



Augenblick, Palaich
and Associates, Inc.

Update to Colorado Costing Out Study

Prepared for

The Colorado School Finance Project

By

Augenblick, Palaich and Associates

February 2013

Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Successful Schools Approach	3
Examining Successful District Efficiency	3
Determining Base Spending in Successful Districts	6
III. Professional Judgment Approach	8
Updated PJ Panel Results.....	10
Updated Salaries	11
Updated Base Cost.....	11
IV. Applying Results.....	12
Base Cost.....	12
Adjustments	13
Modeling District Costs	13
Applying the Figures to a Formula	16
Appendix A- Summary of Standards and Requirements	i
Appendix B- Updated Salaries.....	xiii

I. Introduction

In March 2011, Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA) released the report “Costing Out the Resources Needed to Meet Colorado Education Standards and Requirements.” The report was prepared for Children’s Voices and identified the resources needed in Colorado for school districts to be able to meet all state education standards and requirements. Resource levels were identified through the utilization of two well respected costing-out approaches, the Professional Judgment (PJ) and Successful School District (SSD) approaches; a full description of each of the approaches can be found in the 2011 report. Utilizing the two approaches, APA identified the resources needed for each school district in Colorado to meet state standards and requirements by calculating the base cost expenditure level needed for a student with no special needs in a district with no special circumstances and then the adjustments needed for students with special needs and districts in special circumstances.

All figures identified in the first report were for the 2008-09 school year, the most recent year for which expenditure data were available at the time. The two approaches really examined two different levels of resource need. The SSD approach focused on districts that had been identified by the state as Accredited with Distinction. That is, the districts that were doing the best in the state in comparison to all other districts. Those districts were not meeting all state standards and requirements and, in fact, had not had the chance to implement a number of policy changes that were on the horizon. APA identified the base cost spending of the districts identified as accredited with distinction using the SSD approach. The PJ approach allowed APA to bring together Colorado educators to identify the resources needed to allow school districts to meet *all* of the state’s standards and requirements, including allowing all students to be proficient on state assessments. From the PJ approach, APA identified the base cost needed to meet all standards and requirements and the adjustments needed for students with special needs and districts in special circumstances. The base cost figures from the 2011 study were an SSD base cost of \$6,051 and a PJ base cost of \$7,738. The adjustments identified by the study needed for each district included a cost-of-living adjustment, district size adjustment, and special needs student adjustments as shown below for specific district sizes.

District Size	Size Adjustment	At-Risk Weight	ELL Weight	G/T Weight	SpEd Mild Weight	SpEd Moderate Weight	SpEd Severe Weight
156	2.269	0.35	0.564	0.300	1.24	2.37	6.96
495	1.411	0.35	0.564	0.300	1.08	2.15	6.61
1,790	1.144	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.93	1.93	5.20
5,050	1.097	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.82	1.77	5.20
13,275	1.042	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.73	1.69	5.20
43,865	1.000	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.73	1.69	5.20

Starting in the fall of 2012, APA began work for the Colorado School Finance Project to update the 2011 costing out work. The update allowed us to accomplish a number of things including:

- Update the base cost and weight figures to a more recent fiscal year, in this case the 2010-11 school year;
- Examine the spending of the districts identified by the state for the 2010-11 school year as being accredited with distinction;
- Get a better understanding of the resources needed to accomplish the most recent standards and requirements of districts; and
- Look at the difference between the needed resource levels and the current resources available to districts as state funding has been reduced.

To accomplish these goals APA fully redid the SSD approach to capture the spending for the 2010-11 school year of those districts identified as Accredited with Distinction in that year. APA did not think it was necessary to undertake a completely new PJ approach. The update focused on standards and requirements that were either new since the completion of the previous costing out study or for which a better understanding of the resource requirements had been gained since that study. This included:

- Passage of the READ Act to replace CBLA
- Increased clarity around assessments- including method of administration (online) and additions of assessments in 11th grade, social studies (administered once at each school level- elementary, middle and high school) and early numeracy in grades K-3
- Increased clarity around SB191 from pilot districts, model templates and defined process.
- Changes in Accountability, specifically related to Turnaround schools
- Changes to NCLB – specifically the granting of the state waiver

The update did not include readdressing the adjustments for special needs students or district circumstances. Neither study looked at capital, transportation, or food service.

The remainder of the report describes the implementation of each of the approaches and then describes how the results can be used to estimate the resource needs of the school districts in the state.

II. Successful Schools Approach

The successful school district (SSD) approach examines the spending in those school districts already considered to be high performers in terms of their student results on statewide standardized tests. The approach therefore has the inherent advantage of focusing its analysis on those districts that have found ways to successfully educate most students to meet more, but not necessarily all, performance expectations.

The original study focused on the districts accredited with distinction, under what was then a new accreditation system, for the 2009-10 school year. Since the accreditation system incorporates many aspects of success and places a high emphasis on student performance, APA chose to use districts identified as Accredited with Distinction as the “successful” districts for the study. For this update APA was able to examine the 2010-11 spending for the districts identified as Accredited with Distinction for the 2010-11 school year. Eighteen school districts were identified in that year, including:

Academy School District 20	Agate School District 300
Aspen School District 1	Buffalo School District RE-4
Cheyenne Mountain School District 12	Dolores School District RE-4A
Frenchman School District RE-3	Hinsdale County School District RE-1
Kiowa County School District C-2	Lewis-Palmer School District 38
Littleton Public Schools 6	Moffat School District 2
North Park School District R-1	Ouray School District R-1
Plateau School District RE-5	Ridgway School District R-2
Steamboat Springs School District RE-2	Telluride School District R-1

Examining Successful District Efficiency

There are several options to analyze the spending of the 18 districts identified as successful using the process described above. The most basic approach is to examine the base per-student spending for each district, excluding spending for any students with special needs. Such an approach, however, does not allow for more detailed district comparisons including those associated with spending efficiency. Such an efficiency analysis can help identify those districts that not only outperform others in the state academically, but also those that do so without utilizing significantly higher resources than their other successful peers.

APA took this more comprehensive approach to reviewing successful district spending. In particular, APA used expenditure, staffing data, and student membership data available on the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) website for the 2010-11 school year to examine successful district resource efficiency in three key areas:

1. Instruction: Measured by the numbers of teachers per 1,000 students.
2. Administration: Measured by the number of administrators per 1,000 students.
3. Maintenance and operations (M&O): Measured by overall M&O spending per student.

In each of these three areas, APA conducted a separate analysis designed to compare the 18 districts with each other. Comparisons were not made to other school districts in the state because the focus of our research, and the priority of this portion of the costing out study, is on understanding the spending associated only with those districts that are deemed “successful.”

