Meeting Objectives

1. **GUIDANCE**: The group will analyze and provide guidance on the key elements to be included in a possible Great Schools Policy.

2. **GUIDANCE**: The group will analyze and provide guidance around the benefits and risks of a possible Great Schools policy.

3. **GUIDANCE**: The group will analyze proposed criteria and a process for identification (methodology and sequencing) of schools in a possible Great Schools policy and provide feedback for revisions.
Denver Plan 2020

Our Vision: Every Child Succeeds

Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

GOALS
- A Foundation for Success in School
- Support for the Whole Child
- Ready for College & Career
- Close the Opportunity Gap

STRATEGIES
- Leadership
- Teaching
- Flexibility
- Invest Early Culture

CORE BELIEFS
- Every child has talent and potential.
- Our diversity is a community treasure.
- We can and will eliminate the opportunity gap.
- We must dramatically accelerate our progress.
- Every family deserves choice and access.
- Our kids need all of us.

SHARED CORE VALUES
- Students First
- Integrity
- Equity
- Collaboration
- Accountability
- Fun
Denver Plan: Great Schools in Every Neighborhood
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Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

Citywide, in order to meet our Denver Plan 2020 goal of Great Schools in Every Neighborhood, over 30,000 seats need to move from Schools not meeting SPF expectations into a Green or Blue School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2013-14 # of Students in Blue/Green Seats</th>
<th>2013-2014 # of Students in Red, Orange and Yellow Seats</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNE</td>
<td>7,868</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNE</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>17,283</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>9,729</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>3,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51,585</td>
<td>10,215</td>
<td>6,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Do We Achieve Great Schools in Every Neighborhood?

Denver Plan 2020: Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

One way we get there:

“Expand high-quality school choices in all communities through differentiated supports for existing schools, new school strategies, turnaround efforts and strong accountability systems.”

-- Denver Plan 2020, describing the priority strategy of flexibility
DPS Performance and Accountability Guiding Principles

Alignment: Alignment of all performance systems at every level of the organization to ensure that all students succeed and graduate college and career ready.

Transparency: We must transparently share data and build understanding about its meaning and implications.

Continuous improvement and growth: All performance systems must embody a continuous learning approach and focus significantly on growth.

Multiple measures and personal growth: Utilize multiple measures to inform ratings, supports, and decisions.
Board of Education Dialogue on a Great Schools Policy
Framing Essential Elements of a Great Schools Policy

Working individually, take 3 minutes to reflect on, and fill in, the following guiding statement for the Great Schools Policy.

So as to advance ____________________________,

(fundamental goal)

this policy should ____________________________.

(accomplish what)

In order to do this well, it must be ____________________________,

(key qualities)

and provide guidance to ____________________________.

(stakeholder groups)
Discussion of Essential Great Schools Policy Elements

• In reviewing your answers, and the responses that were generated by the Board Working Committee and SLT:

  – What needs to be added to the responses generated by the Board Working Committee and the SLT?

  – What, if any, points of difference exist with the responses generated by the Board Working Committee and the SLT?
Achieving Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

Great Schools Policy

Universal

Strategic Supports and Diagnostics

Intensive Supports

Designation Line

Identification of Schools for Restart/Replacement/Closure
Reflection and Analysis: Points of Alignment

The provided “Points of Alignment” document outlines key benefits and risks of adopting a Great Schools Policy, generated by collecting input from the Board Working Committee and the DPS Internal Working Group.

1. What benefits and risks are not yet captured?

2. Which benefits or risks do you see differently?

3. What additional mitigation strategies can we implement to address the identified risks?
Proposed Identification Criteria
PROPOSED: Gate Overview

• **Gate 1**: Schools that are red or orange on the three most recent SPF returns OR schools that have been red in the two most recent years.

• **Gate 2**: Schools whose one year performance (either overall or growth) does not meet District expectations.

• **Gate 3**: School Quality Review (SQR) and review of leading indicators to acquire a more complete picture of school performance.
Criteria Essential Questions

• **Gate 1**: What is the appropriate number of years to include for Gate 1? If a school has two years of red performance, how likely is it the school will move out of that performance band in the future?

• **Gate 2**: What are the benefits and risks of looking at overall 1-year performance versus growth in the most recent year?

• **Gate 3**: How do we ensure the inclusion and use of an SQR is objective and transparent?
Gate 1: Historical School Performance

**Essential Questions**: What is the appropriate number of years to include for Gate 1? If a school has two years of red performance, how likely is it the school will move out of that performance band?

Of schools that were red on the SPF for two consecutive years (either 2011/2012 or 2012/2013), 71% (10/14) had an SPF of red the following year. 86% (12/14) were either red or orange the following year.
## Risks and Benefits of 3 Year Timeline for Gate 1

The benefit and risk analysis below assumes looking at a school’s performance on the SPF for the three most recent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Alignment with charter statute (Schools come up for initial renewal with three years of operation)</td>
<td>• A longer timeline results in students being served in an underperforming school for 6+ years (including the phase-out years.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alignment with turnaround research that shows improvements take three years to take hold</td>
<td>• Previous interventions might be in early stages of implementation and impact may not reflected in SPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates ability to forecast for recruitment, which is harder with a shorter timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**Gate 2: Looking at 1 Year Performance**

**Essential Question:** What are the benefits and risks of looking at overall 1-year performance versus looking at only growth in the most recent year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of Overall 1 Year Performance</th>
<th>Benefits of Looking at 1 Year Growth Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Better predictor of overall SPF performance in future years</td>
<td>-More of a leading indicator than overall performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Considers metrics of post-secondary readiness</td>
<td>-Better accounts for performance of school, as opposed to entering proficiency of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Aligns with District shift towards increasing emphasis on proficiency</td>
<td>-Emphasizes the importance of stimulating gains for students vs. focusing only on starting and ending proficiency levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ensures students are moving to proficiency in reasonable time frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

*Discover a world of opportunity*
Rationale for Gate 2

Schools whose one year performance does not meet District expectations will move through this gate.

- Each SPF score takes into account two years worth of school data to improve year-over-year stability (see sample matrix below)
- As a result of providing stability to SPF scores, single year improvements can be harder to see

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. Does not meet</td>
<td>0. Does not meet</td>
<td>0. Does not meet</td>
<td>2. Approaching</td>
<td>2. Approaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012-2013

2013-2014

A school scoring “Meets” for the 2013-2014 SY may receive “Approaching” on their SPF based on 2012-2013 Score
Building a System of Great Schools
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Additional Considerations

The following are key considerations as we continue to build a system of great schools and develop a Great Schools Policy:

• Tiered Support Framework
  – How do we strengthen our tiered support interventions and systems in place to support schools nearing the designation line?

• School Performance Framework
  – To what extent does the SPF adequately address issues of equity and what adjustments might need to be made?

• High Quality Operator and School Design Pipeline
  – What is our recruitment and development strategy for high quality operators?
  – What are the support structures to enable high-quality District applicants?
  – How does this policy allow us to forecast needs in advance, in order to inform recruitment?
  – How do we attract and retrain the best talent to support schools that are struggling?