



## **Strategic Direction**

### **Updated 10/15/2012**

#### **Purpose**

Developed by the Executive Team in collaboration with Cabinet and with input from all staff, this document provides strategic direction for CDE's work over the next three to five years.<sup>1</sup> It is a living document intended to help guide decision making and inform detailed work planning. It is updated annually through a process of organization-wide review and refinement.

#### **Systematic Use of Document<sup>2</sup>**

On a monthly basis, Executive Team will review progress toward the strategies identified in the document. On a quarterly basis (January, April, June, and September), Cabinet will monitor progress and all staff will receive progress updates at quarterly all-staff meetings. Every July, the Executive Team and Cabinet will review the document to: 1) review and affirm or refine the vision, mission, values, and levers; 2) examine measures of progress toward the state's goals; 3) assess progress toward objectives; and 4) identify/refine goals, objectives, targets, and strategies for the coming year.

#### **Alignment**

The strategic direction guides the work of the units and staff at CDE. Each unit prepares and submits annual unit plans that are aligned to the goals, strategies, and targets established in the strategic direction. All staff prepare performance goals as part of their evaluation process. At least one goal for all staff must be tied to the unit plan and/or the overall organization's strategic plan.

#### **Accountability for Achievement**

All members of the organization share accountability for helping CDE reach its goals with ultimate accountability held by members of Cabinet and the Executive Team. On or before October 15 of each year, the Commissioner will provide an annual report on the progress made toward the goals and critical tasks to the State Board of Education. A summary report will also be shared across CDE and with appropriate external partners and audiences.

#### **Partners**

CDE believes the department can and must work with other agencies, organizations, and business to assure a comprehensive, community and statewide approach to education and student success. We partner with districts, boards of cooperative services, schools, families, education organizations, and other state agencies to accomplish the statewide goals articulated in this document. In addition, CDE engages in a unique partnership with the Colorado Legacy Foundation, which seeks to build CDE's capacity and assist CDE in seeding innovation and recognizing and spreading successful practices.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Executive Team includes the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Associate Commissioners, Assistant Commissioner of Public School Finance and Chief Communications Officer. Cabinet includes all direct reports to Executive Team members and are the leaders of each unit at CDE.

<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of this document, all references to "educators" include teachers, school and district-level administrators, and related service personnel who support directly or indirectly student learning.

## **Vision**

*Statement that describes a picture of a changed world. It is the ultimate impact towards which all organizational efforts and resources are directed.*

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

## **Mission**

*Statement that describes the specific purpose of an organization and how it intends to make progress towards realizing its grand vision of change.*

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

## **Organizational Description**

*Summary of the organization's activities and functions*

As a **dynamic service agency**, CDE 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 approximately 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, and General Education Development (GED) testing centers reaching learners of all ages. CDE operates the Colorado Talking Book Library which provides supports for people who have vision, print, and reading disabilities. 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.

## **Values**

*The beliefs and priorities that drive staff and organizational behavior and decision making.*

### **1. Students**

We work to ensure that all students attain the necessary literacy, numeracy, and life skills and knowledge needed to become successful and productive citizens. We attend to the needs of the whole child and seek to ensure equitable, high quality, safe, healthy, and positive learning environments that enable all students to reach their full potential.

### **2. Leadership**

We set the vision for preK-12 education in Colorado, providing dynamic leadership at all levels of our organization to the students, families, schools, districts, policy makers, and communities we serve. Our leadership expands beyond our state borders, as we strive to lead education reform both nationally and internationally.

### **3. Results that Drive Action**

We focus on student and system results. We hold ourselves, districts, and schools accountable for improving student and organizational performance. We are the definitive source of education data for Colorado and use data as the basis for action and ongoing improvement. We act with a sense of urgency, recognizing that students, parents, and the public rely on us to take informed action, remove barriers to excellence, and find innovative solutions to complex problems.

### **4. Service**

We exist to lead and serve students, adult learners, families, schools, and districts across the state. We provide services that build the capacity of those we serve to both improve and sustain results. We protect the public trust by ensuring quality and accountability and by upholding laws that support and protect students and taxpayers. We commit to timely, responsive, respectful, efficient, and effective service. This spirit of service extends to our employees whom we treat as our most valuable resource.

### **5. Communication**

We maintain open, honest, and transparent communication within CDE and with the public. We recognize and maximize the power of communication to stimulate new ideas, challenge false or outdated assumptions, and advance the state's education system.

### **6. Teamwork**

We work as a team, effectively and efficiently developing, leveraging, and valuing the expertise, diversity, skills, and knowledge of our colleagues, districts, schools, families, and partners to accomplish desired results. We break down barriers that impede teamwork, work across units, build strong relationships based on trust, and assume good intent in all interactions. We value diversity in our workforce. We seek to attract, develop, and retain the best talent for our organization. We develop and advance team members who exceed expectations, deliver results, demonstrate a "can-do" attitude, and foster collaboration and partnerships.

### **7. Innovation**

We believe that innovation is critical to the transformation of the state's education system and to the continuous improvement of operations at CDE. We promote effective innovation, experimentation, and continuous improvement efforts that lead to improved outcomes for student and system performance.

### **8. Integrity**

We ensure the public trust by acting with integrity. We treat others with fairness and respect. We do what we say and we take responsibility for our actions.

## Levers of Change

CDE has key levers of change that are unique to its position as the state's education agency. The levers differentiate CDE from districts, schools, and other education associations and organizations. Just as companies have strategic advantages that give them a competitive edge, CDE has unique levers that enable us to shape, support, and safeguard the state's education system. The levers are described below.