For both instruction and administration, APA measured district resource efficiency using a “weighted” student enrollment count. This means that district enrollment numbers were adjusted to reflect the cost implications of having higher numbers of students with special needs. Such students can require significant extra resources to serve effectively, and APA did not wish to identify any of the successful districts as being less efficient simply because they had higher numbers of teachers or administrators that were related to the higher needs of their students. Using membership data for each of the 18 districts, APA applied the following special need student weights to reflect the relative cost of serving students:

- 1.1 for special education students
- .75 for English language learners (ELL)
- .4 for at-risk (the proxy used is the number of students enrolled in the federal free and reduced price lunch program).

These weights were estimated by looking at a variety of studies APA has conducted in other states across the country regarding the added costs needed to educate students to meet state and federal performance standards. For each of the 18 districts, the special need student populations were multiplied by the above weights to generate a new, higher, weighted enrollment number. The number of teachers (for instruction) and administrators (for administration) were then divided by this number to generate weighted numbers of teachers and administrators per 1,000 students.¹ APA did not conduct this weighting analysis for maintenance and operations (M&O) spending because such spending is not typically considered to be directly related to student academic performance. In particular, districts that spend more on M&O would not ordinarily do so in response to the presence of higher numbers of special need students.

Once the weighted enrollment numbers were determined for each of the 18 districts, APA applied a statistical analysis to identify those successful districts that appear to be more efficient resource users than their peers. For each of the three spending categories (instruction, administration, and M&O²) APA used a 1.5 standard deviation above the average to identify and eliminate the highest resourced districts and a 2.0 standard deviation below the average to identify and eliminate the lowest ones. One standard deviation on either side of the average typically includes two-thirds of all cases when values are distributed normally. The more lenient standard was used to eliminate low spending districts because the main point of the exercise was to identify efficient districts. Including a measure to exclude potentially extreme low spenders, however, is still important in order to eliminate any data outliers

¹ APA used staffing data from the Colorado Department of Education website.

² The M&O spending had been adjusted for cost-of-living and size factor differences prior to being used in the efficiency screens.

where resources and spending may be extremely low for reasons unknown to APA but which might be unrelated to efficiency.

In each of the three spending categories APA conducted a separate analysis of the 18 districts, identifying only those that remained after the standard deviations were applied. From these APA calculated the overall, per-student spending average in each category. The following table shows the districts included in each of the three categories once the efficiency screens were applied.

INSTRUCTION	ADMINISTRATION	OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
ACADEMY 20	ACADEMY 20	ACADEMY 20
ASPEN 1	ASPEN 1	AGATE 300
BUFFALO RE-4J	BUFFALO RE-4J	ASPEN 1
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12	BUFFALO RE-4J
DOLORES RE-4A	DOLORES RE-4A	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12
FRENCHMAN RE-3	FRENCHMAN RE-3	DOLORES RE-4A
HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1	KIOWA C-2	FRENCHMAN RE-3
KIOWA C-2	LEWIS-PALMER 38	HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1
LEWIS-PALMER 38	LITTLETON 6	KIOWA C-2
LITTLETON 6	MOFFAT 2	LEWIS-PALMER 38
MOFFAT 2	NORTH PARK R-1	LITTLETON 6
NORTH PARK R-1	OURAY R-1	NORTH PARK R-1
OURAY R-1	PLATEAU RE-5	OURAY R-1
PLATEAU RE-5	RIDGWAY R-2	PLATEAU RE-5
RIDGWAY R-2	STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2	RIDGWAY R-2
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2	TELLURIDE R-1	STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2
TELLURIDE R-1		TELLURIDE R-1

As the table shows, the results of the efficiency screens removed one district each in instruction and maintenance and operations and two districts in administration. For each of the three spending categories, the districts listed that passed the efficiency screen were used to determine base spending levels as described below.

Determining Base Spending in Successful Districts

As mentioned earlier, the goal of the SSD analysis is to determine base spending levels for successful districts. Such basic spending represents only those dollars allocated to educate students in districts without special circumstances or students with no special needs. In order to accurately examine these expenditures in Colorado, APA also had to take into account funding to the eighteen districts that are in place due to specific, cost-related district characteristics.

APA used information from CDE's funding simulation for the 2010-11 school year to adjust expenditures for additional district funding related to both cost of living (COL) and school district size. In the case of both adjustments, Colorado currently runs a finance system that gives every district in the state a positive adjustment for both COL and district size. The adjustments are only made to total program funding, so amounts for override and categorical funding were not included when the COL and district size adjustments were taken into account. In 2010-11, Colorado was utilizing the state budget stabilization factor, which reduced the amount of additional total program funding generated by the factors for each district. To account for this, APA first used the full adjustments for the COL and size adjustments and then readjusted them to take into account the reduction in factor funding from the state budget stabilization factor.

Once the additional funding for COL and district size had been removed from actual expenditures, the administration and maintenance and operations figures were ready to be used. Additional adjustments, however, still needed to be made to the instructional expenditures to ensure that spending for special needs students was not included in the data supplied by the Department.

In particular, the Department's data enabled APA to directly remove spending for special education students, but did not provide adequate data for excluding spending for at-risk or English Language Learners. To account for this, APA drew upon its own studies conducted in states across the country to determine the average added dollar amounts that districts currently tend to spend on at-risk and English Language Learners.

From these studies, APA determined a weight of .25 for at-risk or ELL students. This weight was applied to each district's at-risk and English Language Learner enrollment numbers to reduce the overall level of spending to a base spending amount. The weight is lower than the .75 ELL and .4 at-risk weights identified above because it reflects only what districts might be spending now on such students and does not take into account whether the added spending is sufficient for such students to achieve a specific performance standard.

Once the basic, per-student spending levels were determined for those successful districts that passed the efficiency screens, an overall average was generated. The resulting per-student averages in each of the three spending categories were:

- 1) Instruction - \$5,155
- 2) Administration - \$812 and
- 3) Maintenance and Operations - \$852.

Added together, these figures generate an SSD base cost of \$6,819.

III. Professional Judgment Approach

The professional judgment (PJ) approach relies on the assumption that experienced educators can specify the resources representative schools and districts need in order to meet state standards and requirements, and that the costs of such resources can be determined based on a set of prices specific to those resources. The resources are identified for representative schools and districts of different size. The original costing out study examined the resources needed for six representative districts ranging from very small to very large. Identified resources were divided into two groups:

1. Those associated with a “base cost” that applies to all students; and
2. Those associated with students who have special needs and district with special circumstances.

