Colorado Department of Education
FY 2012-13 Budget Request

Strategic Plan

December 12, 2011

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Table of Contents

Introduction And Statutory Authority.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

I. Vision & Mission Statement 5

II. Goals and Objectives 6

III. Performance Measures 7

IV. Strategies 15

V. Evaluation of Success 17

Appendix:

Performance Measures for Student Subgroups 19

INTRODUCTION AND STATUTORY AUTHORITY

As a dynamic service agency, the Colorado Department of Education provides leadership, resources, support, and accountability to the state's 178 school districts, 1,780 schools, and over 130,000 educators to help them build capacity to meet the needs of the state's over 840,000 public school students. CDE also provides services and support to boards of cooperative educational services (BOCES), early learning centers, state correctional schools, facility schools, the state's libraries, adult/family literacy centers, Colorado Talking Book Library, and General Education Development (GED) testing centers reaching learners of all ages. In addition, CDE provides structural and administrative support to the Colorado School for the Deaf and the Blind and the Charter School Institute.

As the administrative arm of the State Board of Education, CDE is responsible for implementing state and federal education laws, disbursing state and federal funds, holding schools and districts accountable for performance, licensing all educators, and providing public transparency of performance and financial data. CDE serves students, parents, and the general public by protecting the public trust through ensuring adherence to laws, strong stewardship of public funds, and accountability for student performance.

As a learning organization, CDE actively partners with districts, schools, educators, families, and community agencies to assess needs, foster innovation, identify promising practices, learn from each other, and disseminate successful strategies to increase student achievement and ensure college and career readiness.

As a change agent, CDE seeks to continually advance and improve the state's education system to prepare all learners for success in a rapidly changing global workplace. CDE sets a clear vision for increasing student and overall system performance and holds itself and the state's schools and districts accountable for results.

Statutory Authority – The statutory authority for the Colorado Department of Education is established in Section 24-1-115 of the Colorado Revised Statutes.

I. VISION AND MISSION STATEMENT

Vision Statement

All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in a globally competitive workforce.

Mission Statement - State Board of Education

The mission of CDE is to shape, support, and safeguard a statewide education system that prepares students for success in a globally competitive world.

Narrative of the Department's Vision and Mission

The vision and mission guide the work of the department. CDE's strategic plan focuses the department on achieving its mission by creating an aligned statewide education system from the classroom all the way to the statehouse. We have set clear goals related to student achievement, educator effectiveness, school/district performance, and state agency operations – all aimed at aligning efforts toward giving students what they need for success after high school.

We believe that the strategies for accomplishing our goals are tightly connected to our effective implementation of several key pieces of education reform legislation, namely Colorado's Achievement Plan for Kids (S.B. 08-212), Colorado's Accountability Act (S.B. 09-163), and Colorado's Educator Effectiveness Act (S.B. 10-191). The strategies in our strategic plan specifically relate to accomplishing key implementation milestones for each of these laws. We believe the power is in the integration and connection of these three pieces of legislation that collectively raise the bar for students, educators, and schools/districts. We are increasing the rigor and relevance of what we are teaching and assessing through the Colorado Academic standards adopted pursuant to S.B. 08-212. At the same time, we are increasing accountability and support to teachers to help them be more effective in teaching this more rigorous content through high quality evaluations connected to student growth, as outlined in S.B. 10-191. And, we are implementing a comprehensive accountability system that holds schools and districts accountable for growth and continuous improvement, as envisioned in S.B. 09-163.

Our budget requests for 2012-13 are directly tied to the state's implementation of these reforms. Specifically, the department is requesting funding for the development of the state's new assessment system that will assess student mastery of the new content standards. In addition, the department is requesting funds to support the continued operation of the state's educator effectiveness office to implement S.B. 10-191.

II. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The department has four overarching goals with specific objectives tied to each of them. The objectives drive the performance measures, benchmarks, strategies and action plans of the department. As noted earlier, the goals and objectives aim to build an aligned education system (student, educator, schools/districts, state) focused on better results for all students.

Globally Competitive Workforce

1. **Build a globally competitive workforce.**
   a. Ensure every student is on track to graduate postsecondary and workforce ready.
   b. Ensure students graduate ready for success in postsecondary education and the workforce.
   c. Increase achievement and international/national competitiveness for all students.

Great Teachers and Leaders

2. **Ensure effective educators for every student and effective leaders for every school and district.**
   a. Increase and support the effectiveness of all educators.
   b. Optimize the preparation, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.
   c. Eliminate the educator equity gap.

Outstanding Schools and Districts

3. **Build the capacity of schools and districts to meet the needs of Colorado students and their families.**
   a. Increase school and district performance.
   b. Foster innovation and expand access to a rich array of high quality school choices for students.

Best State Education Agency in the Nation

4. **Operate with excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness**
   a. Develop, implement, and monitor CDE's new strategic direction.
   b. Increase internal and external customer satisfaction with our communication, services, and systems.
   c. Attract and retain outstanding talent to CDE.