Levers of Change	Description
Leadership	CDE serves as the state's education authority, providing leadership and expertise that help shape and advance the state's education system.
Law and regulation	CDE shapes and administers the statutes, rules, and policies that set expectations and guide district, school, and educator behavior. CDE's approach to policy leadership, monitoring and accountability focuses educators on the actions that produce sustainable improvement.
Communication	CDE has the ability to initiate two-way communication statewide. This statewide audience enables CDE to inform and elevate statewide conversations regarding the state's education system and to solicit, receive, and disseminate information on needs and successful practices.
Support	CDE has the ability to provide support to educators across the state, convening educators, coordinating professional development, offering technical assistance, and making available tools, resources, leadership, and guidance through a variety of delivery channels.
Funding	CDE disseminates all state and federal funds to districts, BOCES, and schools; and, where allowable, has the ability to leverage and target resources toward those activities that yield greatest return on investment.
Economies of scale	CDE can invest in and deliver solutions for districts and BOCES that would be cost prohibitive for a single district or BOCES to do alone (e.g., Colorado Growth Model, statewide longitudinal data system, cost-effective access to library resources, Statewide Assistive Technology Support, and the Colorado Instructional Materials Center).
Information	CDE is the definitive source of K-12 public education, GED, and library data for Colorado. CDE has the ability to collect, aggregate, analyze, and disseminate student, educator, school, and district data to examine trends, identify critical priorities, make predictions, and support the effective use of data to inform practice, policy, and decision making.

## Using the Levers

As CDE implements this strategic direction, employees should constantly ask: Are we maximizing our unique levers to achieve our goals? For example, with our goal of ensuring effective educators for every student and effective leaders for every school/district, we should ask:

- **Leadership:** Are we effectively using our leadership role to improve and support the effectiveness of our educators?
- **Law and regulation:** Are we effectively using our ability to monitor and hold schools/districts/BOCES accountable for evaluating and supporting educators and ultimately improving instruction? Are we monitoring the things that matter most? Are we advancing new policies where needed?
- **Communication:** Are we using our statewide communication reach to effectively inform educators and the public about the educator effectiveness work? What should we be talking about? Are we

raising the right questions? Are we elevating the state's discussion and understanding of effective teaching/learning? Do we have strong feedback loops so that our work can be informed by the field?

- **Support:** Are we providing the right statewide supports that will have the greatest impact?
- **Funding:** Are we targeting our resources and assisting district/BOCES in focusing their resources on this work?
- **Economies of scale:** How can we ensure that our model educator evaluation system and resource bank of measures of student growth in tested and non-tested subjects maximize our economy of scale and minimize duplicate investments of resources by districts and BOCES? Are there other state-wide resources we should be providing for districts/BOCES to accomplish this work?
- **Information:** What data should we be collecting to inform and advance the state's efforts to improve educator effectiveness?

This line of questioning can be applied to every major project and body of work in which we engage.

## **Statewide Goals**

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.

### **Successful Students**

- 1. Prepare students to thrive in their education and in a globally competitive workforce.**
  - a. Ensure every student is making adequate growth to graduate from high school postsecondary and workforce ready.<sup>3</sup>
  - b. Increase achievement for all students and close achievement gaps.
  - c. Ensure students graduate ready for postsecondary and workforce success.
  - d. Increase national and international 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, licensure, 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 performance for all districts and schools.
  - b. Turnaround the state's lowest performing districts and schools.
  - c. Foster innovation and expand access to a rich array of high quality learning options for all students.

### **Best Education System in the Nation**

- 4. Build the best education system in the nation.**
  - a. Lead the nation in policy, innovation, and positive outcomes for education.
  - b. Operate with excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness to become the best SEA in the nation.
  - c. Attract and retain outstanding talent to CDE.

---

<sup>3</sup> "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. For a full description of "postsecondary and workforce ready," visit:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdegen/downloads/PWRdescription.pdf>.

## Successful Students

### Goal 1: Prepare students to thrive in their education and in a globally competitive workforce.

Note: 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 making adequate growth to graduate from high school postsecondary and workforce ready.

Org-wide strategies for Objective 1a (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	Primary Unit Responsible
<b>School Readiness</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase access to quality programs that foster early learning, school-readiness, and family literacy so students enter school ready to learn.</li> <li>• Assess, monitor, and improve student readiness for school by identifying and supporting districts with implementation of school readiness assessments.</li> </ul>	Early Learning and School Readiness; Library, Adult and Family Literacy; Exceptional Student Services; Assessment
<b>High Standards</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase student achievement in all content areas by supporting districts in implementing the Colorado Academic and English Language Proficiency Standards and by supporting early childhood providers in implementing Colorado's early learning guidelines.</li> <li>• Improve students' literacy skills by supporting district implementation of Colorado's READ Act.</li> </ul>	Teaching and Learning; School and District Performance; Language, Culture & Equity; Exceptional Student Services
<b>Powerful, aligned assessment system</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess student mastery by designing and implementing a comprehensive assessment system accessible to all students:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the state's new summative social studies, science, and accompanying alternate assessments and support districts with the first online administration in spring of 2014.</li> <li>• Provide leadership in the PARCC consortium for the development of new summative English Language Arts and math assessments.</li> <li>• Implement the new WIDA assessments for the state's English language learners.</li> <li>• Identify, vet, and/or develop interim and formative measures of student learning for the state's ten standard content areas, using the Content Collaboratives and leveraging other state and national efforts in this area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Assessment; Teaching & Learning; Exceptional Student Services; Language, Culture, & Equity

**Performance Targets for Objective 1a:<sup>4</sup>**  
**Student Proficiency and Adequate Growth**

The targets for this objective were determined by examining historical trend data from 2006-07 to 2010-11 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 three and seven percentage points.

