.

(*) Not Applicable; (-) No Reportable Data

1010: COLORADO SPRINGS 11

Level: High - (1-Year)

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Subject	Student Group	Count	Participation Rate	Mean Scale Score	Percentile Rank	Pts Earned/Eligible	Rating
CO PSAT - Evidence-Based Reading & Writing	All Students	3,240	93.4%	449.4	34	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	238	92.3%	375.2	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	1,695	91.9%	424.0	15	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	1,592	93.0%	426.5	17	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	289	90.3%	351.9	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
CO PSAT - Math	All Students	3,254	93.4%	434.4	36	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	252	92.3%	379.3	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	1,705	91.9%	410.6	13	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Minority Students	1,605	93.0%	416.3	18	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	289	90.3%	333.0	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
CMAS - Science	All Students	1,170	68.0%	577.9	21	4/8	Approaching
	English Learners	110	79.9%	476.7	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	572	69.3%	554.9	9	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Minority Students	576	67.6%	541.5	4	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Students with Disabilities	83	73.5%	472.9	1	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
TOTAL		*	*	*	*	15.75/36	Approaching

ACADEMIC GROWTH

Subject	Student Group	Count	Median Growth Percentile/Rate	Pts Earned/Eligible	Rating
CO PSAT/SAT - Evidence-Based Reading & Writing	All Students	3,985	50.0	6/8	Meets
	English Learners	344	36.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	2,003	46.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	1,973	45.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	294	34.0	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
CO PSAT/SAT - Math	All Students	3,906	50.0	6/8	Meets
	English Learners	346	43.5	0.5/1	Approaching
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	1,984	47.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Minority Students	1,956	48.0	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	290	34.0	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
ELP	English Language Proficiency (ELP)	234	34.0	1/4	Does Not Meet
	On Track to EL Proficiency	234	35.5%	0/0	Does Not Meet
TOTAL		*	*	16.5/28	Approaching

This page displays the performance indicator data for the high school level. Data are based on results from 2017-18, unless otherwise noted.

Academic Achievement: reflects the mean scale score for the identified subject and student group based on 2018 assessment results. The participation rate displayed with the achievement results includes Parent Excuses in the denominator and does not apply the exemption for English Learners in their first year in the United States.

Academic Growth: reflects the median student growth percentile for the identified student group based on 2018 PSAT/SAT growth results for Math and Evidence-Based Reading and Writing. English Language Proficiency growth results for 2018 are included for points. The On-Track to EL proficiency metric is reported for informational purposes only in 2018 and will be included for points in 2019.

For additional information regarding Academic Achievement and Academic Growth points, cut-points, and ratings reference the scoring guide at the end of this document.

(*) Not Applicable; (-) No Reportable Data

1010: COLORADO SPRINGS 11

Level: High - (1-Year)

POSTSECONDARY AND WORKFORCE READINESS

Subject	Student Group	Count	Best Rate	Rate/Score	Participation Rate	Pts Earned/Eligible	Rating
CO SAT - Evidence-Based Reading & Writing	All Students	1,544	*	497.0	*	1/2	Approaching
	English Learners	114	*	408.7	*	0/0	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	702	*	468.6	*	0/0	Approaching
	Minority Students	736	*	470.2	*	0/0	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	88	*	395.0	*	0/0	Does Not Meet
CO SAT - Math	All Students	1,545	*	479.8	*	1/2	Approaching
	English Learners	115	*	406.1	*	0/0	Does Not Meet
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	703	*	452.4	*	0/0	Approaching
	Minority Students	737	*	457.2	*	0/0	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	88	*	364.6	*	0/0	Does Not Meet
Dropout	All Students	14,565	*	3.1%	*	2/4	Approaching
	English Learners	875	*	3.5%	*	0/0	Approaching
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	7,663	*	2.7%	*	0/0	Approaching
	Minority Students	7,189	*	3.4%	*	0/0	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	1,310	*	3.0%	*	0/0	Approaching
Matriculation	All Students	1,738	*	46.7%	*	1/2	Approaching
	2-Year Higher Education Instituti..	*	*	14.3%	*	*	-
	4-Year Higher Education Instituti..	*	*	27.1%	*	*	-
	Career & Technical Education	*	*	5.8%	*	*	-
Graduation	All Students	2,142	7yr	80.8%	*	2/4	Approaching
	English Learners	141	6yr	80.9%	*	0.5/1	Approaching
	Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	1,171	7yr	74.9%	*	0.25/1	Does Not Meet
	Minority Students	966	7yr	79.3%	*	0.5/1	Approaching
	Students with Disabilities	190	7yr	77.4%	*	0.5/1	Approaching
TOTAL		*	*	*	*	8.75/18	Approaching