III. PERFORMAMCE MEASURES

Goal 1: Build a globally competitive workforce.

The performance measures selected for the objectives related to this goal are the same measures we hold our schools and districts accountable for in their accountability performance frameworks. They are also the measures the U.S. Department of Education holds us accountable to monitor and meet. We believe strongly that if we are to have an aligned system, we need to be examining at the state level the same performance framework measures we monitor at the district and school level.

Objective 1a. Ensure every student is <u>on track</u> to graduate postsecondary and workforce ready.

The benchmarks for this objective were determined by examining historical trend data from 2006-07 to 2010-11 (see Charts 1 & 2 below) for both student proficiency (are students where they need to be) and student adequate growth (are students making progress). Change over time was examined and a stretch goal of three times the five-year growth trend was applied. In cases where there was a decline in numbers or more growth was needed in order for subpopulations to catch up, the performance benchmarks were based on management decisions to increase performance between 5 and 7 percentage points.

Chart 1: Percent of Students Scoring At or Above Proficient in Reading, Writing, Math, and Science by Elementary, Middle, and High School
(includes student results for CSAP, CSAP-A, Lectura and Escritura)

2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 Interim Target -		2014-15 Final Target	
Reading		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*	
Elementary	68.8%	Elementary	69.4%	Elementary	69.5%	Elementary	69.2%	Elementary	69.3%	Elementary	69.7%	Elementary	70.8%
Middle	65.2%	Middle	67.1%	Middle	67.0%	Middle	69.0%	Middle	67.3%	Middle	68.9%	Middle	73.8%
High	67.6%	High	67.5%	High	69.5%	High	68.6%	High	65.1%	High	66.2%	High	69.5%
Writing		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*	
Elementary	54.8%	Elementary	54.8%	Elementary	55.2%	Elementary	53.7%	Elementary	56.5%	Elementary	57.8%	Elementary	61.5%
Middle	56.0%	Middle	56.0%	Middle	57.8%	Middle	56.5%	Middle	57.3%	Middle	58.3%	Middle	61.2%
High	50.0%	High	49.0%	High	51.2%	High	49.1%	High	49.7%	High	50.5%	High	52.7%
Math		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*	
Elementary	67.7%	Elementary	67.8%	Elementary	67.7%	Elementary	69.0%	Elementary	68.8%	Elementary	69.6%	Elementary	72.0%
Middle	50.3%	Middle	49.9%	Middle	54.3%	Middle	52.9%	Middle	54.3%	Middle	57.4%	Middle	66.6%
High	32.7%	High	34.7%	High	33.3%	High	35.6%	High	34.9%	High	36.5%	High	41.4%
Science		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*	
Elementary	42.1%	Elementary	43.7%	Elementary	44.9%	Elementary	46.9%	Elementary	46.8%	Elementary	50.4%	Elementary	61.0%
Middle	52.4%	Middle	48.6%	Middle	49.3%	Middle	48.9%	Middle	49.9%	Middle	50.6%	Middle	52.9%
High	49.2%	High	46.9%	High	51.1%	High	48.2%	High	48.5%	High	49.2%	High	51.5%

Chart 2: Percent of Students Making Adequate Growth To Catch Up & Keep Up on Path to Proficiency

2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 Interim Target -		2014-15 Final Target	
Reading		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*	
Elementary	64.1%	Elementary	65.9%	Elementary	65.6%	Elementary	67.6%	Elementary	64.4%	Elementary	64.6%	Elementary	65.3%
Middle	65.0%	Middle	64.3%	Middle	65.8%	Middle	66.2%	Middle	62.3%	Middle	63.3%	Middle	66.2%
High	71.6%	High	68.0%	High	72.1%	High	69.0%	High	67.0%	High	68.3%	High	72.1%
Writing		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*	
Elementary	55.9%	Elementary	56.2%	Elementary	58.6%	Elementary	55.0%	Elementary	60.3%	Elementary	63.5%	Elementary	73.3%
Middle	51.5%	Middle	48.9%	Middle	52.1%	Middle	48.3%	Middle	50.3%	Middle	51.1%	Middle	53.3%
High	52.5%	High	49.1%	High	52.6%	High	49.0%	High	50.6%	High	51.3%	High	53.6%
Math		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*	
Elementary	53.3%	Elementary	47.7%	Elementary	54.4%	Elementary	50.6%	Elementary	54.5%	Elementary	55.4%	Elementary	58.2%
Middle	37.7%	Middle	37.8%	Middle	39.0%	Middle	39.0%	Middle	38.9%	Middle	39.8%	Middle	42.4%
High	32.2%	High	33.0%	High	32.2%	High	33.5%	High	34.3%	High	35.8%	High	40.6%