The original PJ work focused on adjustments for students with special needs that included:

- Those in special education programs (for which students require individual education plans [IEPs]);
- Those with language difficulties (who we refer to as English language learners [ELL students]);
- Those who are at risk of failing in school; and
- Those who are identified as gifted.

The work also identified the base cost should vary due to school district size. The additional costs of serving students with such special needs were expressed through student “weights” relative to the base cost.³ The ability to identify resources for such special needs students distinguishes the professional judgment approach from the successful school approach; this is because the successful school approach only allows for an examination of base, per-student costs.

For a complete review of the PJ approach undertaken in the original study, including: (1) the development of representative schools and districts; (2) the integration of the evidence-based approach; and (3) the full professional judgment panel procedure, please refer to the initial report.

APA did not think it was necessary to undertake a completely new PJ approach in our 2012 update. Instead, the update focused on standards and requirements that were either new since the completion

³ Pupil weights are factors used to express the added cost of serving students with special needs. Every student, regardless of special needs, is counted as a 1.00 student. In order to determine the base cost for a district, the number of students enrolled in the district is multiplied by 1.00 and that product is then multiplied by the base cost figure. If the *added* cost of serving a student with a special need were determined to be 60 percent of the base cost, then the weight applied to such a student would be .60 (for a total weight of 1.60). Additional weighting might be applied to all students in a district to account for certain district characteristics (such as size) that can impact per student costs.

of the previous costing out study or where we believed a better understanding of the resource requirements had been gained since that study. This included:

- Passage of the READ Act to replace the Colorado Basic Literacy Act (CBLA);
- Increased clarity around assessments- including method of administration (online) and additions of assessments in 11th grade, social studies (administered once at each school level- elementary, middle and high school) and early numeracy in grades K-3;
- Increased clarity around SB191 from pilot districts, the development of model templates and a defined process;
- Changes in Accountability, specifically related to Turnaround schools; and
- Changes to NCLB – specifically the granting of the state waiver.

The update did not include readdressing the adjustments for special needs students or district circumstances. Neither study looked at capital, transportation or food service.

To conduct the update, APA convened four topic-specific professional judgment panels over two days: (1) one on the impact of the READ Act; (2) one on the increased understanding of SB191; (3) one on accountability and turnaround; and (4) a final review panel, that considered the work of the other three update panels and addressed assessments. Panelists that were invited were identified as having specific knowledge of the requirements. This included participants from the SB191 pilot districts and those districts involved in turnaround programs.

Panelists were provided the same summary of Colorado state standards and requirements as the first panel, with some noted clarifications and additions in these topic-areas (see Appendix A). Panels were also limited to reviewing the resources, including personnel time and non-personnel costs, identified in first study specifically related to these topics areas and did not start from scratch. The previously identified resources were considered to be valid unless the new panels had specific information that led to a needed change.

APA also shared a list of the key resources identified as part of the original work that included:

- Higher teacher salaries;
- Small class sizes: on average, 15:1 in K-3, and 25:1 in all other grades (same figures from evidence-based work), with lower class sizes in the smallest districts due to their size;
- An increased focus on educator effectiveness, including increased embedded professional development and instructional coaching for teachers and administrative personnel to conduct ongoing evaluations and provide instructional leadership;
- Additional counselors at the high school level to support the development of Individualized Career and Academic Plans and ensure that students are on track to be postsecondary and workforce ready upon graduation;
- Additional staff to support special needs students-Special Education, at-risk, ELL, gifted- such as specialized teachers, interventionists, psychologists, social workers and family liaisons;

-
- An extended school day for struggling students and an extended school year (10 days) for almost all students;
 - A wide range of additional learning opportunities, including virtual, distance and online learning, and concurrent enrollment (onsite and at nearby postsecondary campuses);
 - A technology environment to ensure that students acquire the 21st Century skills that the state expects of them;
 - Full day kindergarten; and
 - Preschool for all at-risk three and four year olds.

Following the professional judgment panels, APA made any identified adjustments to the resources from the first study, then “re-costed out” the resources using updated salaries from 2010-11.

Updated PJ Panel Results

As noted previously, the PJ panels only addressed changes related to standards and requirements that were either new since the completion of the previous costing out study or where we believed there was a better understanding of the resource requirements. As a result, there were only a few key resource needs identified through the update process that were not included in the original work; primarily, these resources were related to SB191 which was not fully understood in the original work. The update panels identified the following areas of resource need:

1. School administration staffing to conduct teacher evaluations as required by SB191 at a ratio of 15:1 teacher-to-administrator;
2. Additional instructional coaching for teachers as a result of SB191; and
3. School-level data management and assessment coordination as a result of SB191, accountability and assessment system changes; this was a 0.5 FTE in schools under 500, and 1.0 FTE in schools over 500.

In general, the panels felt that the resources identified in the original work were otherwise sufficient to address the impact of READ Act, SB191, assessments, accountability and turnaround, the state’s recent NCLB waiver.

The participants in the turnaround panel discussed additional resource implications for Turnaround districts, but APA did not believe these resources were appropriate to include in the base cost for all schools, so no resource revisions were made as a result.

The review panel indicated that there could be technology implications due to online assessments, but that there was still not enough clarity at this time about what the hardware requirements would be in order to estimate the associated resources.

Finally, it was discussed in more than one panel that preschool should be available for all 4 year olds, and not just at-risk students. This recommendation will be explored in the statewide cost modeling.

Updated Salaries

APA used 2010-11 statewide average salaries to do the updated PJ costing out. In many instances, including for teachers, the average salary went down since the original work (please see Appendix B for an updated list of average salaries used).

Using the comparison of Colorado teaching salaries to neighboring states from the original work, APA applied the identified 10 percent salary adjustment to professional instructional staff in order to make Colorado salaries comparable to, and competitive with, the average salaries of other states. APA also maintained the benefit rate of 34 percent from the original work.

Updated Base Cost

After the noted resource adjustments and the application of 2010-11 salaries, the updated PJ base cost is \$9,357. *Note this base cost will need to be reduced to account for embedded cost of living variations to get to an unadjusted base cost that can be compared to the SSD base cost and the final base cost figures from the 2011 report.*

IV. Applying Results

Base Cost

After undertaking the work for the SSD and PJ approaches described in the previous chapters, APA was able to update the two possible base cost figures. It is important to understand the difference between the two base cost figures. As we described in the SSD chapter, the state of Colorado currently uses a base cost figure in the school finance formula that is not adjusted for cost pressures related to district size or cost of differences. The SSD base was generated excluding these types of adjustments. While the PJ base figure is net of any size adjustments, it does need to be adjusted for possible cost of living (COL) differences.

