

**History of Colorado's State Accountability Performance Frameworks**

See Additional Notes on Reverse

**Performance Frameworks**

Target Setting

Indicator Weighting

Performance Indicators

% of Schools Identified as PI/T  
% of Districts Identified as PI/T

**Federal Legislation**

**State Legislation**

**Standards**

**Assessments**



**Term Definitions & Notes**  
(Additional Notes on Reverse)

EM = Elementary & Middle  
H = High School

PI/T = Priority Improvement or Turnaround

NCLB = No Child Left Behind  
ESSA = Every Student Succeeds  
ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act  
AYP = Adequate Yearly Progress

*\*this legislation has not yet been fully implemented*

*\*this implementation phase will continue through 2020*

**Assessed Subjects & Grades:**  
CSAP [Math & Reading & Writing] 3<sup>rd</sup> - 10<sup>th</sup>  
CMAS [Math & ELA] 3<sup>rd</sup> - 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> in 2015  
CMAS [Science] 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>  
ACT [Math & English] 11<sup>th</sup>  
SAT [Math & Evidenced Based Reading and Writing] 11<sup>th</sup>  
PSAT [Math & Evidence Based Reading and Writing] 9<sup>th</sup> - 10<sup>th</sup>

## History of Colorado's State Accountability Performance Frameworks

The purpose of this resource is to provide educational stakeholders in the state with a large-scale view of the factors that have impacted the performance frameworks since their origin, in order to support decision making about future changes. Note: This resource addresses traditional performance frameworks, but does not address Alternative Education Campus (AEC) frameworks.

### Performance Frameworks

With the implementation of Colorado's Education Accountability Act of **2009** (SB-09-163), performance frameworks were produced for the first time in **2010**. The purpose of this accountability system is to meaningfully differentiate between school and district performance across the state, based on a common set of metrics, in order to identify the lowest performing in need of additional support (identified as Priority Improvement or Turnaround). **2017** was the first year of Accountability Clock hearings before the State Board of Education (SBE) for those schools and districts that consistently demonstrated low performance without improvement.

For the first five years (**2010-2014**), schools and districts were assessed on four (4) performance indicators:

- **Achievement** [Weighting: Elementary/Middle: 25%, High: 15%] – based on percent at benchmark measure
- **Growth** [Weighting: Elementary/Middle: 50%, High: 35%] – based on median growth percentiles (included adequate growth measure)
- **Growth Gaps** [Weighting: Elementary/Middle: 25%, High: 15%] – based on median growth percentiles for student subgroups (included adequate growth measure)
- **Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness (PWR)** [Weighting: High: 35%] – based on ACT scores, graduation, and dropout

The weighting of these indicators was set along with the targets for all underlying metrics (i.e., cut points for performance expectations) in **2010** and remained consistent for these five years.

In **2015**, performance frameworks were not produced due to a significant **transition in assessments**. This transition occurred with the conclusion of the standards implementation phase.

For the next three years (**2016-2018**), schools and districts were assessed on three (3) performance indicators:

- **Achievement** [Weighting: Elementary/Middle: 40%; High: 30%] – based on mean scale scores for all students and subgroups
- **Growth** [Weighting: Elementary/Middle: 60%; High: 40%] – based on median growth percentiles for all students and subgroups
- **Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness (PWR)** [Weighting: High: 30%] – based on SAT scores, graduation, matriculation, and dropout

The weighting of these indicators was set along with the targets for all underlying metrics (i.e., cut points for performance expectations) in **2016** and remained consistent for these three years. Additionally, beginning in **2016**, parent opt-outs no longer counted against accountability participation rates.

Over the eight total years that the performance frameworks have been produced, the percent of schools and districts identified as Priority Improvement or Turnaround decreased from 12% and 13%, respectively, in **2010** to 9% and 3%, respectively, in **2018**. This indicates that performance across the state has been improving in comparison to the initial baseline.

With the conclusion of the **assessment transitions** in **2018**, calculation of the adequate growth measure (also known as growth-to-standard) required by SB-09-163 may now resume. It is anticipated that this metric will be reintroduced in the **2020** performance frameworks; discussions are currently ongoing with respect to the calculation methodology for this revised metric.

### Federal Legislation

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is the original federal accountability law, and has been reauthorized eight subsequent times. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act was the version of this law in place when Colorado's Education Accountability Act of **2009** (SB-09-163) was enacted. Under NCLB, all states were required to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations. Colorado applied for and received a waiver for many ESEA requirements beginning in **2012**, to enable the streamlining of state and federal accountability systems and focus improvement efforts. At the end of **2015**, a new version of the national education law was enacted, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In **2018**, schools and districts in the state received federal accountability identifications with associated implications for the first time in seven years.

### State Legislation

The state education law is the Education Accountability Act of **2009**. Several other state laws have been passed that impact the performance frameworks since their origin; they are detailed below.

- HB-12-1238: Required addition of READ Act metric in performance frameworks
- HB-15-1170: Required addition of matriculation metric in performance frameworks (PWR)
- HB-15-1323: Changed state assessments and implemented "hold" on state accountability during assessment transitions
- SB-17-272: [not yet implemented] Requires addition of metric that shows college and career readiness based on the available graduation demonstration options (PWR)
- SB-18-012: [not yet implemented] Requires addition of military enlistment data into matriculation metric (PWR)
- HB-18-1019: [not yet implemented] Requires addition of metric of higher level performance in AP, IB or concurrent enrollment courses in subject areas other than English Language Arts or Math.

Also in **2018**, HB-18-1355 was passed modifying the state's Education Accountability Act, provisions of which go into effect in the fall of **2019**. The largest changes are related to the consequences of a school or district remaining on the Accountability Clock (receiving a Priority Improvement or Turnaround identification for consecutive years); this will be replaced by the Performance Watch Process.

### Standards

Driven by other state legislation, in **2009** Colorado adopted new Science, Math, and Reading Writing and Communicating (RWC) academic standards. In **2010**, Math and RWC standards were revised to include the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The standards implementation phase followed, concluding with an **assessment transition** in **2015**. In **2016**, planning began for the next revision of state standards. In **2018**, new standards were adopted in all content areas along with the addition of Computer Science standards. The transition to implement these standards will continue through **2020**.

### Assessments

Colorado state assessments remained relatively consistent from **2009** to **2014**. With the implementation of new state standards, there was a significant assessment transition in **2015** and ongoing transitions in the high school assessments that contributed to performance framework identifications for the three years that followed. The primary new assessments were:

- the Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) for elementary and middle school students, which was developed with the PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers) Consortium, and
- the PSAT & SAT for high school students, which have gradually been phased in each year.