Performance measure 1a. Student Achievement: Percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 Appropriated	2012-13 Request
Percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school	Benchmark	N/A	N/A	***Reading*** Elm 69.7% Mid 68.9% High 66.2% ***Writing*** Elm 57.8% Mid 58.3% High 50.5% ***Math*** Elm 69.6% Mid 57.4% High 36.5% ***Science*** Elm 50.4% Mid 50.6% High 49.2%	***Reading*** Elm 70.0% Mid 70.5% High 67.3% ***Writing*** Elm 59.0% Mid 59.2% High 51.2% ***Math*** Elm 70.4% Mid 60.5% High 38.1% ***Science*** Elm 53.9% Mid 51.4% High 50.0%

	Actual	***Reading*** Elm 69.2% Mid 69.0% High 68.6% ***Writing*** Elm 53.7% Mid 56.5% High 49.1% ***Math*** Elm 69.0% Mid 52.9% High 35.6% ***Science*** Elm 46.9% Mid 48.9% High 48.2%	***Reading*** Elm 69.3% Mid 67.3% High 65.1% ***Writing*** Elm 56.5% Mid 57.3% High 49.7% ***Math*** Elm 68.8% Mid 54.3% High 34.9% ***Science*** Elm 46.8% Mid 49.9% High 48.5%		

Performance measure 1a. Student Growth: Percent of students making adequate growth to catch up and keep up on the path to proficiency

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 Appropriated	2012-13 Request
Percent of students making adequate growth to catch up and keep up on path to proficiency	Benchmark	N/A	N/A	***Reading*** Elm 64.6% Mid 63.3% High 68.3% ***Writing*** Elm 63.5% Mid 51.1% High 51.3% ***Math*** Elm 55.4% Mid 39.8% High 35.8%	***Reading*** Elm 64.8% Mid 64.3% High 69.3% ***Writing*** Elm 66.8% Mid 51.8% High 52.1% ***Math*** Elm 56.3% Mid 40.6% High 37.4%
	Actual	***Reading*** Elm 67.6% Mid 66.2% High 69.0% ***Writing*** Elm 55.0% Mid 48.3% High 49.0% ***Math*** Elm 50.6% Mid 39.0% High 33.5%	***Reading*** Elm 64.4% Mid 62.3% High 67.0% ***Writing*** Elm 60.3% Mid 50.3% High 50.6% ***Math*** Elm 54.5% Mid 38.9% High 34.3%		

Objective 1b. Ensure students graduate ready for success in postsecondary education and the workforce.

Performance Measure 1b. Graduation Rate (using best of 4, 5, 6, or 7-year graduation rate) - The state moved to a new graduation rate calculation beginning in 2009-2010 (prior year's data is not comparable). The new calculation includes examining the 4, 5, 6, or 7 year graduation rates from districts. This more inclusive number provides a more accurate picture of graduation rates, capturing students who transfer and those who graduate after the 4th year. The state is targeting a graduation rate of 80% for all students by 2014-15. The 2011-12 benchmark below represents incremental progress toward that objective.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 Appropriated	2012-13 Request
Graduation rate (using best of 4, 5, 6, or 7-year graduation rate) All – refers to all students FRL – refers to students who qualify for free and reduced lunch IEP – refers to students with individualized education plans per special education ELL – refers to English Language Learners	Benchmark	N/A	All 75.0% FRL 62.5% Min 62.2% IEP 63.5% ELL 57.3%	All 76.0% FRL 63.6% Min 63.3% IEP 64.6% ELL 58.5%	All 77.4% FRL 65.3% Min 65.0% IEP 66.3% ELL 60.2%
	Actual	All 74.7% FRL 61.8% Min 61.5% IEP 62.8% ELL 56.7%	Not yet available*		

*Graduation rates are collected through CDE's End-of-Year Collection. The initial deadline for districts to submit this data is September 15th, which allows districts to include summer graduates through the end of August. The department then engages in two "post processes;" the first of which involves the comparison of data within a district and any subsequent clean-up, and the second of which is a cross-district comparison to ensure, for example, that students are not inaccurately counted as a transfer when they have instead dropped out and that students are not double-counted in more than one district. Final graduation rates are released in January for the prior year.

Performance Measure 1b. ACT scores – Increase student ACT scores as a measure of college readiness. The benchmarks set for this objective were determined by examining historical trend data from 2006-07 to 2010-11 (see Chart 3 below) for all students. Change over time was examined and a benchmark of three times the five-year growth trend was applied. In cases where there was a decline in numbers, the benchmarks were based on management decisions to drive desired increases.