In applying costs to the staffing resources identified by the PJ panelists, APA used statewide average salaries for specific staff positions. To get the PJ base cost figure to an “unadjusted base cost” figure, the average adjustment for COL across the state must be backed off. To do this, APA looked at the weighted average COL adjustment used in the 2010-11 funding formula. The statewide average COL adjustment was 1.218 for 2010-11. The cost of living adjustment is applied to only the portion of costs related to personnel as determined by the state’s personnel cost factor. The weighted average personnel cost factor for the year was 89.2 percent. The two factors used in conjunction lead to an average COL adjustment of 1.194. The PJ base cost of \$9,357 was divided by this number to generate a comparable base cost figure of \$7,837.

Once the adjustment has been made to the PJ base cost figure, the SSD base of \$6,819 and the PJ base of \$7,837 can be compared. Though these two cost figures can be compared on a dollar to dollar basis, they are the result of different analytic processes and represent different levels of outcome achievement. The SSD base cost figure represents what the eighteen districts identified as Accredited with Distinction spent at a base level within the current confines of the Colorado funding system. It represents what the districts spent to get the current level of performance, not the amount they would need to spend to fully meet all of Colorado’s standards and requirements. The SSD base figure therefore does not include the resources needed for districts to fully comply with the accreditation system.

The PJ base figure, on the other hand, represents the resources that professional educators indicate are needed to fully meet all of the state’s standards and requirements, including ensuring appropriate levels of academic performance for all students. This figure includes the new resources identified by the panels during the updated PJ panels. Examples of the types of differences between the resources provided under the SSD and PJ analyses include resources such as five additional days for professional development, ten additional days of school for the majority of students, and higher salaries to allow districts to attract and retain highly qualified staff. The panels made it clear that these types of additional resources are needed to allow districts to meet the full complement of state and federal standards and requirements.

Adjustments

The base cost figures must be paired with the special needs and district size adjustments to create the final set of figures for the costing out study. Resources for mild special education, moderate special education, severe special education, at-risk students, English Language Learners, and gifted students were identified by the PJ panels. The differences in costs for districts based on size were also considered. The adjustments were not reexamined as part of this update and the weights described in the original report should still be used (A weight is the additional cost per student above the base cost, represented by a figure such as .50. A .50 weight, means that the student requires 50 percent more resources above the base cost to be able to meet the performance standards and expectations. If the base cost figure is \$7,837, then serving such a student would require the base plus an additional \$3,918.50). The table below shows the weights identified from the first report. The weights vary by district size but would always be applied to the statewide base cost figure.

District Size	Size Adjustment	At-Risk Weight	ELL Weight	G/T Weight	SpEd Mild Weight	SpEd Moderate Weight	SpEd Severe Weight
156	2.269	0.35	0.564	0.300	1.24	2.37	6.96
495	1.411	0.35	0.564	0.300	1.08	2.15	6.61
1,790	1.144	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.93	1.93	5.20
5,050	1.097	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.82	1.77	5.20
13,275	1.042	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.73	1.69	5.20
43,865	1.000	0.35	0.470	0.250	0.73	1.69	5.20

One additional cost not captured in the figures above is the cost of pre-school for at-risk students. Panelists made it clear that in order to accomplish all of the standards and requirements, at-risk students would need a pre-school program. The program would help these students be school ready and would provide benefits throughout the students' education. The cost of a half day preschool program was set at \$3,151.

Modeling District Costs

Using the base cost figure, weights, and pre-school costs, the resource needs for every district in Colorado can be modeled. APA used two main data sources to create such a model. The first is the 2010-11 school year funding simulation from the CDE website. The second is membership data for the 2010-11 school year, also from the CDE website. We attempted to utilize as much of the current school finance formula as possible in the model, although some changes were made. The primary difference is that APA's model uses student weights for the funding of special education, ELL and gifted students. In Colorado's current system these students are funded through categorical programs. Weights fund specific students whereas categorical funding is a lump sum payment that is not always student specific.

APA ran the model using both the SSD and PJ-derived base cost figures. As discussed in earlier chapters, the SSD base cost figure is \$6,819 and the PJ cost figure is \$7,837 (after the adjustment for COL).

For this update we ran three different model variations. The first two are the same as the original report and apply the same weights to each of these base figures. Applying the weights generated by the PJ work makes the SSD cost a very conservative estimate. To create the weights, the additional resources identified by the PJ panels for special needs students were divided by the PJ base cost figure. This base cost figure represents the base level of resources the panels felt were needed for every student. The PJ base figure is higher than the SSD figure, which means the weights are lower than they would have been had the SSD figure been used as the denominator in creating the weights.

The new model that was run for this update uses the SSD figure but applies weights that are adjusted to reflect the lower SSD base figure. Each weight would need to be adjusted up by about 12.3% to account for the differences in the two base cost figures. The new weights are shown below. The size adjustment weights stay the same.

District Size	Size Adjustment	At-Risk Weight	ELL Weight	G/T Weight	SpEd Mild Weight	SpEd Moderate Weight	SpEd Severe Weight
156	2.269	0.393	0.634	0.337	1.393	2.662	7.818
495	1.411	0.393	0.634	0.337	1.213	2.415	7.425
1,790	1.144	0.393	0.528	0.281	1.045	2.168	5.841
5,050	1.097	0.393	0.528	0.281	0.921	1.988	5.841
13,275	1.042	0.393	0.528	0.281	0.820	1.898	5.841
43,865	1.000	0.393	0.528	0.281	0.820	1.898	5.841

It is also important to mention once again that the SSD figure only represents what “successful” districts spent in 2010-11 at a base level within the constraints of the Colorado funding system and without fully implementing all standards and requirements. The PJ figures represent what Colorado educators feel is necessary for districts to be able to fully meet state standards and requirements.

In order to create a needed resource level for each district, shown as a total amount of needed funding, APA applied the base costs and weights described above to demographic data for each district. The base cost figure was applied to an enrollment figure. This figure was derived from the 2010-11 funding model and took into account Colorado’s current process of funding a district at the highest figure, from either this year’s funded count or an average of this year’s count and a number of subsequent years’ counts. The averaging can take into account up to five years of student counts. The funding figures from the state’s model were adjusted to include figures for full day kindergarten. The base funding was also adjusted for district size, using the current personnel cost factors and APA’s size adjustment, and

the cost of living figures, using figures from the state's model. Online students were funded at the base cost figure.

APA used membership data from the CDE for the special needs populations. The membership data was used with the weights and formulas described above and each district's COL-adjusted base cost figure to estimate the resource needs for each special needs category. For special education, actual special education figures for each district were used. The actual figures for each district were split into the mild, moderate, and severe categories by allocating 63.6% of each districts' special education figure into the mild category, 27.3% into the moderate category, and 9.1% into the severe category. Each district's free lunch membership was used as a proxy for at-risk students and the membership figures for ELL and Gifted were used for those categories.

