

State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program Data Report: Indicator (d)(6)

Colorado is required to provide the following information for the state: “Of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.”

Explanation of Data Reported:

For purposes of this data collection, schools have been “**turned around**” if they have engaged in all of the following activities:

- Replaced the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
- Used locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
- Screened all existing staff and rehired no more than 50 percent;
- Selected new staff;
- Implemented such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround schools;
- Provided staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- Adopted a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent of Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
- Used data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with state academic standards;
- Promoted the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;

- Established schedules and implemented strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- Provided appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

For purposes of this data collection, schools have been **“restarted”** if they have engaged in all of the following activities:

- School has been converted or closed and re-opened under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process; and
- School has enrolled, within the grades it serves, any former student who wished to attend the school.

For purposes of this data collection, schools have been **“closed”** if they have engaged in all of the following activities:

- School has been closed; and
- LEA has enrolled the students who attend that closed school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.

For purposes of this data collection, schools have been **“transformed”** if they have engaged in all of the following activities:

- Replaced the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
- Used rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased graduation rates; and are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
- Identified and rewarded school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduating rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
- Provided staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g. regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are

equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;

- Implemented such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformed school;
- Used data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
- Promoted the continuous use of student data (such as formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- Established schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time;
- Provided ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement;
- Gave the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
- Ensured that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as school turnaround organization or an EMO).

Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools “Turned Around” in 2009-10: 1

- R-5 High School, Mesa County Valley 51

Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools “Restarted” in 2009-10: 0

Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools “Closed” in 2009-10: 4

- Colorado Distance & Electronic Learning Academy, Charter School Institute
- Academy of Urban Learning, Delta County 50(J)
- Skyland Community High School, Denver County 1
- Colorado High School of Greeley, Greeley 6

Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools “Transformed” in 2009-10: 0