**Percent of students scoring at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science on state assessment**  
*(includes student results for CSAP/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)*

	<b>2006-07 Actual</b>	<b>2007-08 Actual</b>	<b>2008-09 Actual</b>	<b>2009-10 Actual</b>	<b>2010-11 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Target</b>	<b>2012-13 Target</b>	<b>2013-14 Target</b>	<b>2014-15 Target</b>
<b>READING</b>										
Elementary	68.8%	69.4%	69.5%	69.2%	69.3%	<b>70.7%</b>	69.7%	70.0%	70.4%	70.8%
Middle	65.2%	67.1%	67.0%	69.0%	67.3%	68.7%	68.9%	70.5%	72.1%	73.8%
High	67.6%	67.5%	69.5%	68.6%	65.1%	<b>68.9%</b>	66.2%	67.3%	68.4%	69.5%
<b>WRITING</b>										
Elementary	54.8%	54.8%	55.2%	53.7%	56.5%	54.1%	57.8%	59.0%	60.3%	61.5%
Middle	56.0%	56.0%	57.8%	56.5%	57.3%	57.2%	58.3%	59.2%	60.2%	61.2%
High	50.0%	49.0%	51.2%	49.1%	49.7%	<b>50.6%</b>	50.5%	51.2%	52.0%	52.7%
<b>MATH</b>										
Elementary	67.7%	67.8%	67.7%	69.0%	68.8%	69.0%	69.6%	70.4%	71.2%	72.0%
Middle	50.3%	49.9%	54.3%	52.9%	54.3%	54.4%	57.4%	60.5%	63.5%	66.6%
High	32.7%	34.7%	33.3%	35.6%	34.9%	35.8%	36.5%	38.1%	39.7%	41.4%
<b>SCIENCE</b>										
Elementary	42.1%	43.7%	44.9%	46.9%	46.8%	48.6%	50.4%	53.9%	57.4%	61.0%
Middle	52.4%	48.6%	49.3%	48.9%	49.9%	49.3%	50.6%	51.4%	52.1%	52.9%
High	49.2%	46.9%	51.1%	48.2%	48.5%	<b>50.3%</b>	49.2%	50.0%	50.7%	51.5%

<sup>4</sup> Data source CDE unless otherwise noted.



**Performance Targets for Objective 1a:**  
**Percent of students making adequate growth to catch up and keep up on path to proficiency**

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
<b>READING</b>										
Elementary	64.1%	65.9%	65.6%	67.6%	64.4%	<b>66.8%</b>	64.6%	64.8%	65.1%	65.3%
Middle	65.0%	64.3%	65.8%	66.2%	62.3%	<b>64.0%</b>	63.3%	64.3%	65.2%	66.2%
High	71.6%	68.0%	72.1%	69.0%	67.0%	<b>69.6%</b>	68.3%	69.6%	70.8%	72.1%
<b>WRITING</b>										
Elementary	55.9%	56.2%	58.6%	55.0%	60.3%	55.8%	63.5%	66.8%	70.1%	73.3%
Middle	51.5%	48.9%	52.1%	48.3%	50.3%	48.7%	51.1%	51.8%	52.6%	53.3%
High	52.5%	49.1%	52.6%	49.0%	50.6%	49.3%	51.3%	52.1%	52.8%	53.6%
<b>MATH</b>										
Elementary	53.3%	47.7%	54.4%	50.6%	54.5%	51.0%	55.4%	56.3%	57.3%	58.2%
Middle	37.7%	37.8%	39.0%	39.0%	38.9%	38.9%	39.8%	40.6%	41.5%	42.4%
High	32.2%	33.0%	32.2%	33.5%	34.3%	34.0%	35.8%	37.4%	39.0%	40.6%

**Evaluation of progress toward targets for Objective 1a (2011-12 to 2012-13)** The state's TCAP proficiency scores remained steady with slight increases in some areas. State proficiency targets were achieved for elementary and high school reading, high school writing, and high school science. The state held steady for the most part in all other areas. Student adequate growth targets were met in reading for all school levels. Student adequate growth declined for all grade levels in writing and held steady or declined in math. The state is disappointed that performance targets in many areas were not met. We acknowledge that the strategies outlined for this objective are still in the early implementation stage and their impact has yet to be realized. As these strategies are rolled out, the state is working with districts through the unified improvement planning process to help districts identify root causes of performance challenges and implement plans to address them.

**Objective 1b. Increase achievement for all students and close achievement gaps.**

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 1b</b> (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the performance of our <b>lowest performing schools and districts</b> by providing them with targeted interventions and support to close achievement gaps.</li> <li>• Increase performance <b>of students with disabilities</b> by launching the state's "reinventing special education" request for proposal to work with specific districts to close achievement gaps of students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Increase performance of <b>students who are English language learners</b> through targeted supports to districts and by seeking legislative changes to the state's English Language Proficiency Act.</li> <li>• Improve performance of <b>students from low-income families</b> by assisting districts in maximizing the return on investment of their federal and state funds targeted to meet the needs of these students.</li> <li>• Increase the academic growth of <b>students who are gifted</b>.</li> </ul>	School & District Performance Team, Support & Intervention; Federal Programs; Exceptional Student Services; Improvement Planning; Accountability and Data Analysis; Language, Culture, & Equity

## Performance Targets – Objective 1b

### 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/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
<b>READING</b>										
Elementary	49.7%	50.3%	51.1%	52.1%	52.0%	<b>54.3%</b>	53.7%	55.5%	57.2%	58.9%
Middle	43.4%	46.0%	46.2%	50.5%	49.1%	51.2%	53.4%	57.7%	62.0%	66.3%
High	45.3%	44.0%	47.0%	48.2%	46.1%	<b>51.2%</b>	47.3%	48.6%	49.8%	51.1%
<b>WRITING</b>										
Elementary	35.1%	34.8%	36.0%	35.7%	38.4%	36.8%	40.9%	43.3%	45.8%	48.3%
Middle	34.6%	34.2%	37.1%	36.4%	38.4%	39.1%	41.3%	44.1%	47.0%	49.8%
High	26.5%	24.5%	27.8%	26.7%	28.9%	<b>30.8%</b>	30.6%	32.4%	34.1%	35.9%
<b>MATH</b>										
Elementary	49.5%	49.3%	49.9%	52.2%	52.1%	53.0%	54.2%	56.2%	58.2%	60.2%
Middle	28.6%	28.8%	33.5%	33.3%	35.6%	36.1%	40.8%	46.0%	51.3%	56.5%
High	12.9%	13.9%	13.4%	16.6%	16.8%	18.0%	19.6%	22.5%	25.3%	28.2%
<b>SCIENCE</b>										
Elementary	20.9%	21.5%	23.2%	26.2%	26.1%	28.2%	29.9%	33.8%	37.7%	41.5%
Middle	28.3%	23.7%	26.7%	27.8%	28.5%	29.0%	29.8%	31.0%	32.3%	33.5%
High	23.6%	24.1%	26.8%	25.8%	26.6%	<b>29.0%</b>	28.9%	31.1%	33.3%	35.6%