Chart 3: ACT Scores for Colorado Students

2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 Interim Target -		2014-15 Final Target	
All Students	19.7	All Students	20.1	All Students	20.0	All Students	20.0	All Students	19.9	All Students	20.1	All Students	20.5
FRL	16.4	FRL	16.9	FRL	16.7	FRL	16.9	FRL	16.9	FRL	17.2	FRL	18.2
Minority	17.3	Minority	17.7	Minority	17.3	Minority	17.3	Minority	17.8	Minority	18.2	Minority	19.3
Disability	14.4	Disability	14.8	Disability	14.6	Disability	14.6	Disability	14.4	Disability	14.7	Disability	15.9
ELL	15.5	ELL	16.0	ELL	15.9	ELL	15.9	ELL	16.0	ELL	16.3	ELL	17.4

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 Approp.	2012-13 Request
ACT Scores All – refers to all students FRL – refers to students who qualify for free and reduced lunch Dis – refers to students with disabilities ELL – refers to English Language Learners	Benchmark	N/A	N/A	All 20.1 FRL 17.2 Min 18.2 Dis 14.7 ELL 16.3	All 20.2 FRL 17.5 Min 18.6 Dis 15.1 ELL 16.7
	Actual	All 20.0 FRL 16.9 Min 17.3 Dis 14.6 ELL 15.9	All 19.9 FRL 16.9 Min 17.8 Dis 14.4 ELL 16.0		

Objective 1c. Increase achievement and international/national competitiveness for <u>all</u> students.

Performance Measure 1c. Student Achievement Sub-populations– The performance measures for this objective examine the performance of student subpopulations, namely free and reduced lunch students, minority students, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. The percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school is examined for each student population with benchmarks set. Given the magnitude of this data, it is presented in chart form in the Appendix.

Performance Measure 1c. NAEP proficiency (national comparison) - The state has set bechmarks to increase scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a national, biannual test. Historical performance on the NAEP is reflected in the chart below.

Chart 4: Percent of students scoring proficient and above on NAEP

Subject/Grade	2003	2005	2007	2009	2011
Reading 4th	37%	37%	36%	40%	39%
Math 4th	34%	39%	41%	45%	47%
Reading 8th	36%	32%	35%	32%	40%
Math 8th	34%	32%	37%	40%	43%

Performance Measure	Outcome	2007 Actual	2009 Actual	2011 Actual	2013 Request
Percentage of students scoring proficient and above on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) R-4 – reading 4th grade M-4 – math 4th grade R -8 – reading 8th grade M-8 – math 8th grade	Benchmark				R-4: 41% M-4: 49% R-8: 43% M-8: 45%
	Actual	R-4: 36% M-4: 41% R-8: 35% M-8: 37%	R-4: 40% M-4: 45% R-8: 32% M-8: 40%	R-4: 39% M-4: 47% R-8: 40% M-8: 43%	

Goal 2: Ensure effective educators for every student and effective leaders for every school and district.

CDE is assisting districts with implementation of S.B. 10-191 which will require districts to report annually on the effectiveness of their educators. We do not have baseline statistics for educator effectiveness performance measures, as districts will not begin implementing the new educator evaluation systems and submitting reports on those systems until 2013-14. We are building the reporting tools and systems to collect, monitor, and report on these performance measures. We have identified the performance measures and set benchmarks to guide implementation as described below.

Objective 2 a. Increase and support the effectiveness of all educators.
Performance measures:

- 100% of districts implement educator evaluation systems that are aligned to the state's educator quality standards by 2013-14.
- 75% of district evaluation systems yield evaluation ratings that correlate with student outcomes by 2015-16; 90% by 2016-17.
- Once strong correlations with student outcomes are in place, 75% of districts show progress in increasing the overall effectiveness of their educators by quality standard by 2016-17, while maintaining the correlation with student performance.
- Baseline statistics on the retention rates for educators by performance rating are established in 2013-2014 with benchmarks set for increasing the retention rate of highly effective and effective educators.

Objective 2 b. Optimize the preparation, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.
Performance Measures:

- Once correlations of evaluation results with student outcomes are in place, districts demonstrate that at least 75% of new educators in the ineffective or partially effective categories have moved up at least one performance level by the following year.
- Baseline statistics on retention rates of new educators are established in the spring of 2013-14 with benchmarks set for increasing the retention rates for highly effective and effective new educators.
- Baseline statistics on the effectiveness of new educators by educator preparation program are established in 2013-14 with benchmarks set for increasing effectiveness.

Objective 2 c. Eliminate the educator equity gap.
The educator equity gap is the tendency of poor or minority students to have less effective educators than their more affluent or white counterparts.

- Once baseline statistics on educator effectiveness ratings have been established, decrease the educator equity gap between high/low poverty and high/low minority schools by a minimum of 1% each year, with the goal of eliminating gaps in the effectiveness of educators in these schools within five years, while maintaining the correlation with student performance.
- Once baseline statistics have been established, decrease the educator equity gap between teachers serving advanced/proficient and partially proficient/ unsatisfactory students by a minimum of 1% each year, with the goal of eliminating gaps within five years, while maintaining the correlation with student performance.

Goal 3: Build the capacity of schools and districts to meet the needs of Colorado students and their families.