REFERENCE TABLE: DISAGGREGATED GRADUATION RATES

Student Group	4-Year (AYG 2017)	5-Year (AYG 2016)	6-Year (AYG 2015)	7-Year (AYG 2014)	Best Rate
All Students	69.1%	76.4%	78.5%	80.8%	7yr
English Learners	71.2%	69.1%	80.9%	78.7%	6yr
Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	62.2%	68.0%	71.5%	74.9%	7yr
Minority Students	68.0%	75.6%	75.2%	79.3%	7yr
Students with Disabilities	44.4%	56.7%	57.6%	77.4%	7yr

CO SAT: reflects the mean scale score for each subject area on the 2018 SAT. Participation rates are not reported for the preliminary reports.

Dropout Rates: reflect the percentage of students enrolled in grades 7-12 who leave school during a single year. Calculated as the number of dropouts divided by the total number of students enrolled in the school at any time during the year who did not subsequently enroll in another Colorado school. This report is based on the 2017 Colorado End of Year (EOY) data submission.

Matriculation Rates: reflect all 2017 high school graduates that enroll in a Career & Technical Education (CTE) program or a 2-Year or 4-Year Higher Education Institution (both in-state and out-of-state enrollments) during the subsequent academic year. Also includes graduates that earned a CTE certificate from an area technical college or a college degree while still enrolled in high school. Other industry-recognized credentials are now included based on the spring 2018 optional industry-credential submission. For more information: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/performanceframeworkresources>

Graduation Rates: 4-year graduation rate is the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after initially entering ninth grade. Ratings are based on the best of the 4-, 5-, 6-, and 7-year graduation rates at the overall and disaggregated levels. For each rate, the AYG designates the Anticipated Year of Graduation, which is based on the initial year that students enrolled in 9th grade. The rates for this report are based on 2017 graduates. For historical graduation data: <http://www2.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/dish/dashboard.asp>

For additional information, reference the scoring guide on the last page of this report.

(*) Not Applicable; (-) No Reportable Data

Scoring Guide for 2018 District/School Performance Frameworks

Performance Indicator	Measure/Metric	Rating	Point Value		
Academic Achievement	The district or school's mean scale score was*: see table below for actual values		All Students	Each Disaggregated Group	
	• at or above the 85th percentile	Exceeds	8	1.00	
	• at or above the 50th percentile but below the 85th percentile	Meets	6	0.75	
	• at or above the 15th percentile but below the 50th percentile	Approaching	4	0.50	
	• below the 15th percentile	Does Not Meet	2	0.25	
	Students Previously Identified for a READ Plan (bonus point)		1 bonus point		
Academic Growth	Median Growth Percentile was:		All Students	Each Disaggregated Group	ELP
	• at or above 65	Exceeds	8	1.00	4
	• at or above 50 but below 65	Meets	6	0.75	3
	• at or above 35 but below 50	Approaching	4	0.50	2
	• below 35	Does Not Meet	2	0.25	1
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Mean CO SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) scale score was**:				
	• at or above 559.1	Exceeds	2.0		
	• at or above 509.2 but below 559.1	Meets	1.5		
	• at or above 462.3 but below 509.2	Approaching	1.0		
	• below 462.3	Does Not Meet	0.5		
	Mean CO SAT Math scale score was**:				
	• at or above 543.4	Exceeds	2.0		
	• at or above 491.7 but below 543.4	Meets	1.5		
	• at or above 446.5 but below 491.7	Approaching	1.0		
	• below 446.5	Does Not Meet	0.5		
	Dropout Rate: The district or school dropout rate was (of all schools in 2017):				
	• at or below 0.5%	Exceeds	4		
	• at or below 2.0% but above 0.5%	Meets	3		
	• at or below 5.0% but above 2.0%	Approaching	2		
	• above 5.0%	Does Not Meet	1		
	Matriculation Rate (of all schools in 2017):				
	• at or above the 73.1%	Exceeds	2.0		
	• at or above 59.3% but below 73.1%	Meets	1.5		
	• at or above 41.4% but below 59.3%	Approaching	1.0		
	• below 41.1%	Does Not Meet	0.5		
	Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate (Best of 4-, 5-, 6-, or 7-year):		All Students	Each Disaggregated Group	
	• at or above 95.0%	Exceeds	4	1.00	
	• at or above 85.0% but below 95.0%	Meets	3	0.75	
	• at or above 75.0% but below 85.0%	Approaching	2	0.50	
	• below 75.0%	Does Not Meet	1	0.25	

