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Denver Plan 2020:
Great Schools in Every Neighborhood
OUR VISION

EVERY CHILD SUCCEEDS
The Denver Plan 2020 is Denver Public Schools’ five-year strategic plan. With the vision of Every Child Succeeds, DPS has committed to five specific goals designed to close academic achievement gaps and prepare all students for success in college and careers.
THE
DENVER PLAN 2020

GOAL #1
Great Schools in Every Neighborhood

GOAL #2
A Foundation for Success in School

GOAL #3
Ready for College and Career

GOAL #4
Support for the Whole Child

GOAL #5
Close the Opportunity Gap
THE DENVER PLAN 2020
STRATEGIES

LEADERSHIP

TEACHING

FLEXIBILITY

INVEST EARLY

CULTURE
TABLE ACTIVITY 2

FACT

or

MYTH

?
1. The only new schools DPS opens are charter schools. **MYTH**

2. DPS provides different levels of support to schools based on their different needs. **FACT**

3. How DPS makes decisions about school restarts or closures is kept private. **MYTH**

4. The district tells schools exactly what they must do in order to improve. **MYTH**

5. Parents can be involved in selecting new schools to meet their community’s needs. **FACT**
DPS’ top Denver Plan 2020 goal is to ensure Great Schools in Every Neighborhood.
We check progress to see how well each school is helping students succeed.
We provide all schools with a strong foundation of support to help them thrive.
We hold ourselves accountable for how schools are serving students.
We use the Call for New Quality Schools to start new schools in Denver.
We match schools with communities through the Facility Allocation Policy.
We strive for continuous improvement until Every Child Succeeds.
LEARN MORE

How we check school progress through the SPF

SPF.dpsk12.org
What is new about the SPF for 2016?

2016 SPF Changes

- Two years of new state test data and one year of growth data
- New Equity indicator
- Increased number of early literacy measures
- Simpler indicator of parent/student satisfaction
Table Activity 3: Unpacking the SPF
Explore and Discover

• What is the color of the school?

• What is the Equity indicator telling you?

• How are ELA students performing at this school?
When will we know our school’s new rating?

**Tentative Release Date:**

Thursday, Oct. 20, 2016

**School Community Progress Monitoring:**

Oct. 20 - Nov. 18
LEARN MORE
How we support schools and hold ourselves accountable

Support for Schools

Accountability
OPENING QUESTIONS
Panel discussion and audience Q&A

• How has DPS’ commitment to accountability affected the trajectory of your school?

• How did you engage parents through this process?

• How have you focused on supporting English Language Learners?

• How are you being supported by DPS this year?
What is the purpose of the 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 the School Performance Compact

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.
School Performance Compact: Fall 2016 Implementation
Fall 2016 Timeline Overview

**Essential Question:** Given the delays in SPF release, what adjustments should we make to the timeline for SPC implementation?

**Plan:** Conduct SQRs after the SPF is released, necessitating a delay in Board decisions until early December.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Original Target Date</th>
<th>New Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPF Released</td>
<td>Late Sept/Early October</td>
<td>October 20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQR Scheduled</td>
<td>Late Sept/Early October</td>
<td>Late Sept/Early October (Schools will not yet know purpose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQRs Conducted</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Late October-Early November (Post SPF Release)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Decisions</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Early-Mid December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Released</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale for Proposed Timeline

• Provides transparency for schools and communities as to the purpose of School Quality Reviews

• Allows for multiple opportunities to inform communities about the process

• Accommodates delays in data availability

• Provides clarity on decisions prior to Choice window opening

Discussion Question: What are the risks of this timeline and how can we mitigate these risks?
School Performance Compact: Criterion C Threshold
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.
Overview of the Process

Panel convened August 15 and 16

• Panel was composed of
  – experts from multiple advocacy groups
  – school leaders (district-run and charter)
  – an English Language Acquisition specialist
  – whole child specialists
  – a classroom instruction specialist
  – a community engagement specialist
  – external superintendents

• Grounded in the purpose of the School Performance Compact (SPC) and the School Quality Review (SQR) Criteria

• Small groups developed initial recommendations for the level of performance for schools meeting the School Quality Review (SQR)

• Developed consensus recommendation for the level of performance for schools meeting the School Quality Review (SQR)
DPS Performance Level Descriptor

**Likely Capacity for Growth:**

The preponderance of evidence from indicators in the School Quality Review indicates that the school will likely demonstrate growth that meets expectations (i.e., green or blue) on the growth indicator of the SPF for the current year.