Objective 3a. Increase school and district performance

Performance Measure 3a. District Performance Accreditation Ratings- Increase the number of districts accredited with distinction from 10% (2009-10) to 15% or 27 districts (2014-15) and decrease the number of priority improvement and turnaround districts from 15% (2009-10) to 10% or 18 in (2014-15). (Note, 2009-10 is the first year that district performance ratings were given.)

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Approp.	2012-13 Request
Number of districts accredited with distinction	Benchmark	14	18	21	23
	Actual	14	18		

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Approp.	2012-13 Request
Number of districts accredited with priority improvement and turnaround	Benchmark	24	24	22	20
	Actual	24	24		

Objective 3b. Foster innovation and expand access to a rich array of high quality school choices for students.

Performance Measure 3b. Innovation, charter, and online school performance framework ratings – Increase the percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in performing category on school performance framework from 60% in 2010-11 to 80% in 2014-15. Decrease the percentage of these schools in priority improvement and turnaround from 25% in 2010-11 to 15% in 2014-15.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Approp.	2012-13 Request
Percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in performing category on school performance framework	Benchmark	60%	60%	65%	70%
	Actual	60%	60%		

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Approp.	2012-13 Request
Percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in priority improvement and turnaround	Benchmark	25%	25%	23%	20%
	Actual	25%	25%*		

*Note: 17 out of the 40 schools in priority improvement or turnaround are alternative education campuses (AEC) and may have a different rating on the AEC framework. This reflects where they are categorized on the regular school performance framework.

Goal 4: Operate with excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness.

Objective 4a. Develop and implement CDE's new strategic direction.

Performance Measure 4a. Percentage of performance targets met on strategic plan – CDE will be monitoring its strategic plan to meet performance benchmarks and to assess the rigor of the benchmarks set to inform benchmark setting for future years– the aim is to have ambitious yet attainable benchmarks that stretch the organization.

	Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Approp.	2012-13 Request
	Percentage of performance targets met on the strategic plan	Benchmark	N/A	N/A	75%	80%
		Actual	N/A	N/A		

Objective 4b. Increase internal and external customer satisfaction with our communication, services, and systems.

The majority of the performance measures for this goal reside at the unit level within the organization. At the organizational level, the department will be launching a district satisfaction survey in 2012 to establish baseline statistics related to customer satisfaction. The aim is to include key satisfaction metrics in our performance measures over time. Also at an organizational level, the department will continue to monitor and improve licensure cycle time, as this is a critical function of our office that impacts customer satisfaction with the department.

Performance Measure 4b. Educator Licensure Application Process – Length of time (in weeks) to process licensure requests (for applications that have been submitted with complete information and that do not require special background investigations)

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Approp.	2012-13 Request
Average length of time it takes to process educator licenses (weeks)	Benchmark	20	20	4	2
	Actual	20	16		

Objective 4c. Attract and retain outstanding talent to CDE.

Performance Measure 4c. Employee satisfaction survey results – The Department of Public Administration administered an employee satisfaction survey for all state departments this year. We have used it to set baseline measures on key indicators of staff satisfaction.

Performance Measure	Outcome	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2012-13 Request
Percentage of employees who agree/strongly agree: 1) Satisfied with opportunities for career growth and advancement 2) Have the capacity to act on innovative ideas 3) Satisfied with the recognition they receive for their work	Benchmark	N/A	N/A	N/A	1. 50% 2. 40% 3. 70%
	Actual	N/A		1. 39% 2. 35% 3. 62%	

IV. STRATEGIES

The primary strategies that the department is using to meet its performance benchmarks are briefly summarized below beneath each applicable goal area and objective. Detailed project plans and unit-level plans guide the implementation of these strategies across the department.

1. **Build a globally competitive workforce.**
   a. Ensure every student is on track to graduate postsecondary and workforce ready.
      - Implement the state's new academic standards aligned to postsecondary and workforce readiness.
      - Design and implement that state's new assessment system aligned to the new standards. The department's 2012-13 budget request to design the state's new assessment system is critical to this strategy.

   b. Ensure students graduate ready for success in postsecondary education and the workforce.
      - Support district implementation of individual career and academic plans.
      - Design and implement endorsed diplomas, as required by law.
      - Design statewide high school graduation guidelines, as required by law.

   c. Increase achievement and international/national competitiveness for all students.
      - Implement the state's multi-tiered system of supports to meet the needs of all students.

2. **Ensure effective educators for every student and effective leaders for every school and district.**
   a. Increase and support the effectiveness of all educators.
      - Implement S.B. 10-191 (including: design of the model educator evaluation system, piloting the system, development of growth measures to inform the evaluation system, and training to districts across the state). The department's budget request for continuation of the Educator Effectiveness Office is critical to implementing this strategy.

   b. Optimize the preparation, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.
      - Study and develop recommendations for statutory changes to revamp the state's licensure and induction systems to align them to the state's educator effectiveness work.

   c. Eliminate the educator equity gap.
      - Assist districts in developing and implementing evidenced-based plans for addressing equity gaps.