Also included in the model is funding for the ASCENT program. APA modeled this program based on estimates from the panel; in the model 1% of each district's funded pupil count is used to estimate the number of ASCENT students. This number is then applied against the district's size and COL- adjusted base cost figure. Also, preschool is funded at \$3,151 per pupil for at-risk three and four year olds (assuming a half day program).

The SSD total cost figure is \$9.6 billion. This figure can be compared against 2010-11 funding levels, the most recent expenditure data available. Current expenditure data, excluding transportation and food service, were used from the CDE website. Each district's current expenditures were compared to the costing-out figure and, in total, districts would have needed an additional \$2.65 billion to get to the SSD costing out total for 2010-11. The difference of \$2.65 billion includes dollars currently raised by districts above the state's funding system through district override elections. These additional dollars are called override dollars and only some districts have these dollars available to them. If override dollars are taken out of the calculation and only those dollars allocated through the state's funding process are considered, districts would need an additional \$3.31 billion. The totals do not include transportation or food service.

The PJ figure total is \$11.0 billion. Districts would have needed an additional \$4.06 billion to get to the costing- out total when compared to all available funds. If override dollars are taken out of the calculation districts would need an additional \$4.72 billion.

The SSD figure using the adjusted SSD weights figure total is \$9.88 billion. Districts would have needed an additional \$2.94 billion to get to the costing- out total when compared to all available funds. If override dollars are taken out of the calculation districts would need an additional \$3.59 billion.

During the update PJ panelists discussed the need for access to pre-k for all four year olds, not just at-risk four year olds. The models above did not make this change but we did model the additional cost of this intervention. The additional cost of moving from at-risk to all four year olds is \$129.1 million.

Applying the Figures to a Formula

The figures discussed above were used to determine total funding levels for each district. While we have not modeled a funding formula, the base costs and weights could be used to create a formula. The base cost figures could be applied to a formula in their current form as long as a COL adjustment is used and the adjustment were applied only in the positive, as is done today. The weights could be applied but should be adjusted for available federal dollars. The current weights generate the total resources need for special needs populations. Funding for these resources are currently available from federal sources for many of the special needs categories. The weights could be reduced by the federal amount available before being implemented in a state funding system.

For the modeling above, APA did not have student specific information. That is, we did not know if a specific student was identified in more than one special needs category. It is probable, that a number of students received weighting for multiple special needs categories. When developing a formula, a decision would need to be made on how to apply the weights for students in more than one category. The options include allowing the student to receive each of the full weights, allow the student to receive part of each weight, or to provide the student with just one of the weights. Different states have taken different approaches to this issue when using creating a funding system. It is important to note when making this decision that the weights developed by the PJ panels focused on the specific resources for the specific need area being addressed.

Appendix A- Summary of Standards and Requirements

Note: Highlighted portions reflect any revisions or additions since 2011 work.

Minimum # of Days of Instruction

Every child who has attained the age of six years and is under the age of seventeen years shall attend public school for at least one thousand fifty-six hours if a secondary school pupil or nine hundred sixty-eight hours if an elementary school pupil during each school year; except that in no case shall a school or schools be in session for fewer than one hundred sixty days without the specific prior approval of the commissioner of education.

Additional Requirements for Special Needs Students

Requirements for Special Education Students

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), school districts are required to “provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to each eligible child [ages three to twenty-one years old] with a disability.”⁴ Each child with have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) created to address their educational and related services needs.

Preschool for Special Education Students

Districts are required to provide preschool services for three and four year olds who “meet state eligibility criteria of developmental delay or disability and are experiencing challenges in their learning and development. A child is eligible if they have a significant delay in one or more areas of development, such as learning, speaking or playing.”⁵

Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

The state “must ensure that all children with disabilities are included in all general State and district-wide assessment programs with appropriate accommodations and alternate assessments, if necessary, as indicated in their respective individual education plans (IEPs).”⁶

Requirements for Gifted Students

Under the Exceptional Children’s Education Act (ECEA) districts are required to provide education services for gifted students who are” between the ages of four and twenty-one whose abilities, talents, and potential for accomplishment are so exceptional or developmentally advanced that they require special provisions to meet their educational programming needs.”⁷

⁴ Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

⁵ CDE, Preschool Special Education Services

⁶ Colorado Department of Education, Unit of Student Assessment

⁷ Exceptional Children’s Education Act (ECEA)

Advanced Learning Plans (ALPs)

Starting in kindergarten through high school, students identified as gifted will have an Advanced Learning Plan (ALP). The ALP is an annual collaborative review process involving teachers, parents and students which “monitors student success, makes recommendations for pacing, selection of courses, extension options, social-emotional growth and extracurricular activities to maximize potential.”⁸ Further the process will aide students in “understanding academic, affective and behavioral strengths and needs; making decisions about goals and content extensions; becoming a self-directed learner; and using self-advocacy skills.”⁹

Requirements for Limited English Proficiency(LEP) Students

Districts are required to provide language services to students identified as English language learners, whether through a Bilingual or an English as a Second Language (ESL) program, and have flexibility to choose their own method of instruction. Teachers in the program must be fluent in both English and any language the program is offering. Children who have attended school in the United States for at least three consecutive years are required to be tested in English for reading and language arts; waivers may be granted for an additional two years on a case-by-case basis.¹⁰

CAP4K

School Readiness

In December 2008, the State Board of Education adopted the following description of school readiness as part of CAP4K:

School Readiness describes both the preparedness of a child to engage in and benefit from learning experiences, and the ability of a school to meet the needs of all students enrolled in publicly funded preschool or kindergarten. School Readiness is enhanced when schools, families, and community service providers work collaboratively to ensure that every child is ready for higher levels of learning in academic content.

Using this description, school districts are required to assess incoming kindergartener and/or first grade children on the following indicators of school readiness:

- Social and Emotional Development
- Communication and Language Development
- Approaches to Learning
- Content Knowledge
- Physical Well-Being and Motor Development

⁸ CDE, Gifted and Talented Education

⁹ CDE, Gifted and Talented Education

¹⁰ CDE, “Title III Abstract and Guidance.”

Districts will create and implement individualized readiness plans (IRPs) for each child to address any areas where improvement is needed. IRPs are intended to inform teacher practice and help students progress towards school readiness.

In addition to evaluating the preparedness of children entering elementary school, the CAP4K School Readiness Component also addresses the ability of a school to meet the needs of kindergarten students by working collaboratively with families and community service providers. Schools will need to demonstrate capacity in the following areas:

- Professional proficiency for teachers and leadership about child development
- Coordination with local community service agencies (like health, parent education, social service, and family support) and family engagement practices
- School structure and resources (such as, developmentally appropriate materials and resources, small class size, availability of full-day kindergarten, appropriate facilities).

