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Objectives

• **Share** key elements of the School Performance Compact Implementation Guidelines related to:
  – Designation criteria
  – Community engagement

• **Preview** timeline for finalizing the Implementation Guidelines

• **Share** timeline and roles for implementation in Fall 2016
Context Setting
Denver Plan Goal: Great Schools in Every Neighborhood
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Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

Citywide, to meet our Denver Plan 2020 goal of Great Schools in Every Neighborhood, we need to improve schools so that more than 30,000 students who currently attend schools not meeting SPF expectations will attend SPF green or blue schools by 2020.

<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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,585</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,215</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,579</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Do We Achieve Great Schools in Every Neighborhood?

Denver Plan 2020:
Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

“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
How Do We Achieve Great Schools in Every Neighborhood?

Including School Performance Compact
What is the Purpose of a School Performance Compact?

To ensure all students have access to high quality schools that allow them to succeed and graduate college and career ready by *establishing a transparent and consistent policy to identify and designate for restart or closure the most persistently low performing schools.*
Guiding Principles for a School Performance Compact

The School Performance Compact is built on the following principles:

• **Accountability Across Governance Type**
  – All our students deserve **high-quality schools** that allow them to succeed and graduate college and career ready.

• **Transparency**
  – The District should provide a **clear** and **transparent** process for designating **persistently low-performing** schools for restart or closure. The process for designation should be **objectively** and **consistently** applied across all schools.

• **Equity**
  – **Equity of responsibility, accountability and opportunity** must be preserved across all schools.

• **Engage Communities and Families**
  – School communities will be **educated** and **informed** about the process for designating schools for restart or closure. School communities will **share in the responsibility** for reviewing applicants and recommending matches to the Superintendent and Board.
Designation
Process and Criteria
School Performance Compact Criteria

Criterion A
• The lowest-performing 5% of schools, based on most recent three* School Performance Framework ratings; Does not include Early Ed or Alternative Ed SPFs

Criterion B
• 50% or fewer growth points earned in the most recent year, based on the School Performance Framework

Criterion C
• School scores below a predetermined threshold on the School Quality Review

Designation
DPS staff will recommend schools that meet all three criteria for restart or closure. Denver Board of Education will make final designation decisions.

*If a school has 3 full SPFs, the average of the 3 results is used. If a school only has 2 full SPFs, the average of the 2 results is used. If a school only has 1 full SPF, it is exempt from designation.

When modeling this methodology using prior years SPFs, all schools in the lowest 5% were consistently rated as Red or Orange.
Criterion A Overview

- **Purpose:** Identify schools that have been the most persistently low performing

- **Proposed Indicators:** Schools that are in the bottom 5% based on an average of overall SPF score from the most recent three years.*
  - When modeling this methodology using prior years SPFs, all schools in the lowest 5% were consistently rated as Red or Orange.

- **Rationale:**
  - Ensures we are identifying the MOST persistently low performing schools
  - Rank-order methodology accounts for shifts in assessments and SPF methodology
  - Ensures DPS has sufficient supply of high-quality new school applicants

---

*If a school has 3 full SPFs, the average of the 3 results is used. If a school only has 2 full SPFs, the average of the 2 results is used. If a school only has 1 full SPF, it is exempt from designation. When modeling this methodology using prior years SPFs, all schools in the lowest 5% were consistently rated as Red or Orange.
Criterion A: Schools’ SPF Averages are ranked and the lowest 5% (1st-5th percentile) are identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School K</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowest 5%
Criterion B Overview

• **Purpose:** Identify schools that are not showing strong academic growth in the most recent year

• **Proposed Indicators:** Schools that receive 50% or fewer of growth points in the most recent year
  – Considers all growth metrics of SPF in most recent year

• **Rationale:**
  – Identifies schools showing strong growth that are not yet improving on the overall SPF due to two-year matrix
  – Acknowledges that it can be difficult for schools to meet status expectations immediately based on students’ incoming performance
Criterion B: Schools that earned 50% or fewer growth points in the most recent year, based on the SPF, meet threshold and receive an SQR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>5th Percentile</th>
<th>4th Percentile</th>
<th>3rd Percentile</th>
<th>2nd Percentile</th>
<th>1st Percentile</th>
<th>Meets Threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion C Overview: School Quality Review

• **Purpose:** Identify schools where instructional quality indicators suggest the school is not on a trajectory towards improved student achievement based on a School Quality Review (SQR)

• **Proposed Methodology:** Identify a quantified threshold for SQR performance that, if not met, would lead to a staff recommendation for restart or closure

• **Rationale:**
  – Using an SQR allows the District to evaluate qualitative leading indicators of student achievement
  – Sets a quantified threshold:
    • Minimizes subjectivity
    • Provides transparency for school communities
    • Allows for consistent application
Criterion C: School Quality Review Process Information

Team Composition
- Teams will include DPS staff, community members and charter representatives, in addition to vendor staff.
- Vendor will conduct calibration training for all team members starting summer 2016.

Rubric
- 2016-17 SQRs will utilize the same customized rubric that was used in 2015-16 to ensure consistency for school leaders.
- Staff will consider further rubric customization in future years based on stakeholder feedback.

Timing
- All schools who meet Criteria A and B will receive an SQR in Fall 2016 that will be considered for Criteria C; prior SQR results will not be used in designation decisions.
- Other schools may receive a diagnostic SQR but these will be separate from the SPC.