**Policy Rationale:** Given schools that reach Criterion C are persistently low-performing and not trending upward based on their most recent year of data, they need to score well on the School Quality Review in order to remain operating.
Panel Recommendations

The School Quality Review (SQR) is comprised of ten key questions, each of which is rated on a 1 to 4 scale:

1 = does not meet  
2 = partially meets  
3 = meets  
4 = exceeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SchoolWorks Quality Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest score point = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended cut = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest score point = 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The panel’s consensus recommendation was a total score of 25 and at least a “2” rating on all ten key questions.
2015-16 SQR Information

• SQR has evolved over the years. Prior to 2015-16 was narrative (no scores)

• In 2015-16, we implemented a version with scores

• 17 schools had a SQR conducted in 2015-16

• 16 of the 17 schools were red or orange on the 2014 SPF

• 3 of these schools, all of which were red or orange on the SPF, scored at least a 25 on the SQR AND didn’t receive any 1s
Fall 2016 Community Engagement & Communications
Community Engagement & Communications Principles

Ensure that impacted communities understand:

1. Current and past performance of their school;

1. The School Quality Review process and its relationship to the School Performance Compact for their specific school;

1. The findings of the school’s School Quality Review;

1. Next steps in terms of:
   • additional tiered supports
   • choice supports
   • opportunities to engage the selection process for potential restart providers.
Community Engagement & Communications Overview

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

Late September-Early October 2016
• SQR Process Update through parent letter and staff meeting
• A subset of potentially SPC impacted schools will also hold CSC meeting

Late October 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

Discussion Question: How can we ensure communities are well-informed while also respecting school and community time?

NOTE: Community meetings will be accompanied by other means of communication in order to reach a broader group.
What is the purpose of the 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.
School Performance Compact: Fall 2016 Implementation
### FALL 2016 TIMELINE OVERVIEW

**Essential Question:** Given the delays in SPF release, what adjustments should we make to the timeline for SPC implementation?

**Plan:** Conduct SQRs after the SPF is released, necessitating a delay in Board decisions until early December.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Original Target Date</th>
<th>New Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPF Released</td>
<td>Late Sept/Early October</td>
<td>October 20th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQR Scheduled</td>
<td>Late Sept/Early October</td>
<td>Late Sept/Early October (Schools will not yet know purpose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQRs Conducted</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Late October-Early November (Post SPF Release)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Decisions</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Early-Mid December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Released</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED TIMELINE RATIONALE

• Provides transparency for schools and communities as to the purpose of School Quality Reviews

• Allows for multiple opportunities to inform communities about the process

• Accommodates delays in data availability

• Provides clarity on decisions prior to Choice window opening

Discussion Question: What are the risks of this timeline and how can we mitigate these risks?
School Performance Compact: Criterion C Threshold
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.
Panel convened August 15 and 16

- Panel was composed of
  - experts from multiple advocacy groups
  - school leaders (district-run and charter)
  - an English Language Acquisition specialist
  - whole child specialists
  - a classroom instruction specialist
  - a community engagement specialist
  - external superintendents

- Grounded in the purpose of the School Performance Compact (SPC) and the School Quality Review (SQR) Criteria

- Small groups developed initial recommendations for the level of performance for schools meeting the School Quality Review (SQR)

- Developed consensus recommendation for the level of performance for schools meeting the School Quality Review (SQR)
• **Likely Capacity for Growth:** The preponderance of evidence from indicators in the School Quality Review indicates that the school will likely demonstrate growth that meets expectations (i.e., green or blue) on the growth indicator of the SPF for the current year.

• **Policy Rationale:** Given schools that reach Criterion C are persistently low-performing and not trending upward based on their most recent year of data, they need to score well on the School Quality Review in order to remain operating.
Panel Recommendations

- The School Quality Review (SQR) is comprised of 10 key questions, each of which is rated on a 1 to 4 scale:
  - 1 = does not meet
  - 2 = partially meets
  - 3 = meets
  - 4 = exceeds

- A school’s total score on the SQR is the sum of the ratings on each of the key questions. This means that the score scale ranges from 10 to 40.

- The panel’s consensus recommendation was a total score of 25 on the SQR score scale with an additional requirement that a school meeting this expectation would earn at least a “2” rating on all ten key questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SchoolWorks Quality Criteria</th>
<th>Lowest score point</th>
<th>Recommended cut</th>
<th>Highest Score point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SQR has evolved over the years. Prior to 15/16 was narrative (no scores).

In 15/16 we implemented a version with scores.

17 schools had a SQR conducted in 15/16.

16 of the 17 schools were red or orange on the 2014 SPF.

3 of these schools, all of which were red or orange on the SPF, scored at least a 25 on the SQR AND didn’t receive any 1s.
Fall 2016
Community Engagement & Communications
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS PRINCIPLES

Impacted communities will understand:
1. Current and past school performance;
2. The School Quality Review process and its relationship to the School Performance Compact for their specific school;
3. The findings of the school’s School Quality Review;
4. Dependent on findings, next steps in terms of: a) additional tiered supports, b) Choice supports, and c) opportunities to engage the selection process for potential restart providers.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS OVERVIEW

**Spring 2016-Early September 2016**
- School Performance Conversations at select schools, including an overview of the School Performance Compact

**Late September-Early October 2016**
- SQR Process Update through parent letter and staff meeting
- A subset of potentially SPC impacted schools will also hold CSC meeting

**Late October 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

Discussion Question: How can we ensure communities are well-informed while also respecting school and community time?

---

**NOTE:** Community meetings will be accompanied by other means of communication in order to reach a broader group.