### Minority Students<sup>5</sup>

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/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
<b>READING</b>										
Elementary	51.2%	52.2%	53.0%	53.2%	54.9%	57.0%	57.6%	60.3%	63.0%	65.8%
Middle	45.6%	49.0%	48.9%	52.7%	53.0%	54.1%	58.5%	64.0%	69.5%	73.8%
High	47.9%	47.1%	50.1%	50.2%	50.2%	<b>55.0%</b>	51.9%	53.7%	55.4%	57.1%
<b>WRITING</b>										
Elementary	38.1%	38.2%	39.1%	38.6%	42.6%	41.4%	46.0%	49.4%	52.8%	56.2%
Middle	37.9%	38.0%	41.2%	39.7%	43.4%	43.8%	47.4%	51.5%	55.5%	59.6%
High	30.0%	28.3%	31.5%	29.5%	33.4%	35.4%	36.0%	38.5%	41.1%	43.6%
<b>MATH</b>										
Elementary	51.3%	51.4%	52.1%	53.4%	55.0%	55.6%	57.8%	60.5%	63.3%	66.1%
Middle	31.7%	32.3%	37.2%	36.4%	40.2%	40.2%	46.5%	52.8%	59.2%	65.5%
High	15.5%	16.9%	16.5%	19.0%	20.8%	22.5%	24.8%	28.8%	32.8%	36.8%
<b>SCIENCE</b>										
Elementary	22.0%	23.0%	24.7%	26.8%	28.5%	31.0%	33.4%	38.3%	43.2%	48.1%
Middle	29.6%	25.5%	29.0%	29.4%	32.7%	32.9%	35.1%	37.4%	39.7%	42.1%
High	25.5%	26.3%	29.0%	27.2%	29.9%	32.1%	33.2%	36.4%	39.7%	43.0%

<sup>5</sup> Minority includes all students identified as American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, two or more races, other, and Mexican-American/Chicano/Latino.

**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/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)*

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
<b>READING</b>										
Elementary	32.2%	28.7%	27.9%	25.4%	25.3%	25.7%	27.0%	28.7%	30.5%	32.2%
Middle	26.1%	22.7%	22.9%	22.1%	20.7%	21.9%	23.4%	25.0%	26.5%	28.0%
High	25.8%	20.2%	22.0%	20.8%	19.2%	<b>21.2%</b>	20.8%	22.5%	24.1%	25.8%
<b>WRITING</b>										
Elementary	21.5%	18.1%	17.8%	16.0%	16.3%	14.8%	17.6%	18.9%	20.2%	21.5%
Middle	17.4%	14.8%	15.2%	13.8%	14.6%	14.6%	15.8%	17.1%	18.3%	19.6%
High	13.0%	9.5%	10.1%	9.3%	10.0%	10.0%	11.3%	12.5%	13.8%	15.0%
<b>MATH</b>										
Elementary	28.5%	28.5%	27.4%	26.9%	26.1%	<b>30.1%</b>	27.4%	28.6%	29.9%	31.1%
Middle	12.8%	11.9%	13.6%	12.2%	12.1%	16.3%	17.1%	17.9%	18.7%	19.5%
High	4.8%	5.4%	4.6%	5.3%	5.3%	7.0%	8.8%	10.5%	12.3%	14.0%
<b>SCIENCE</b>										
Elementary	19.0%	18.9%	18.3%	18.2%	16.8%	16.7%	20.5%	24.3%	28.0%	31.8%
Middle	20.0%	18.3%	18.2%	15.6%	15.3%	14.6%	16.5%	17.8%	19.0%	20.3%
High	15.8%	14.7%	16.1%	14.3%	14.4%	13.7%	15.7%	16.9%	18.2%	19.4%

**Students who are English Language Learners**  
**Percent of students who are 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/TCAP, CSAP-A/CoAlt, Lectura and Escritura)*

	2006-07 Actual	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2011-12 Target	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
<b>READING</b>										
Elementary	38.9%	41.3%	41.7%	43.1%	43.5%	46.1%	46.9%	50.3%	53.7%	57.2%
Middle	32.2%	36.1%	36.9%	41.2%	41.9%	41.8%	49.1%	56.4%	63.6%	70.9%
High	33.3%	34.7%	37.5%	37.9%	37.7%	<b>43.0%</b>	41.0%	44.3%	47.5%	50.8%
<b>WRITING</b>										
Elementary	27.9%	28.3%	30.2%	31.0%	33.5%	34.4%	37.7%	41.9%	46.2%	50.4%
Middle	26.3%	26.6%	31.1%	29.8%	33.4%	35.3%	38.7%	44.0%	49.4%	54.7%
High	18.4%	18.1%	20.9%	18.6%	21.4%	<b>24.4%</b>	23.7%	26.0%	28.2%	30.5%
<b>MATH</b>										
Elementary	43.6%	44.7%	45.5%	47.3%	48.4%	49.0%	52.1%	55.7%	59.4%	63.1%
Middle	25.0%	26.3%	31.6%	31.4%	34.3%	34.0%	41.3%	48.3%	55.2%	62.2%
High	11.1%	12.1%	11.9%	13.9%	14.9%	16.8%	17.8%	20.6%	23.5%	26.3%
<b>SCIENCE</b>										
Elementary	12.5%	14.0%	15.4%	18.4%	17.9%	<b>22.2%</b>	22.0%	26.1%	30.1%	34.2%
Middle	20.0%	16.3%	19.6%	20.3%	22.8%	23.9%	24.9%	27.1%	29.2%	31.3%
High	15.1%	16.7%	19.1%	17.0%	18.9%	20.9%	21.7%	24.5%	27.4%	30.2%

**Evaluation of progress toward targets for Objective 1b (2011-12 to 2012-13):** The charts on the prior pages show that performance: 1) increased for all subjects and school levels for students eligible for free and reduced lunch with the exception for elementary writing, achieving targets in four areas; 2) increased or held steady for all subjects and school levels for minority students, with the exception of a slight decrease in elementary writing, one target was met high school reading; 3) increased or held steady for students with disabilities in all subjects and school levels with the exception of elementary writing and all school levels for science, achieving targets in elementary math and high school reading; 4) held steady or increased performance for students learning English in all subjects and school levels with the exception for middle school reading and math, achieving targets in high school reading and writing and elementary science. Despite overall positive progress, the forward movement is not enough to close achievement gaps. The state is working with districts to address these gaps through the unified improvement planning process. Please note: Some targets were adjusted upward from last year's submission to ensure closure of achievement gaps over time.