3. **Build the capacity of schools and districts to meet the needs of Colorado students and their families.**
   a. Increase school and district performance.
      - Implement a single system of state/federal school and district accountability.
      - Provide targeted support to priority improvement and turnaround schools and districts.

- Develop and implement a comprehensive plan to meet the needs of rural schools/districts.

b. Foster innovation and expand access to a rich array of high quality school choices for students.
   - Develop and implement rules establishing standards for quality charter schools and their authorizers as required by law.
   - Implement plan to increase the quality of online schools.

4. Operate with excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness

a. Develop, implement, and monitor CDE's new strategic direction.
   - Implement regular monitoring of the plan, formalize organization-wide project management system for key strategies, and institute system of aligned unit planning and aligned performance evaluation system.

b. Increase internal and external customer satisfaction with our communication, services, and systems.
   - Implement annual district satisfaction survey.
   - Decrease cycle time for processing of all complete license requests that do not require investigations to two weeks.

c. Attract and retain outstanding talent to CDE.
   - Develop and implement a consistent professional evaluation and growth plan process for all employees.
   - Implement action plans in response to key findings from the employee satisfaction survey.

V. EVALUATION OF SUCCESS

CDE evaluates its success by reviewing the performance measures outlined in this document, examining trends in statewide assessment and accountability data, and conducting program evaluations of key state/federal programs.

As 2011 marked the final administration of CSAP, CDE is using historical data from the assessment to evaluate the state's success in increasing student performance over time. Below are a few highlights from this evaluation:

- All grade levels have improved in mathematics since 2005 with substantial gains in grade 4 (5.2%), grade 6 (6.4%), grade 7 (7.2%), and grade 8 (7.4%). Middle school gains cut across poverty, race/ethnicity, gender and English Learner lines more than improvements in any other school level or content area.
- Science scores have remained relatively low since the science standards used in the 2011 assessments were introduced in 2008. Less than 50% of Colorado students were proficient at the three grade levels tested.
- Reading and writing proficiency scores have remained relatively steady since 2005.
- Hispanic students have made considerable progress across most grades and content areas since 2005. The gaps narrowed by nearly 8% to 11% in these areas; however, sizeable gaps continue to persist.
- Double-digit poverty achievement gaps persist in all content areas. More work is needed in this area. Our strategies related to our multi-tiered system of supports, turnaround schools, and rural schools are aimed at assisting schools impacted by high poverty.

In addition, the state examines how Colorado's students compare nationally. Colorado public school students in grades four and eight perform higher than the national average on 2011 mathematics and reading assessments, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

In mathematics, Colorado fourth-grade students received an average scale score of 244. There were five states that outperformed Colorado fourth-grade students in scale score (Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey and Maryland), 16 states that were not significantly different than Colorado and 30 states scored significantly lower than Colorado. In reading, Colorado fourth-graders received an average scale score of 223. There were eight states that outperformed Colorado fourth grade students in scale score (Connecticut, Department of Defense Schools, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Vermont), 24 states were not significantly different than Colorado and 19 states scored significantly lower than Colorado.

In mathematics, the average scale score for Colorado eighth-grade students was 292. There were only two states that outperformed Colorado eighth-graders in scale score (Massachusetts and Minnesota), 10 states that were not significantly different and 39 states scored significantly lower. The Colorado grade eight mathematics average scale score is significantly higher than the 2009 score of 287 and has significantly improved since the 2005 and 2003 administrations.

Colorado is one of only thirteen states to significantly improve the grade eight mathematics scale score since the 2009 administration of the test.

In the 2011 NAEP reading, the average scale score for Colorado eighth-grade students was 271. There were only three states that outperformed Colorado eighth-graders in scale score (Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Jersey), 19 states that were not significantly different and 29 states scored significantly lower. The Colorado grade eight reading average scale score is significantly higher than the 2009 score of 266.

In addition to evaluating success based on these performance measures, CDE conducts program evaluations pursuant to federal requirements and monitors internal process improvements. The department has focused specific attention on improving licensure cycle time. Wait times have reduced dramatically; and the department is well on its way to meeting its two-week turnaround goal for all complete license requests not requiring special investigations.

CDE uses the data from its performance measures and gathered through program administration to inform and refine our strategic direction, focus our efforts on the strategies that the data indicates are most tied to student improvement, and inform our ongoing work with districts and schools.