New Content Standards

As part of CAP4K, the state updated Colorado's state content standards. Previously, Colorado Model Content Standards existed in the areas of civics, dance, economics, foreign language, geography, history, mathematics, music, physical education, reading and writing, science, theater, and the visual arts for grades K-12. CAP4K required CDE to revise the standards in three ways: (1) to expand the standards to preschool through grade twelve; (2) to align the standards with the new expectations of school readiness and postsecondary and workforce readiness; and (3) to meet the highest national and international standards that have been implemented successfully and that incorporate other statutory requirements. School districts must revise their standards to meet or exceed the new state standards, at a minimum, in those subject matter areas that are included in the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards, including but not limited to English language competency.

New content standards and depth of knowledge indicators, by grade level, were created in the following areas:

- Dance
- Drama and Theatre Arts
- Comprehensive Health & Physical Education
- English Language Proficiency
- Mathematics
- Music
- Reading, Writing and Communicating
- Science

-
- Social Studies
 - Visual Arts
 - World Languages

Standards in the areas of Reading and Math are based upon the common core standards developed by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers that have currently been adopted in 33 states.

Additionally, districts are expected to incorporate Postsecondary Readiness and 21st Century Skills- critical thinking and reasoning; information literacy; collaboration; self-direction; innovation; and analysis and interpretation skills- into all areas where appropriate.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The definition of postsecondary and workforce readiness (PWR) jointly adopted on June 30, 2009 by the Colorado State Board of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is as follows:

“Postsecondary and workforce readiness” describes the knowledge, skills, and behaviors essential for high school graduates to be prepared to enter college and the workforce and to compete in the global economy. The description assumes students have developed consistent intellectual growth throughout their high school career as a result of academic work that is increasingly challenging, engaging, and coherent.

Postsecondary education and workforce readiness means that before graduating high school students are ready and able to demonstrate the following without the need for remediation:

1. Content knowledge in the areas of (1) literacy; (2) math; (3) science; (4) social sciences; and (5) the arts and humanities.
2. Learning and life skills in the areas of (1) critical thinking and problem-solving; (2) finding and using information/information technology; (3) creativity and innovation; (4) global and cultural awareness; (5) civic responsibility; (6) work ethic; (7) personal responsibility; (8) communication; and (9) collaboration.

Students will be assessed in these areas and the state is currently determining what this assessment or these assessments will be. Once the assessment system has been identified, CAP4K calls for the State Board and Colorado Commission on Higher Education to review and consider the state’s graduation guidelines, criteria for endorsed diplomas and alignment with the higher education admission placement tests.

Additionally, schools will also need to provide additional services and supports for 11th and 12th grade English language learners if they are unable to meet English language competency standards or demonstrate Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

Assessments

New assessments are currently being created to measure student mastery of the new content standards, as well as their postsecondary and workforce readiness. The Assessment Subcommittee charged with redesigning the assessment system will make its recommendations to the board in November 2010. Their intent is to create “a balanced system combining formative and summative components that measure both growth and status.”¹¹ Further, “Colorado’s P-12 Assessment System must be relevant for students and teachers in that it is tied directly to students’ learning and preparation for PWR, and it provides data/information on growth and status that informs instruction and is easily understandable by students, teachers, and parents.”¹² Specifications for a system will also include that it must “measure mastery of the Colorado Academic Standards for all students [including] the application of content through the demonstration of 21st century skills and readiness competencies, at appropriate grade levels” and be “easy to use, meaningful, and timely.”¹³

The current assessment schedule requires TCAP testing in 3rd through 10th grade in the subject areas of Reading, Writing and Math, with testing in Science also being required in grades 5, 8, and 10. Eleventh grade students are also required to take the Colorado ACT. A number of recent changes will impact the assessment system in future years.

First, Colorado is part of the PARCC consortium which will provide an online assessment for Language Arts and Mathematics, to be available in 2015. These tests will align with the Common Core Standards and will be administered in grades 3-11. The Colorado Department of Education is currently designing new assessments for Social Studies and Science to be available in 2014; these will be administered once in elementary school, once in middle school and once in high school. Second, with the passage of the READ Act, additional assessments will be given to students upon entering kindergarten and for every year until 3rd grade to track the progress and improvement towards literacy goals established under the legislation. Third, under CAP4K, the assessment schedule is expanded to include School Readiness assessments in kindergarten and 1st grade, as well as early number in grades K-3.

READ Act

The READ Act was passed in May of 2012 by the state legislature. This legislation will require school districts to create policies and assessments focusing on student’s ability by 3rd grade to be at “grade” level. The school district must initially evaluate the student as they enter their system (Pre School – First Grade) to create a plan so the parents or guardians are aware of the expectations, needs and responsibilities for the student to be successfully at 3rd grade reading level. Various interventions, meetings and expectations will outlined in the plan, so that parents and teachers can provide supports necessary for the student. If the student has not reached the expected reading level they may be asked to be held back or not advance to the next grade level. The superintendent or their designee will have

¹¹ July 17, 2010 Assessment Subcommittee meeting presentation

¹² July 17, 2010 Assessment Subcommittee meeting presentation

¹³ July 17, 2010 Assessment Subcommittee meeting presentation

the final say, in these decisions. The school district may apply for limited state grant dollars, which were allocated for one year, in anticipation of students needing, full day kindergarten, tutoring, or extension of time.

Individual Career and Academic Plan (ICAP)

All students are required to develop an ICAP starting no later than 9th grade in collaboration with their school counselors, school administrators, school personnel and/or Approved Postsecondary Service Providers that is used to help establish personalized academic and career goals, explore postsecondary career and educational opportunities, align course work and curriculum, apply to postsecondary institutions, secure financial aid and ultimately enter the workforce school. “Each ICAP shall include a career planning, guidance and tracking component and a portfolio that reflects, at a minimum: (1) Documentation of the student’s efforts in exploring careers including: a written postsecondary and workforce goal for the student; yearly benchmarks for reaching that goal; interest surveys that the student completes; and anticipated postsecondary studies; (2) The student’s academic progress including the courses taken, any remediation or credit recovery and any concurrent enrollment credits earned; (3) An intentional sequence of courses reflecting progress toward accomplishment of the student’s postsecondary and workforce objectives; (4) Relevant assessment scores; (5) The student’s plans for and experiences in Contextual and Service Learning, if applicable; (6) A record of the student’s college applications or alternative applications as they are prepared and submitted; (7) The student’s postsecondary studies as the student progresses through high school; (8) The student’s progress toward securing scholarships, work-study, student loans and grants; and (9) Other data reflecting student progress toward postsecondary and workforce readiness, including the student’s understanding of the financial impact of postsecondary education.”¹⁴ ICAPs should be easily accessible to students, guardians and educators and be transferable in print or electronic form for internal and external district use. The ICAP’s will be one of the criteria utilized in determining Postsecondary Work Force Readiness, as well as entrance into Higher Education.