**Objective 1c. Ensure students graduate ready for postsecondary and workforce success.**

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 1c</b> (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<b>Postsecondary and workforce ready supports</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decrease dropout rates and increase graduation rates by assisting districts in providing more effective postsecondary and workforce readiness services (e.g., credit recovery, academic and career counseling, concurrent enrollment, multiple pathways to exit, expanded learning opportunities, GED prep, ACT prep, remediation courses).</li> <li>Improve students' planning for academic and career success by supporting successful district implementation of individual career and academic plans (ICAPs).</li> </ul>	Innovation, Choice, and Engagement; Support & Intervention; Exceptional Student Services; Federal Programs; School & District Performance; Improvement Planning
<b>Postsecondary and workforce ready indicators</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and adopt high school graduation guidelines that allow students multiple ways to demonstrate postsecondary and workforce readiness.</li> <li>Assist in piloting the endorsed diploma criteria in selected districts to provide students with an avenue to guaranteed entrance to the state's higher education system.</li> <li>Partner with postsecondary and workforce entities to ensure alignment of higher education admissions policies and workforce competencies with Pre-K-12 standards.</li> </ul>	Achievement & Strategy, Innovation, Choice, and Engagement

**Evaluation of progress toward targets for Objective 1c:** As the charts on the following page will show, the state's 2010-11 actual graduation rates exceed the 2011-12 targets for all subpopulations. We will examine 2011-12 data to see if targets for this goal need to be reset. The state made gains in ACT scores for all students, coming close to targets in many areas. The strategies being implemented to support college/career readiness appear to be having an impact.

**Performance Targets for Objective 1c:**

**Graduation Rate (using best of 4, 5, 6, or 7 year graduation rate) – Baseline began in 2009-10**

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 4<sup>th</sup> year. The state is targeting a graduation rate of 80% by 2014-15.

		<b>2009-10 Actual</b>	<b>2010-11 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Target</b>	<b>2012-13 Target</b>	<b>2013-14 Target</b>	<b>2014-15 Target</b>
<b>Best of 4, 5, 6, or 7 year graduation rate</b>	All Students	74.7%	77.1%	*	76.0%	77.4%	78.7%	80.0%
	FRL	61.4%	66.1%	*	63.6%	65.3%	67.1%	68.8%
	Minority	61.5%	66.0%	*	63.3%	65.0%	66.8%	68.5%
	Disability	62.8%	67.0%	*	64.6%	66.3%	68.1%	69.8%
	ELL	56.7%	58.8%	*	58.5%	60.2%	62.0%	63.7%

**Performance Targets for Objective 1c: Dropout Rates\***

	<b>2006-07 Actual</b>	<b>2007-08 Actual</b>	<b>2008-09 Actual</b>	<b>2009-10 Actual</b>	<b>2010-11 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Target</b>	<b>2012-13 Target</b>	<b>2013-14 Target</b>	<b>2014-15 Target</b>
All Students	4.4%	3.8%	3.6%	3.1%	3.0%	*	2.9%	2.8%	2.6%	2.4%

**Performance Targets for Objective 1c: Colorado ACT Composite Scores**

	<b>2006-07 Actual</b>	<b>2007-08 Actual</b>	<b>2008-09 Actual</b>	<b>2009-10 Actual</b>	<b>2010-11 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Target</b>	<b>2012-13 Target</b>	<b>2013-14 Target</b>	<b>2014-15 Target</b>
All Students	19.7	20.1	20.0	20.0	19.9	20.0	20.1	20.2	20.4	20.5
FRL	16.4	16.9	16.7	16.9	16.9	17.1	17.2	17.5	17.9	18.2
Minority	17.3	17.7	17.3	17.3	17.8	*	18.2	18.6	19.0	19.3
Disability	14.4	14.8	14.6	14.6	14.4	14.6	14.7	15.1	15.5	15.9
ELL	15.5	16.0	15.9	15.9	16.0	16.1	16.3	16.7	17.0	17.4

\*At time this document went to publication, 2012 ACT number was still being verified.

**Performance Targets for Objective 1c: Colorado Remediation Rates<sup>6</sup>**

	<b>2009-10 Actual</b>	<b>2010-11 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Target</b>	<b>2012-13 Target</b>	<b>2013-14 Target</b>	<b>2014-15 Target</b>
All Students	28.6%	31.8%	*	30.1%	28.4%	26.7%	25.0%

\*Current remediation rate not yet available - Remediation rate is tabulated based on the number of recent graduates who required remediation in one or more subject areas at a four-year or two-year institution in Colorado. The remediation rate increased in 2011 partly due to an increased in college enrollment; college enrollment increased by 14,000 students, or 5.6 percent, from 2010. Data limitations: remedial rates do not include data for recent graduates who enrolled in out-of-state college, Colorado institutions for which the CDHE does not collect data, who were not assessed, or who were reported by institutions with missing data (e.g., year of high school graduation, age, high school code, etc.).

<sup>6</sup> Data Source: Colorado Department of Higher Education; these targets are solely those of the CDE.