Academic Achievement: Mean Scale Score by Percentile Cut-Points

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects achievement as measured by the mean scale score on Colorado's standardized assessments. The presented targets for the Achievement Indicators have been established utilizing baseline year data.*

Percentile	English Language Arts & EBRW for CO PSAT				Mathematics				Science		
	Elem	Middle	CO PSAT (1-Year)	CO PSAT (MultiYear)†	Elem	Middle	CO PSAT (1-Year)	CO PSAT (MultiYear)†	Elem	Middle	High
15th percentile	722.3	724.1	423.5	430.0	719.1	716.5	413.0	419.8	531.9	527.7	564.4
50th percentile	739.5	740.1	461.1	468.2	734.3	731.2	448.4	452.7	601.7	591.4	609.2
85th percentile	755.9	757.3	505.0	509.4	751.9	746.2	491.0	496.1	655.9	643.3	651.3

Cut-Points for Each Performance Indicator

Achievement; Growth; Postsecondary Readiness	Cut-Point: The district or school earned...of the points eligible.		
	• at or above 87.5%		Exceeds
	• at or above 62.5% but below 87.5%		Meets
	• at or above 37.5% but below 62.5%		Approaching
	• below 37.5%		Does Not Meet

Total Possible Points by Performance Indicator

Indicator	Total Possible Points	Elementary/Middle	High/District
Achievement	36 points (8 per subject for all students, 4 per subject by disaggregated group)	40%	30%
Growth	28 total points (8 per subject for all students, 4 per subject by disaggregated group, 4 for ELP)	60%	40%
Postsecondary Readiness	18 total points (8 for graduation, 2 for matriculation, 4 for dropout, 2 per CO SAT subject)	not applicable	30%

Cut-Points for Plan/Category Type Assignment

Total Framework Points	District	School	Accreditation Category/Plan Type
	74.0%	not applicable	Accredited w/Distinction (District only)
	56.0%	53.0%	Accredited (District) or Performance Plan (School)
	44.0%	42.0%	Accredited w/Improvement Plan (District) or Improvement Plan (School)
	34.0%	34.0%	Accredited w/Priority Improvement Plan (District) or Priority Improvement (School)
	25.0%	25.0%	Accredited w/Turnaround Plan(District) or Turnaround Plan (School)

* 2016 school data used as baseline for CMAS & CoAlt ELA & Math (g3-8), CMAS Science (g5, 8, 11); 2017 for CO SAT & CoAlt EBRW/ELA & Math (g11).

** 2018 school data used as baseline for CO PSAT and CoAlt EBRW/ELA & Math (g9-10).

† 2018 Multiyear high school EBRW/ELA & Math cuts based on 1-year of g9 CO PSAT/CoAlt and 3-years of g10 CO PSAT/CoAlt.

SAC Training Survey – September 13, 2018

SAC 101

Please help us improve our SAC Training by providing your feedback on this short survey. Your answers will remain confidential. Mark the appropriate bubble. Thank you.