APPENDIX

Performance Measures and Benchmarks for Student Subgroups

Chart 5: Students Receiving Free and Reduced Lunch
Percent of students receiving free and reduced lunch scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school

(includes student results for CSAP, CSAP-A, Lectura and Escritura)

2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 Interim Target -		2014-15 Final Target	
Reading		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*	
Elementary	49.7%	Elementary	50.3%	Elementary	51.1%	Elementary	52.1%	Elementary	52.0%	Elementary	53.7%	Elementary	58.9%
Middle	43.4%	Middle	46.0%	Middle	46.2%	Middle	50.5%	Middle	49.1%	Middle	53.4%	Middle	66.3%
High	45.3%	High	44.0%	High	47.0%	High	48.2%	High	46.1%	High	47.3%	High	51.1%
Writing		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*	
Elementary	35.1%	Elementary	34.8%	Elementary	36.0%	Elementary	35.7%	Elementary	38.4%	Elementary	40.9%	Elementary	48.3%
Middle	34.6%	Middle	34.2%	Middle	37.1%	Middle	36.4%	Middle	38.4%	Middle	41.3%	Middle	49.8%
High	26.5%	High	24.5%	High	27.8%	High	26.7%	High	28.9%	High	30.6%	High	35.9%
Math		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*	
Elementary	49.5%	Elementary	49.3%	Elementary	49.9%	Elementary	52.2%	Elementary	52.1%	Elementary	54.2%	Elementary	60.2%
Middle	28.6%	Middle	28.8%	Middle	33.5%	Middle	33.3%	Middle	35.6%	Middle	40.8%	Middle	56.5%
High	12.9%	High	13.9%	High	13.4%	High	16.6%	High	16.8%	High	19.6%	High	28.2%
Science		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*	
Elementary	20.9%	Elementary	21.5%	Elementary	23.2%	Elementary	26.2%	Elementary	26.1%	Elementary	29.9%	Elementary	41.5%
Middle	28.3%	Middle	23.7%	Middle	26.7%	Middle	27.8%	Middle	28.5%	Middle	29.8%	Middle	33.5%
High	23.6%	High	24.1%	High	26.8%	High	25.8%	High	26.6%	High	28.9%	High	35.6%

Chart 6: Minority Students
Percent of minority students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school

(includes student results for CSAP, CSAP-A, Lectura and Escritura)

2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 Interim Target -		2014-15 Final Target	
Reading		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*	
Elementary	51.2%	Elementary	52.2%	Elementary	53.0%	Elementary	53.2%	Elementary	54.9%	Elementary	57.6%	Elementary	65.8%
Middle	45.6%	Middle	49.0%	Middle	48.9%	Middle	52.7%	Middle	53.0%	Middle	58.5%	Middle	75.0%
High	47.9%	High	47.1%	High	50.1%	High	50.2%	High	50.2%	High	51.9%	High	57.1%
Writing		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*	
Elementary	38.1%	Elementary	38.2%	Elementary	39.1%	Elementary	38.6%	Elementary	42.6%	Elementary	46.0%	Elementary	56.2%
Middle	37.9%	Middle	38.0%	Middle	41.2%	Middle	39.7%	Middle	43.4%	Middle	47.4%	Middle	59.6%
High	30.0%	High	28.3%	High	31.5%	High	29.5%	High	33.4%	High	36.0%	High	43.6%
Math		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*	
Elementary	51.3%	Elementary	51.4%	Elementary	52.1%	Elementary	53.4%	Elementary	55.0%	Elementary	57.8%	Elementary	66.1%
Middle	31.7%	Middle	32.3%	Middle	37.2%	Middle	36.4%	Middle	40.2%	Middle	46.5%	Middle	65.5%
High	15.5%	High	16.9%	High	16.5%	High	19.0%	High	20.8%	High	24.8%	High	36.8%
Science		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*	
Elementary	22.0%	Elementary	23.0%	Elementary	24.7%	Elementary	26.8%	Elementary	28.5%	Elementary	33.4%	Elementary	48.1%
Middle	29.6%	Middle	25.5%	Middle	29.0%	Middle	29.4%	Middle	32.7%	Middle	35.1%	Middle	42.1%
High	25.5%	High	26.3%	High	29.0%	High	27.2%	High	29.9%	High	33.2%	High	43.0%

Chart 7: Students with Disabilities

Percent of students with disabilities scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school

(includes student results for CSAP, CSAP-A, Lectura and Escritura)