Higher Education Admission Requirements

In 2003, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education adopted the Higher Education Admission Requirements which are entry requirements for students planning to attend any of Colorado’s public four-year colleges or universities.¹⁵

¹⁴ State Board of Education, Department of Education, 1 CCR 301-81 “Rules governing standards for Individual Career and Academic Plans.”

¹⁵ Colorado Department of Higher Education

Academic Area*	2010+ Graduates
English**	4 years
Mathematics (Must include Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II or equivalents)***	4 years
Natural/Physical Sciences (two units must be lab-based)***	3 years
Social Sciences (at least one unit of U.S. or world history)	3 years
Foreign Language	1 year
Academic Electives****	2 years

* CCHE, CDE, and School Districts are developing standards for alternative demonstration of proficiency to be accepted in lieu of course completion. For course guidelines see paragraph 4.01 of the [Admissions Standards Policy](#).

**Two units of ESL English may count for HEAR requirements when combined with two units of successfully completed college preparatory English.

***College-preparatory ESL mathematics/science courses that include content and academic rigor/level comparable to other acceptable courses may satisfy HEAR requirements.

****Acceptable Academic Electives include additional courses in English, mathematics, natural/physical sciences and social sciences, foreign languages, art, music, journalism, drama, computer science, honors, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate courses, and appropriate CTE courses.

The current draft for implementation utilizes a diploma from the school district in addition to an additional diploma by the state which may include guaranteed entry into a Colorado Institution of Higher Education. This duo system reflecting the seamless requirement being the last phase for implementation of CAP4K. The assessment for completion to obtain an additional diploma from the state will, reflect the PARCC multi state alignment of the common core assessment. These tests will be used for entry into numerous institutions of Higher Education across the country.

Concurrent Enrollment

In May 2009, the Colorado State Legislature passed HB09-1319 and SB09-285 (“Concurrent Enrollment Programs Act”). “The collective intent is to broaden access to and improve the quality of concurrent enrollment programs, improve coordination between institutions of secondary education and

institutions of higher education, and ensure financial transparency and accountability.”¹⁶ Additionally, the legislation created the Accelerating Students through Concurrent Enrollment (ASCENT) program which would allow eligible students to be retained for a “5th year” in high school during which they can take classes at a qualified postsecondary institution.

In order to comply with this legislation, districts are required to:

- Enter into a cooperative agreement with a qualified institution of higher education to operate a concurrent enrollment program.
- Reimburse concurrent courses at the in-state (“resident”) community college tuition rate and all concurrently enrolled students will be classified as Colorado residents for tuition setting purposes.
- Allow students to concurrently enroll into any career and technical education course, certificate program, community college course and traditional college course, at a qualifying institution.
- Ensure that all college credit hours earned concurrently apply toward the students’ high school graduation requirements as defined in the students’ academic plan.¹⁷

In order to be eligible for the ASCENT program, students must meet the following requirements: have an ICAP in place, have completed or are on schedule to complete at least 12 credit hours (semester hours or equivalent) of postsecondary course work prior to the completion of twelfth-grade year; is not in need of basic skills coursework as defined by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education’s remedial education policy; has been selected for participation in the ASCENT program by a high school principal or equivalent school administrator; has satisfied the minimum prerequisites for the course before enrollment in the course; and has not previously participated in ASCENT.¹⁸

SB191

SB191 codifies the Governor’s Council for Educator Effectiveness and tasks the Council with studying and making recommendations on the implementation and details of the evaluation system, ensuring meaningful opportunities for educators to improve their effectiveness, and providing a means for educators to share effective practices across the state. The bill applies to educators employed by Colorado school districts, boards of cooperative educational services (BOCES), and charter schools.

Implications of this legislation include:

- **Development of new educator evaluations**
Teachers and principals should be evaluated using multiple fair, transparent, timely, rigorous, and valid measures. At least 50% of each teacher’s evaluation will be determined by the academic growth of their students using multiple achievement measures, not just the CSAP. The bill also requires principals to be evaluated annually with at least 50% of their evaluation based

¹⁶ Colorado Department of Education, “Concurrent Enrollment Fact Sheet.”

¹⁷ Colorado Department of Education, “Concurrent Enrollment Fact Sheet.”

¹⁸ Colorado Department of Education, “Concurrent Enrollment Fact Sheet.”

on the academic growth of students in their school using the Colorado growth model. Another factor that will be considered in the evaluations of principals is the effectiveness of teachers in their school.

The state will provide a “list” of resources or assessments for subject areas that are not part of the PARCC or state provided assessments. Districts will have the latitude to design and implement assessments in addition to determine the “weighting” of the different assessments. The state will provide a sample matrix for school districts, as they may utilize this for their administrator or teacher evaluations.

Teachers who receive an evaluation rating of ‘ineffective’ shall receive a written district-developed remediation plan that includes professional development opportunities designed to improve teacher performance, along with an outline of steps to take to improve effectiveness. The plans may also include other opportunities such as induction/mentorship programs and access to instructional leaders or coaches. Development plans for principals receiving ‘ineffective’ ratings on their evaluations should include opportunities for professional development and a list of steps to take for improvement.

- Organization of classrooms, schools, districts

District boards of education, charter school boards, and BOCES have some flexibility in designing their own performance evaluation systems, but are required to meet or exceed the guidelines established by the State Board. The minimum standards for evaluating principals will be provided by the State.

The bill defines a probationary teacher as a teacher who has not completed 3 consecutive years of demonstrated effectiveness based on teacher evaluations OR one who has established non-probationary status but has had 2 consecutive years of demonstrated ineffectiveness. The bill also allows evaluations to be used as factors in layoffs, thus allowing teachers to be suspended or to have their contracts cancelled based on their performance evaluations.

Teachers may only be assigned to a school with the consent of the receiving school, after a review of teachers’ previous effectiveness and qualifications. Active non-probationary teachers who were deemed effective or satisfactory the prior year will be members of a priority hiring pool and have the first opportunities to interview for available positions for which they are qualified. Teachers who are not assigned to a school after 2 hiring cycles will be placed on unpaid leave until they secure a position, at which time their salary and benefits will be reinstated.