**Objective 1d. Increase national and international competitiveness for all students.**

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 1d</b> (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strategies articulated for Objectives 1 a-c are intended to help the state achieve this objective.</li> </ul>	

**Performance Targets for Objective 1d:<sup>7</sup>**

**Percent of Students Scoring Proficient and Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)**

	<b>Baseline</b>					<b>Goal</b>	
<b>Reading 4th grade</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2015</b>
All students	37%	37%	36%	40%	39%	41%	43%
FRL	19%	20%	17%	19%	19%	21%	23%
Minority	20%	20%	19%	23%	22%	25%	28%
ELL	9%	7%	6%	4%	5%	7%	10%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	12%	10%	13%	15%

	<b>Baseline</b>					<b>Goal</b>	
<b>Math 4th grade</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2015</b>
All students	34%	39%	41%	45%	47%	49%	51%
FRL	14%	20%	21%	24%	28%	31%	33%
Minority	16%	21%	23%	27%	30%	33%	36%
ELL	5%	6%	9%	9%	12%	14%	16%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	14%	17%	19%	22%

	<b>Baseline</b>					<b>Goal</b>	
<b>Reading 8th grade</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2015</b>
All students	36%	32%	35%	32%	40%	43%	46%
FRL	17%	15%	18%	16%	20%	22%	25%
Minority	19%	17%	19%	19%	28%	31%	34%
ELL	2%	3%	3%	5%	4%	7%	10%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	5%	5%	7%	10%

	<b>Baseline</b>					<b>Goal</b>	
<b>Math 8th grade</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2015</b>
All students	34%	32%	37%	40%	43%	45%	47%
FRL	13%	13%	17%	19%	23%	25%	28%
Minority	14%	13%	18%	22%	27%	32%	37%
ELL	5%	5%	3%	4%	3%	7%	10%
Disability	NA	NA	NA	9%	6%	8%	10%

<sup>7</sup> National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress, Colorado; Performance numbers and targets are Colorado-specific.

Minority includes all students identified as Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and two or more races.

**National Comparison:** When compared to other states and Washington DC, Colorado scored higher than most states on the percentage of students who scored proficient and above on the NAEP mathematics and reading tests for 2011. The chart below shows Colorado's performance is indeed ranked higher than most states. This chart provides the ranking of Colorado performance on the NAEP mathematics and reading tests compared to 49 states and Washington DC for 2011.<sup>8</sup>

**Colorado's Rank of Average Scale Scored on NAEP by Subject and Grade Level, 2011**

	Grade 4	Grade 8
Mathematics	13	8
Reading	17	8

***Evaluation of performance targets for Objective 1d:*** NAEP is administered biannually. We will have evaluation data following the 2013 administration.

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: National Center for Education Statistics; National Assessment of Education Progress, Colorado

**Great Teachers and Leaders**  
**Goal 2: Ensure effective educators for every student and effective leaders for every school and district.**

**Objective 2a. Increase and support the effectiveness of all educators.**

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 2a</b> <i>(Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)</i>	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<b>Evaluation system</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement S.B. 10-191 (including: rules, pilots, trainings, resources, metrics).</li> <li>Develop an electronic system that enables districts to input and report educator evaluation data and connect that data to professional development.</li> <li>Implement the educator/student data link and common course codes.</li> <li>Establish a system for capturing and reporting educator effectiveness metrics and support districts in using the metrics to improve their human capital systems.</li> </ul>	Educator Effectiveness; Information Management Systems
<b>Support system</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain a dynamic, web-based educator resource bank that provides training materials, resources, and tools to support increased educator effectiveness.</li> <li>Leverage the Shared Learning Collaborative and SchoolView as platforms for connecting teachers to resources aligned to their needs and the individual needs of all of their students.</li> <li>Provide targeted training and technical assistance based on educator needs and district performance data to help educators improve the performance of all students.</li> </ul>	Educator Effectiveness  (All units support)

**Performance Targets for Objective 2a:**

Note: Because the department is implementing legislation for which no outcome baseline data currently exists (in other words, educator effectiveness ratings), the current performance targets are geared toward outputs related to developing and implementing the state model evaluation system that will eventually lead to outcome data.

<b>Measure</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12 Target/Actual</b>	<b>2012-13 Target</b>	<b>2013-14 Target</b>	<b>2014-15 Target</b>
Number of districts provided full training on the state model educator evaluation system	N/A*	27/42	150 (over 80% of districts)	50 (in depth follow up)	35 (in-depth follow-up)
Number of educators who have received full training in the state model system and can provide training to the educators in their district	N/A*	462/600	1600	2000	2500
Number of "CDE approved" training programs for evaluators	N/A*	1 (CDE)	2	10	15

\*Training did not begin on the educator evaluation system until the summer of 2011.



**Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 2a:** *The department exceeded its target of training 27 districts in the pilot districts and reached more educators than originally targeted. This outreach was possible due to regional trainings and the ability to accommodate heightened demand for the training.*

Note: Once the department has data on the number of districts implementing the state model system and district educator effectiveness ratings, we will provide performance measures and targets for such areas as: number of districts implementing a robust evaluation system, number of districts with educator effectiveness rating distributions that are correlated with student achievement, number of evaluators certified, number of districts reporting the use of evaluation systems as influencing their human capital decisions, and percentage of educators in each effectiveness rating.

**Objective 2b. Optimize the preparation, licensure, retention, and effectiveness of new educators.**

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 2b</b> (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<b>Effectiveness-based System of Licensure, Educator Preparation, and Induction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decrease the cycle time for processing all completed license requests that do not require investigations to two weeks.</li> <li>Revamp the state's licensure and induction system to align to the state's educator effectiveness system.</li> <li>Develop and begin using metrics to report on educator preparation program effectiveness (including graduate effectiveness, retention rates, etc.).</li> <li>Partner with the Department of Higher Education and other designated agencies in the authorization and reauthorization of educator preparation programs to better prepare teachers, leaders and other licensed school personnel.</li> </ul>	Office of Professional Services and Licensure; Educator Effectiveness; Policy; Legislative Liaison; Innovation, Choice, & Engagement; Information Management Services

**Performance Targets for Objective 2b:**

Note: Once districts are fully implementing the state's new educator evaluation system in 2013-14, the department will be able to monitor effectiveness of educator preparation programs and new educators over time. Until such data is available, the primary performance target for this objective pertains to decreasing licensure cycle time. The state processes approximately 30,000 applications a year.