	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Does not apply
1) Use of handouts, PowerPoint, links etc.	7	6	4			
2) Level of my knowledge of how a SAC operates and the roles and responsibilities needed to be an effective SAC <i>prior</i> to the training	6	5	2	2	2	
3) Level of my knowledge of how a SAC operates and the roles and responsibilities needed to be an effective SAC <i>after</i> the training	8	5	3	1		
4) Level of understanding about where to find resources and support <i>prior</i> to the training	4	4	3	2	4	
5) Level of understanding about where to find resources and support <i>after</i> the training	6	5	2	3	1	
6) Level of understanding on how to run an effective SAC and what is necessary to support student achievement <i>after</i> the training	7	6	1	3		
Best thing(s) about the SAC training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hand-outs • PowerPoint both on screen and to take • Speaker – good job addressing key points • Learned what it does! • Basic info – what is it. What do I do on it • Each school designs SAC to increase parent involvement and transparency and shared leadership • I was able to better understand SAC and get excited to help my school 						

Best thing(s) about the SAC training (Continued):

- Small group setting
- Great information
- Great guidance on what questions to ask/how to begin productive conversation
- Where to find information that is needed or who to contact
- Relatable!

Thing(s) I would change for future SAC trainings/ideas for future trainings:

- Try not to cover so much
- Too much information to squeeze into 30 minutes
- Maybe a little more time

SAC Training Survey – September 13, 2018
Colorado Growth Model, Growth Results, and School Performance Frameworks

Please help us improve our SAC Training by providing your feedback on this short survey. Your answers will remain confidential. Mark the appropriate bubble. Thank you.

	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Does not apply
1) Use of handouts, PowerPoint, links etc.	3	6	5	1		
2) Level of my knowledge of Colorado Growth Model and results <i>prior</i> to training	2	4	3	5	2	
3) Level of my knowledge of Colorado Growth Model and results <i>after</i> training	4	6	3	3		
4) Level of my knowledge of the use of three year trend growth reports and relation to School Performance Framework (SPF) score/rating and USIP development <i>after</i> the training	2	7	3	3	1	
5) Level of my understanding regarding the School Performance Framework and rating system <i>before</i> the training	2	4	5	4	1	
6) Level of my understanding regarding the School Performance Framework and rating system <i>after</i> the training	4	5	5	2		
Best thing(s) about the SAC training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hand-outs were very knowledgeable • Hand-outs and information • The handouts and diagraming on the growth model & SPF page • Refreshments • Variety of shareholders present • Variety of training opportunities (choice) • Good information • Actual school SPFs being handed out • Awesome that it is available! • Introduction and welcome by DAC Chair and Superintendent • Daycare for children 						

Best thing(s) about the SAC training (Continued):

- Great Information
- Love the individual sessions
- Break out sessions
- Reorganizing excellence

Thing(s) I would change for future SAC trainings/ideas for future trainings:

- Wants more time
- Slides were partially off screen so we couldn't follow what he was talking about. Tape off a box so he knows the display limits
- More testimonials and examples of schools that have made significant improvement. Also what did their SAC do or have a hand in on that improvement
- Nothing at this time
- Earlier in the evening would be better

SAC Training Survey – September 13, 2018
ACT Plan Development (USIP) & Tiered School Improvement Model

Please help us improve our SAC Training by providing your feedback on this short survey. Your answers will remain confidential. Mark the appropriate bubble. Thank you.

	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Does not apply
1) Use of handouts, PowerPoint, links etc.	6	5	2	1		
2) Level of my knowledge of ACT USIP Development <i>prior</i> to the training	4	2	4	1	3	
3) Level of my knowledge of ACT USIP Development <i>after</i> the training	4	6	2	2		
4) Level of my knowledge of CMAS Data Analysis <i>prior</i> to the training	3	3	5		3	
5) Level of my knowledge of CMAS Data Analysis <i>after</i> the training	4	3	5	2		
6) Level of my understanding of the New ACT identification process and Tiered Supports for Schools <i>prior</i> to the training	3	3	2	1	4	
7) Level of my understanding of the New ACT identification process and Tiered Supports for Schools <i>after</i> the training	4	4	2	3		
Best thing(s) about the SAC training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refreshments • Variety of shareholders present • Variety of training opportunities (choice) • This training helped me find better questions to ask during SAC meetings and to understand ACT schools • SAC getting to know what ACT plan is • New info – useable info for use within schools • Learning • Answering questions • Hand-outs helpful – not sure we need all the data/info on slides, but it may be helpful later 						