- Integration of staff development, technology, new standards, assessments, and accountability into teacher evaluation

SB191 defines ‘performance standards’ as the levels of effectiveness that educators are expected to meet. District-developed performance standards must define ‘highly effective’,

‘effective’ and ‘ineffective’ standards, and districts may elect to include other levels as well. The Council is responsible for developing guidelines for the performance standards, as well as defining principal and teacher effectiveness. ‘Quality standards’ are the elements and criteria used to measure success. The quality standards must include measures of student growth (see data reporting systems for necessary quality standard components). Both performance and quality standards must be integrated into each district’s performance evaluation plan.

- **Data reporting**

For the purpose of teacher evaluations, a comprehensive system needs to be in place to measure student academic growth annually. The measures of student growth should include statewide summative assessments (such as CSAP) and interim assessments or evidence of student work that is aligned with state content and performance standards. In addition, data systems need to include information on special education, student mobility, and high risk students. It will be necessary for the state to provide adequate training and collaborative time to ensure educators understand the data used in their evaluations. This system must be easily accessible to teachers for classroom use.

Accreditation

The Colorado Department of Education originally established a system of accountability through educational accreditation in 1998 to comply with House Bill 98-1267. The State Board revised the accreditation rules in May 2009 under the directive of SB 09-163 to emphasize student results, particularly focusing on student growth and postsecondary-readiness, and to improve and streamline the accreditation process for schools and districts across the state. The purposes of accreditation are numerous and include aligning conflicting accountability systems, improving the reporting of performance data, creating a clear, fair, and effective support and intervention system, and enhancing oversight of improvement efforts. New rules created by CDE are further designed to make explicit links between school accreditation and improvement planning.

District Accreditation

CDE accredits districts based upon the following Performance Framework Indicators:¹⁹

1. **Achievement-** Percent of students scoring proficient or advanced in Reading (on CSAP, Lectura, CSAPA), Writing (on CSAP, Escritura, CSAPA), Math (on CSAP and CSAPA), and Science (on CSAP and CSAPA).
2. **Growth-** Normative and criterion-referenced growth using CSAP (Reading, Writing and Math), median student growth percentiles and adequate median student growth percentiles using the Colorado Growth Model²⁰.

¹⁹ Colorado Department of Education presentation

²⁰ The Colorado Growth Model is intended to measure student growth from year to year by measuring how much progress should be expected of a student based upon where they are starting from and how likely they are to reach state standards within three years.

-
3. Gaps- Looking at median student growth percentiles for disaggregated groups: poverty, race/ethnicity, disabilities, English proficiency, and below proficient.
 4. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness-Measures include student performance on the Colorado ACT, graduation rate and dropout rate.

Based upon these indicators, districts are assigned into the following categories using set distribution percentages:²¹

- Accredited with Distinction (10% of districts)
- Accredited (50% of districts)
- Accredited with Improvement Plan (25% of districts)
- Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan (10% of districts)
- Accredited with Turnaround Plan (5% of districts)

Districts not meeting their Safety or Financial assurances will automatically drop into Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan (or remain in Accredited with Turnaround Plan if already there) until requirements are met.

After CDE has made their initial accreditation assignment, districts will be given the opportunity to appeal. Finalized accreditation levels will result in districts receiving varying degrees of support from the state. Districts that are accredited but require an improvement plan must develop and implement a correction plan with specific goals, actions, timelines, and resources for improvement. Districts in the lowest two categories will also receive targeted resources from the state including: focused technical assistance, grants, periodic reviews, planning support, implementation follow-up and evaluation (process and outcomes).²²

School Accreditation

Districts are required to accredit their schools using a performance framework that is more exhaustive or stringent than the one used by CDE based upon the same Performance Framework Indicators (Achievement, Growth, Gaps and Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness) as used for district accreditation. Schools will be similarly categorized and have to develop improvement plans as needed. Districts are responsible for reviewing school improvement plans and providing support for school improvement efforts.

Numerous districts and schools within the state have or are considered in “Turnaround” status. This has requirements for change that a district must utilize, inclusive of leadership, teachers, charters, private providers and district changes. A district or a school must show measureable positive improvement in

²¹ Colorado Department of Education presentation

²² Colorado Department of Education presentation

order to remove themselves from the timeline for state control to be in effect. It is unclear what the state will do if taking over a school or a district becomes necessary.

No Child Left Behind Federal Requirements

Colorado has received a waiver from the previous NCLB requirements and now the Federal and State requirements are the same.

Highly Qualified Teachers

Under NCLB, all K-12 core content teachers, which include regular and special education teachers, must be “highly qualified.” The core content areas this applies to are: English, reading or language arts; mathematics; science; foreign languages; social studies; and the arts. To be highly qualified these teachers must hold a degree, be fully licensed and demonstrate subject area competency, which may be through content testing or an endorsement, certification or degree in the subject matter field depending on whether the teacher is in elementary or secondary education.

Appendix B- Updated Salaries

School Site	Salary	Salary + benefits
Teacher	\$53,098	\$71,151
Instructional Facilitator/Coach	\$53,098	\$71,151
Teacher Tutor	\$53,098	\$71,151
Librarians/Media Specialist	\$61,621	\$82,572
Technology Specialist	\$53,098	\$71,151
Counselor	\$55,864	\$74,857
Nurse	\$55,656	\$74,579
Psychologist	\$62,763	\$84,102
Social Worker	\$60,525	\$81,104
Family Liaison	\$22,836	\$30,600
Instructional Aide	\$16,885	\$22,626
Clerical/Data Entry	\$29,204	\$39,133
Principal	\$83,812	\$112,308
Assistant Principal	\$73,863	\$98,976
Duty Aides	\$17,521	\$23,478
Speech Therapist	\$62,993	\$84,410
OT/PT Therapist	\$59,107	\$79,204
Health Aide	\$17,032	\$22,823
Athletic Director	\$73,863	\$98,976
Dean	\$53,967	\$72,316
School Resource Officer (SRO)	\$53,098	\$71,151
Library Aide	\$19,895	\$26,660
Campus Monitor	\$17,521	\$23,478

District		
	Salary	Salary + benefits
Superintendent	\$108,718	\$145,683
Assistant Superintendent	\$109,347	\$146,525
Director	\$83,395	\$111,749
Coordinator/Supervisor	\$66,324	\$88,874
Clerical/Data Entry	\$29,204	\$39,133
Business Manager	\$83,395	\$111,749
IT Technician	\$40,355	\$54,075
Special Education Therapist	\$59,107	\$79,204
Bookkeeper	\$40,355	\$54,075
Interpreter	\$16,885	\$22,626
Legal Counsel	\$120,000	\$160,800
Data Manager	\$66,324	\$88,874
Data Tech	\$40,355	\$54,075