2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 Interim Target -		2014-15 Final Target	
Reading		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*	
Elementary	32.2%	Elementary	28.7%	Elementary	27.9%	Elementary	25.4%	Elementary	25.3%	Elementary	27.0%	Elementary	32.2%
Middle	26.1%	Middle	22.7%	Middle	22.9%	Middle	22.1%	Middle	20.7%	Middle	22.1%	Middle	26.1%
High	25.8%	High	20.2%	High	22.0%	High	20.8%	High	19.2%	High	20.8%	High	25.8%
Writing		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*	
Elementary	21.5%	Elementary	18.1%	Elementary	17.8%	Elementary	16.0%	Elementary	16.3%	Elementary	17.6%	Elementary	21.5%
Middle	17.4%	Middle	14.8%	Middle	15.2%	Middle	13.8%	Middle	14.6%	Middle	15.8%	Middle	19.6%
High	13.0%	High	9.5%	High	10.1%	High	9.3%	High	10.0%	High	11.3%	High	15.0%
Math		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*	
Elementary	28.5%	Elementary	28.5%	Elementary	27.4%	Elementary	26.9%	Elementary	26.1%	Elementary	27.4%	Elementary	31.1%
Middle	12.8%	Middle	11.9%	Middle	13.6%	Middle	12.2%	Middle	12.1%	Middle	13.4%	Middle	17.1%
High	4.8%	High	5.4%	High	4.6%	High	5.3%	High	5.3%	High	6.5%	High	10.3%
Science		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*	
Elementary	19.0%	Elementary	18.9%	Elementary	18.3%	Elementary	18.2%	Elementary	16.8%	Elementary	18.0%	Elementary	21.8%
Middle	20.0%	Middle	18.3%	Middle	18.2%	Middle	15.6%	Middle	15.3%	Middle	16.5%	Middle	20.3%
High	15.8%	High	14.7%	High	16.1%	High	14.3%	High	14.4%	High	15.7%	High	19.4%

Chart 8: English Language Learners

Percent of English Language Learners scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science by elementary, middle, and high school

(includes student results for CSAP, CSAP-A, Lectura and Escritura)

2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12 Interim Target -		2014-15 Final Target	
Reading		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*		*Reading*	
Elementary	38.9%	Elementary	41.3%	Elementary	41.7%	Elementary	43.1%	Elementary	43.5%	Elementary	46.9%	Elementary	57.2%
Middle	32.2%	Middle	36.1%	Middle	36.9%	Middle	41.2%	Middle	41.9%	Middle	49.1%	Middle	70.9%
High	33.3%	High	34.7%	High	37.5%	High	37.9%	High	37.7%	High	41.0%	High	50.8%
Writing		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*		*Writing*	
Elementary	27.9%	Elementary	28.3%	Elementary	30.2%	Elementary	31.0%	Elementary	33.5%	Elementary	37.7%	Elementary	50.4%
Middle	26.3%	Middle	26.6%	Middle	31.1%	Middle	29.8%	Middle	33.4%	Middle	38.7%	Middle	54.7%
High	18.4%	High	18.1%	High	20.9%	High	18.6%	High	21.4%	High	23.7%	High	30.5%
Math		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*		*Math*	
Elementary	43.6%	Elementary	44.7%	Elementary	45.5%	Elementary	47.3%	Elementary	48.4%	Elementary	52.1%	Elementary	63.1%
Middle	25.0%	Middle	26.3%	Middle	31.6%	Middle	31.4%	Middle	34.3%	Middle	41.3%	Middle	62.2%
High	11.1%	High	12.1%	High	11.9%	High	13.9%	High	14.9%	High	17.8%	High	26.3%
Science		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*		*Science*	
Elementary	12.5%	Elementary	14.0%	Elementary	15.4%	Elementary	18.4%	Elementary	17.9%	Elementary	22.0%	Elementary	34.2%
Middle	20.0%	Middle	16.3%	Middle	19.6%	Middle	20.3%	Middle	22.8%	Middle	24.9%	Middle	31.3%
High	15.1%	High	16.7%	High	19.1%	High	17.0%	High	18.9%	High	21.7%	High	30.2%

Chart 9: National Assessment of Educational Progress
Percent of Colorado 4th and 8th grade students coring at or above proficient by student subgroup

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)						
Percent of Colorado 4th and 8th grade students scoring at or above proficent						
	2003	**2005**	**2007**	**2009**	**2011**	**2015 Target**
Reading 4th grade						
All students	37%	37%	36%	40%	39%	43%
FRL	19%	20%	17%	19%	19%	23%
Black	18%	18%	18%	17%	18%	23%
Hispanic	18%	17%	15%	18%	18%	23%
ELL	9%	7%	6%	4%	5%	10%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	12%	10%	15%
Math 4th grade						
All students	34%	39%	41%	45%	47%	51%
FRL	14%	20%	21%	24%	28%	33%
Black	12%	18%	20%	23%	21%	28%
Hispanic	13%	18%	19%	24%	26%	30%
ELL	5%	6%	9%	9%	12%	16%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	14%	17%	22%
Reading 8th grade						
All students	36%	32%	35%	32%	40%	46%
FRL	17%	15%	18%	16%	20%	25%
Black	16%	18%	18%	15%	22%	26%
Hispanic	14%	15%	17%	16%	22%	26%
ELL	2%	3%	3%	5%	4%	10%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	5%	5%	10%
Math 8th grade						
All students	34%	32%	37%	40%	43%	47%
FRL	13%	13%	17%	19%	23%	28%
Black	9%	11%	21%	16%	17%	22%
Hispanic	12%	10%	13%	18%	20%	25%
ELL	5%	5%	3%	4%	3%	10%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	9%	6%	10%