External Vendor Role
- In order to maintain objectivity, external vendor will be responsible for evidence synthesis and report writing as well as assist in the assignment of team members.
- In order to maintain consistency, teams will be consistent across schools where possible.

NOTE: The District conducts SQRs in additional schools, but only for schools that have met Criteria A and B will the results be considered for designation.
Revisiting the Designation Criteria

• Staff will review designation methodology on an annual basis to ensure current methodology is identifying the most persistently low-performing schools.

• One likely change in future years is moving from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced methodology for Criterion A.
Community Engagement
Engaging Communities Throughout the Process

Spring 2016-Late August 2016
• School Performance Conversations at select schools, including an overview of the School Performance Compact

September 2016
• School Performance Conversations including performance relative to Criteria A and B
• Share information about School Quality Review process

November-December 2016
• Community meeting to share SQR findings and staff recommendation
• Board of Education votes on school restart or closure under the School Performance Compact

Winter 2016-Spring 2017
• Community input into selection of new school, aligned with the Call for New Quality Schools and the Facility Allocation Policy guidelines
Implementation Details
Implementation Considerations

• **Purpose:** Acknowledge significant interventions in process prior to policy adoption and ensure there is reasonable time for those interventions to demonstrate effectiveness.

• **Proposed Process:** For schools that have had a significant intervention prior to policy adoption, the first year of data to be considered will be from the year of intervention.
  – Significant interventions are defined as a school going through redesign or transformation, as well as new school programs that replaced low performing schools. We have defined redesign and transformation in alignment with the Federal turnaround definitions.
    • Redesign: Replace the principal and rehire no more than 50 percent of the school’s staff; adopt a new governance structure; provide job embedded professional development; offer staff financial and career advancement incentives; implement a research-based, aligned instructional program; extend learning and teacher planning time; create a community-orientation; and provide operating flexibility.
    • Transformation: Replace the principal (no requirement for staff replacement); provide job embedded professional development; implement a rigorous teacher-evaluation and reward system; offer financial and career advancement incentives; implement comprehensive instructional reform; extend learning and teacher-planning time; create a community-orientation; and provide operating flexibility and sustained support.

• **Rationale:**
  – Provides time for intervention to demonstrate effectiveness.
  – SQR will provide an additional opportunity for interventions to show leading indicators of effectiveness.
  – Allows short term considerations to be applied consistently across governance type.
Implementation Considerations

Example 1 – A School With Intervention in 2014-15:

- Year 1 of Implementing Intervention
  - 2014-15 Fall
  - 2015-16 Fall
  - Data for the first SPF
  - 1st SPF report
  - 2016-17 Fall
  - Data for the second SPF
  - 2nd SPF report
  - SPC decision or Restart/Closure
  - Year 4 Fall
  - Year 5 Fall
  - Restart/Closure
  - Year 6 Fall

Example 2 – A New School Program Beginning in 2016-17:

- Year 0
  - 2015-16 Fall
  - Data for the 1st full SPF
  - 1st SPF report
  - 2016-17 Fall
  - Data for the 2nd full SPF
  - 2nd SPF report
  - SPC decision or Restart/Closure
  - Year 3 Fall
  - Year 4 Fall
  - Restart/Closure
  - Year 5 Fall
  - Year 6 Fall

[Diagram showing the timeline and decision-making process for each year]
# Outstanding Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Rationale/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Criterion C Indicators             | August   | - Allow additional time to collaborate with external vendor in setting indicators based on national best practice  
                                     |           | - Schools can continue to action plan relative to 2015-16 SQR results                                                                         |
| New School Selection Process       | August   | - Capture lessons learned from 2015-16 Call for New Quality Schools and Facility Allocation Policy implementation  
                                     |           | - Allow additional time to gather feedback from stakeholders                                                                               |
| New School Requirements            | August   | - Capture lessons learned from 2015-16 Call for New Quality Schools and Facility Allocation Policy implementation  
                                     |           | - Allow additional time to gather feedback from stakeholders                                                                               |
## Fall 2016 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November-December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 School Performance Framework ratings announced</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Quality Reviews</strong> conducted for Criterion C</td>
<td><strong>DPS reviews</strong> School Performance Compact Criteria A, B and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tiered Support Framework support levels determined</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schools that are in intensive support tier</strong> will also receive School Quality Reviews for improvement and support planning</td>
<td><strong>DPS makes recommendations</strong> about school restart or closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools that met Criteria A and B informed</strong>; their School Quality Review results will be considered in Criterion C</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Board of Education votes</strong> on school restart or closure under the School Performance Compact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix
## SQR Indicators

### Domain 1: Instruction

1. Classroom interactions and organization ensure a classroom climate conducive to learning.

2. Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.

3. Teachers regularly assess students’ progress toward mastery of key skills and concepts, and use assessment data to make adjustments to instruction and to provide feedback to students during the lesson.

### Domain 2: Students’ Opportunities to Learn

4. The school identifies and supports special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk.

5. The school has a safe, supportive learning environment that reflects high expectations.

### Domain 3: Educators’ Opportunities to Learn

6. The school designs professional development and collaborative systems to sustain a focus on instructional improvement.

7. The school’s culture indicates high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy.

### Domain 4: Leadership and Community

8. School leaders guide and participate with instructional staff in the central processes of improving teaching and learning.

9. School leaders effectively orchestrate the school’s operations.

10. Communities, parents and families are actively engaged in their students’ progress and school improvement.