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Info for our parents• Getting questions answered• Very knowledgeable! |
| Thing(s) I would change for future SAC trainings/ideas for future trainings: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nothing at this time• Too detailed and confusing• Good information – no changes |

SAC Training Survey – September 13, 2018

Galileo K-12 New Assessment Plan

Please help us improve our SAC Training by providing your feedback on this short survey. Your answers will remain confidential. Mark the appropriate bubble. Thank you.

	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Does not apply
1) Use of handouts, PowerPoint, links etc.	6	6	1			
2) Level of satisfaction from the information presented in the video regarding Galileo K-12	5	6	2			
3) Level of my knowledge of the New District 11 Aligned Benchmarks <i>after</i> the training	5	3	5			
4) Level of understanding about the State Results from 2018 <i>after</i> the training	5	2	5	1		
5) Level of understanding about individual student reports <i>after</i> the training	5	2	6			
6) Level of my understanding about Evidence Statement Analysis <i>after</i> the training	3	3	6	1		
Best thing(s) about the SAC training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handouts were appropriate • Good answers to questions • Parent input • Showing example of schedule of assessed standards 						
Thing(s) I would change for future SAC trainings/ideas for future trainings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments given 						

SAC Training Survey – September 13, 2018

Peachjar/Communication/Volunteers

Please help us improve our SAC Training by providing your feedback on this short survey. Your answers will remain confidential. Mark the appropriate bubble. Thank you.

	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Does not apply
1) Use of handouts, PowerPoint, links etc.	6	3	2	1		
2) Level of my knowledge of the Peachjar program, <i>prior</i> to training	1	1	3	3	4	
3) Level of my knowledge of the Peachjar program, <i>after</i> the training	4	7	1			
4) Level of my knowledge of The D11 Mass Notification System and Mobile App <i>prior</i> to the training	3	4	3	1	1	
5) Level of my knowledge of The D11 Mass Notification System and Mobile App <i>after</i> the training	7	4	1			
6) Level of my understanding of what volunteer opportunities and communication outlets are available in the district <i>after</i> the training	5	3	2	2		
Best thing(s) about the SAC training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Info! • Great job! • More info on D11 app • Very good discussion and information • Visual of the App usage • Engaged presenters! • Questions answered • Very knowledgeable 						

Thing(s) I would change for future SAC trainings/ideas for future trainings:

- Nothing
- How to get what SAC is to the parents to get parental involvement
- We need to only have one way of communication that way everyone on the same
- Screen print – too small