<b>Licensure cycle time</b>	<b>2009-10 Actual</b>	<b>2010-11 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Actual</b>	<b>2011-12 Target</b>	<b>2012-13 Target</b>	<b>2013-14 Target</b>	<b>2014-15 Target</b>
Average length of time it takes to process educator licenses (weeks) that are complete and do not require investigations	20	16	3	4	2	2	2

**Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 2a:** *The state exceeded its target for 2011-12. This was made possible by implementation of an e-licensure system, increased FTE to address bottlenecks, and focused implementation of LEAN business principles.*

## Objective 2c. Eliminate the educator equity gap.

The educator equity gap is defined as the tendency of students who come from low-income families and minority students to have less experienced and less qualified teachers than their higher income or non-minority peers.

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 2c</b> <i>(Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)</i>	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<b>Transparency and Action</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide districts with useful reports on educator equity gaps through the SchoolView Data Center.</li><li>• Assist districts in developing and implementing evidenced-based plans for addressing equity gaps.</li><li>• Capture and disseminate promising practices for reducing educator equity gaps.</li><li>• Explore opportunities to extend the reach of the best educators through expanded learning opportunities pilots.</li></ul>	Educator Effectiveness, Title II-Federal Programs; IMS; Innovation, Choice, and Engagement; Accountability & Data Analysis; Improvement Planning; Exceptional Student Services; Language, Culture & Equity

### Performance Measures Objective 1c

The state plans to use effectiveness ratings to identify and measure the educator equity gap. Until that metric is available, the state's interim goal is to ensure all districts understand how to use educator experience and student growth data as a proxy measure for identifying the educator equity gap. The state will do this through the strategies outlined above.

## Outstanding Schools and Districts

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

#### Objective 3a. Increase performance for all districts and schools.

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 3a</b> <i>(Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)</i>	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<b>Robust, Single Statewide Accountability System that Drives Improvement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement a robust single system of state/federal school and district accountability.</li> <li>• Strengthen the Alternative Education Campus (AEC) performance framework to ensure high expectations and consistency.</li> <li>• Build greater capacity of districts to analyze and use data to engage in effective, continuous improvement efforts through the state's unified improvement planning process.</li> <li>• Identify any policy or legislation changes needed to support multiple pathways for turning around the state's lowest performing schools and districts.</li> <li>• Identify and scale successful district improvement strategies.</li> <li>• Refine and expand the use of SchoolView and maximize the potential of the Shared Learning Collaborative platform and tools to increase district performance.</li> <li>• Develop a summary accountability report for public use.</li> </ul>	Accountability & Data Analysis; Improvement Planning; School and District Performance; Innovation, Choice, & Engagement, Federal Programs; Information Management Systems; Exceptional Student Services
<b>System of Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide targeted supports to schools and districts aligned to their needs by using data to guide the state's services and investment of resources.</li> <li>• Assist districts in building healthy, safe, and positive learning environments for all students.</li> </ul>	Accountability and Improvement; Achievement & Strategy; Innovation, Choice, & Engagement; Information Management Systems
<b>Rural Service Model</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and implement a comprehensive plan to meet the unique needs of rural schools/districts.</li> <li>• Pilot innovative and effective models of expanded and blended learning in rural districts.</li> <li>• Launch the BOCES funding program and help build the capacity of BOCES to provide strong regional services.</li> </ul>	School and District Performance; Innovation, Choice, & Engagement; Information Management Systems

**Performance Targets for Objective 3a: District accreditation ratings and school plan assignments**

Increase the number of districts accredited with distinction from 10% (2009-10) to 15% or 27 districts (2014-15).  
Decrease the number of priority and turnaround districts from 15% (2009-10) to 10% or 18 districts (2014-15).  
Decrease the number of priority and turnaround schools from 12% (2009-10) to 6% or 109 schools (2014-15).

*Districts are designated an accreditation category based on the overall score they earn on their district performance framework, which is a type of district annual report card of performance. There are five accreditation categories for districts: Accredited with Distinction; Accredited; Accredited with Improvement; Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan; and Accredited with Turnaround Plan. The highest rating is Accredited with Distinction. The lowest two ratings are Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan and Accredited with Turnaround Plan. Districts in the two lowest categories must move out of those categories within five years or face loss of their accreditation. For more information on the state's accreditation ratings, please visit: <http://www.schoolview.org/performance.asp>.*

Accreditation category	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Target <sup>9</sup> / Actual	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
Number of districts accredited with distinction	14	18	21/19	23	25	27
Number of districts accredited with priority improvement & turnaround	24	24	22/25	20	19	18
Number of schools assigned priority improvement & turnaround plan types	245	221	177/163	150	128	109

**Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 3a:** *The state increased by one the number of districts accredited with distinction, but did not meet the targeted increase. The state did not meet targets for decreasing the number for priority improvement and turnaround districts, increasing the number by two districts. Of note, the state did meet targets for decreasing the number of priority improvement and turnaround schools. CDE is working to strengthen district and school engagement in the unified improvement planning process to better identify root causes and build appropriate interventions. The state will reexamine the numbers once 2011-12 accreditation ratings are finalized.*

**Objective 3b. Turnaround the state's lowest performing districts and schools.**

Org-wide strategies for Objective 3b (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	Primary Unit Responsible
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Develop performance and fiscal partnerships with districts and schools in priority improvement and turnaround aimed at holding them accountable for increased performance.</li><li>Define and implement a range of promising pathways for turnaround schools which support and push change in practices that will result in districts moving out of these statuses.</li><li>Develop and implement Coordinated Support Teams in order to efficiently and effectively identify and provide targeted and successful support to turnaround and priority improvement districts.</li><li>Develop and implement a documentation tool aimed at tracking key moves</li></ul>	School and District Performance; Accountability and Data Analysis; Improvement Planning; Innovation, Choice, & Engagement; Exceptional Student Services; Language,

<sup>9</sup> At the time this document was submitted, 2012 accreditation ratings were still being verified.

and evidence in the support and accountability of priority improvement and turnaround districts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement the Tiered Intervention Grants with fidelity in order to see improvements in our lowest performing schools.</li> </ul>	Culture, & Equity, Federal Programs
--	-------------------------------------

### Performance Target Objective 3b

The state's annual goal is to ensure that 100% of districts and schools designated Turnaround or Priority Improvement are on track to move out of these categories within five years. The state will help districts and schools improve their performance through the strategies outlined above. The state is using the 2012-13 school year to establish baseline data for this metric.