Attendance 2018-2019 SAC Trainings

September 13, 2018

- Adams ES (Cathy Van De Castelee)
- Audubon ES (Nancy Smith)
- Bristol ES (Steve Handen)
- Buena Vista ES (Vicky McLaughlin)
- Chipeta ES (Alana Gregory)
- Columbia ES (Shanon Siegel, Jill Wright)
- Grant ES (Linda Sanderson, Crystal Riese)
- Jackson ES (Cassandra Guimond)
- Keller ES (Emily Conner, Stacy Brisben)
- King ES (Sara Henly, Carol Nuss)
- Madison ES (Derien Latimer)
- Martinez ES (Aaron Ford, Bobbie Long, Elizabeth Reynolds, Darleen Daniels)
- McAuliffe ES (Toni Schone, David Morris, Megan Haile, Liz Whitehouse, Terry Hernandez, Realynn Bohart)
- Midland ES (Autumn Hayes-Digs)
- Penrose ES (Kristi Kohner, Tamara Sobin)
- Rogers ES (Linda Slothower, Jennie Quichoco)
- Scott ES (Parth Melpakam, Velvet Stepanek)
- Statton ES (Mila Rickard, Julie Edner)
- Twain ES (Alyssa Webb)
- West Campus (Jacilyn Evans)
- Wilson ES (Stephanie Atencio, Tricia Kelly)
- Galileo MS (Lesa Finger, Wendy Crunkleton)
- Holmes MS (Desiree Leonard)
- Jenkins MS (Darren Joiner, John Harding)
- Mann MS (Leah Segura)
- North MS (Chris Kilroy)
- Russell MS (David DuBois)
- Sabin MS (Neil Pettigrew, Velvet Stepanek, Suzanne Warnington, Steve Stepp)
- Swigert MS (Daryl Trujillo, Tina Gossett)
- Doherty HS (Lolly VanTeylingen Offutt, Audrey DeRubin, Velvet Stepanek, Staci Ruddy, Nana Cortes, Dawn Grubbs)
- Mitchell HS (Cynthe Winebrenner, Carlos Perez, Brenda Duzenack, Tina Gossett, M. Rena Harris, Cindy Aubrey)
- The Bijou School (Tineke Seilaffe, Marie Bryan, Kimberley Johnston, Elneta Harjo-Bruna)
- Achieve K-12 (Dan Ottersberg, Frank Krajec)
- Early College HS (Joe Mezzofante)
- Roosevelt Charter Academy (LynDel Randash, Marquita Carr)
- Superintendent (Michael Thomas)
- Training & SAC Support Chair (Lyman Kaiser)

- Membership Chair (Wendy Chiado)
- DAC Budget Subcommittee Chair (Jan Rennie)
- DAC Accreditation Subcommittee Chair (Ed Plute)
- BOE – Julie Ott
- BOE – Nora Brown
- Central Admin (Phoebe Bailey)
- DAC Military Liaison (Victoria Henderson)
- T & SS Member (LouAnn Dekleva)
- DAC administrative Support (Trudy Tool)

Total Attendance:

35 Schools represented

82 total attendees

DAC Committee Members by Category 2018-2019

Date:

Category	Name	Phone #	Email	Affiliation/Location	Sign-in
Chair	Parth Melpakam	264-9188	parth.melpakam@d11.org	Chair	
Vice Chair (Membership Committee)	Wendy Chiado	574-3708	wchiado@aol.com ; wendy.s.chiado@aero.org	Vice Chair	
4 parents with students in District regular elementary schools	1. Vicky McLaughlin 2. Darleen Daniels 3. Carol Nuss 4. Joel Diehl	661-3339 649-2277 213-0662	Vmcloughlin1013@gmail.com ; Dmdnsd2010@yahoo.com ; nussmoose@gmail.com ; isdiehl@gmail.com	Parent/Buena Vista ES Parent/Martinez ES Parent/King ES Parent/Midland ES	
1 parent with a student identified as GT /Special Needs	1. Nila Rickard	217-9409	nilarickard@yahoo.com	Stratton ES	
1 parent with a student identified as ELL	1. Cass Daley	332-0005	cassdaleydesigns@usa.net	Palmer HS	

Category	Name	Phone #	Email	Affiliation/Location	Sign-in
2 parents with students in District regular middle schools	1. Velvet Stepanek	964-6002	vstepanek@msn.com ;	Parent/Sabin MS	
	2. Desiree Leonard	217-2087	Angelicpresents13@gmail.com ;	/Doherty HS Parent/Holmes MS	
2 parents with students in District regular high schools	1. Staci Ruddy	570-7007	staci.ruddy@gmail.com ;	Parent/Doherty HS	
	2. Carl Schueler	385-5391	cschueler@springsgov.com ;	Parent/Palmer HS	
1 parent with a student in a District alternative school	1. Joseph Mezzofante		mezzofantej@gmail.com ;	Parent/Odyssey ECHO	
1 parent with a student in a District charter school	1. Marquita Carr		Marquita.carr@gmail.com ;	Parent/Roosevelt	
3 teachers (one elementary, one middle and one secondary)	1. Esther Smith	328-2475	Esther.Smith@d11.org ;	Teacher/North MS	
	2. Carla Scott	574-1883	Carla.Scott@d11.org ;	Teacher/Carver ES	
	3. Amanda Hawkins	328-6719	Amanda.Hawkins@d11.org ;	Teacher/Mitchell HS	
	4. LynDel Randesh	637-0311	lrandash@rca-csprings.org ;	Teacher/Roosevelt Edison	

Category	Name	Phone #	Email	Affiliation/Location	Sign-in
3 school administrators (one elementary, one middle and one secondary)	1. Aaron Ford 2. Chris Kilroy 3. Carlos Perez	328-5703 328-2402 328-6602	Aaron.Ford@dd11.org ; Christopher.Kilroy@dd11.org ; Carlos.Perez@dd11.org ;	AP/Grant ES/Martinez ES Principal/North MS Principal/Mitchell HS	
1 ESP representative	1. Cynthe Winebrenner	328-6666	Cynthe.Winebrenner@dd11.org ;	ACE Job Coach/Mitchell HS	
4 community members living in the District without students in District schools	1. Lyman Kaiser 2. Bob Null 3. Stacy Fisher 4. Sally Sue Coddington	260-6187 473-7455 928-660-1300 635-0242	Lyman.kaiser@comcast.net ; bob@bobnull.com ; sfishr@yahoo.com ; sscodd@comcast.net ;	Community/No students Community/No students Community/No students Community/No students	
1 person involved in business or industry within the District's boundaries	1. Chyrese Exline	229-4670	Chyreseexline@gmail.com ;	Business	
1 person associated with the military community at Peterson AFB	1. Victoria Henderson	556-6141 556-7832	Victoria.Henderson.1@us.af.mil ; Carnation011476@yahoo.com ;	Military Liaison	

Category	Name	Phone #	Email	Affiliation/Location	Sign-in
Chair of the DAC Budget Committee	1. Jan Rennie	660-4224	janrennie27@gmail.com	Chair – Budget Subcommittee	
Chair of the DAC Accreditation/Achievement Committee	Ed Plute	598-6013 337-1303	eplute@comcast.net ; eplute@harris.com ;	Chair – Accreditation/Achievement	
Administrative Liaison (Appointed by the Superintendent) ex- officio, non-voting member	TBD	520-2017		Assistant Superintendent – Personnel Support Services	
Administrative Support (ex-officio, non-voting member)	Trudy Tool	520-2016 287-4104	toolte@d11.org ;	Personnel Support Services	

Category	Name	Phone #	Email	Affiliation/Location	Sign-in

MTSS Power BI Dashboard

Early Warning System (EWS) research highlights

On Track for Success: The Use of Early Warning Indicator and Intervention Systems to Build a Grad Nation, Nov 2011, Civic Enterprises and the Everyone Graduates Center at Johns Hopkins University. www.every1graduates.org.

What is an Early Warning Indicator and Intervention System (EWS)?

Early Warning Indicator and Intervention Systems represent a collaborative approach among educators, administrators, parents, and communities to using data effectively to keep students on the pathway to graduation. The best EWS are characterized by a combination of features that enable rapid identification of students who are in trouble; rapid interventions that are targeted to students' immediate and longer-term need for support, redirection and greater success; the frequent monitoring of the success of interventions; a rapid modification of interventions that are not working; and shared learning from outcomes.



Over a decade of research supports the development of EWS. Key early warning indicators and their thresholds are:

- Attendance: Missing 20 days or being absent 10 percent of school days;
- Behavior: Two or more mild or more serious behavior infractions; and
- Course performance: An inability to read at grade level by the end of third grade; failure in English or math in sixth through ninth grade; a GPA of less than 2.0; two or more failures in ninth grade courses; and failure to earn on-time promotion to the tenth grade.

3
INDICATORS

The District 11 Early Warning System Risk Level is currently generated from a weighted formula of these A, B, C indicators (absence rate, incidents, suspensions, # of Ds, # of Fs, weighted GPA) and graduation credits.

Future work for the EWS will be incorporating graduation requirements such as targeted credit acquisition and college and career readiness indicators such as SAT/ASVAB/Accuplacer/AP/IB/Industry Certifications/Capstone?. In addition, an elementary school rubric will be established.