### Objective 3c. Foster innovation and expand access to a rich array of high quality learning options for all students.

Org-wide strategies for Objective 3c (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	Primary Unit Responsible
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support and enhance the quality of the state's online, charter, and innovation schools.</li> <li>Implement the state's Expanded Learning Opportunities strategic plan.</li> <li>Release, award, and support a request for proposal for interested districts to pilot expanded learning strategies that meet individual student needs, increase achievement, and help close gaps.</li> <li>Expand blended learning in regions needing access to a wider range of learning opportunities using findings from the state's study of blended learning in rural Colorado.</li> <li>Examine potential policy changes to enhance expanded learning opportunities and digital learning using results from the digital learning study commissioned by H.B. 12-1124.</li> </ul>	Innovation, Choice, & Engagement

### Performance Targets for Objective 3c: School improvement plan ratings

Increase the percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in the performing category on the school performance frameworks 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.

*Schools are assigned an improvement plan rating based on the overall score they earn on their school performance framework, which is a type of school annual report card of performance. There are four improvement plan categories for schools: Performance; Improvement; Priority Improvement; and Turnaround. Performance is the highest rating; Priority Improvement and Turnaround are the lowest ratings.*

School Plan Type Percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools:	2009-10 Actual	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Target/ Actual	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
Receiving a "performing" rating	60%	60%	65%/69%	70%	75%	80%
Receiving a "priority improvement" or "turnaround" rating	25%	25%	23%/13%	20%	18%	15%

**Evaluation of progress toward performance targets for 3c:** *The state exceeded targets for increasing the percentage of innovation, charter, and online schools in the performing category and decreasing the number of these schools in the priority improvement and turnaround categories. The state believes this is due in part to an increased focus on the part of charter authorizers and the state on quality improvement. The state will reexamine the numbers once 2011-12 accreditation ratings are finalized. The state will review the numbers for 2012-13 to see if this positive trend continues and will readjust targets appropriately.*

**Best Education System in the Nation**  
**Goal 4: Build the best education system in the nation.**

**Objective 4a. Lead the nation in policy, innovation, and positive outcomes for education.**

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 4a</b> <i>(Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)</i>	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inform and advance statewide policies that enhance the state's P-20 education system and that lead to more personalized learning opportunities for all students.</li> <li>Help inform, build, and implement a robust school finance system for the state.</li> <li>Lead the country in accountability measures and metrics, using the Colorado Growth Model data and English language proficiency growth.</li> </ul>	Executive Team; Legislative Liaison; Policy; all divisions

**Objective 4b. Operate with excellence, efficiency, and effectiveness to become the best SEA in the nation.**

<b>Org-wide strategies for Objective 4b</b> <i>(Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)</i>	<b>Primary Unit Responsible</b>
<b>Strategic Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement CDE's system of aligned strategic, unit, project, and employee performance plans to meet required deliverables and reach performance targets.</li> </ul> <b>Communications</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and implement a strategic communications plan.</li> <li>Support CDE units in their ability to communicate with coherency and consistency with the field and public.</li> </ul> <b>Operations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build a flexible student longitudinal data system that can accommodate and adapt to changes in the education system over time.</li> <li>Leverage the state's participation as a pilot in the Shared Learning Collaborative to enhance educator access to resources and tools.</li> <li>Implement a department-wide data governance system.</li> <li>Implement planned improvements to school finance reporting systems.</li> <li>Implement the new grants management system.</li> </ul>	Executive Team All Units  Communications  Information Management Systems; School Finance; Grants Fiscal Management; Federal Programs; Exceptional Students Services

**Performance Targets for Objective 4b: Strategic Direction Targets Achieved**

Measure	2011-12 Baseline	2012-13 Target	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
Percent of annual targets achieved in strategic direction	27%	80%	85%	90%

Additional measures for operational excellence are monitored at the unit and project level.

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

Org-wide strategies for Objective 4c (Units will add unit-specific strategies and measures in their unit plans.)	Primary Unit Responsible
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administer and respond to findings from staff satisfaction survey.</li> <li>• Implement an aligned professional evaluation and growth plan process for at-will and classified staff and respond to requested refinements to the system based on 2011-12 roll out.</li> <li>• Develop and implement a CDE new employee orientation program.</li> <li>• Ensure consistency of job classifications and salary structure across the organization.</li> </ul>	Human Resources/All Units Human Resources  Human Resources

**Performance Targets for Objective 4c: Staff Satisfaction and Retention Statistics**

Measure	2010-11 Actual	2011-12 Actual	2012-13 Target/Actual	2013-14 Target	2014-15 Target
*Percentage of employees who agree/strongly agree:					
1) Satisfied with opportunities for career growth and advancement	N/A	38%	60%/40%	70%	80%
2) Have the capacity to act on innovative ideas	N/A	34%	60%/38%	70%	80%
3) New employees get the training they need to do their job well	N/A	43%	60%/41%	70%	80%
4) Other work groups give us the support we need to succeed	N/A	53%	70%/56%	80%	90%
**Retention rate of employees	82%	86%			
**Percent of employees with three or more years of service at CDE	62%	58%			
**Percent of employees who have advanced in the organization (title changes and/or salary increases)	12.4%	11.5%			

\*CDE administers the staff satisfaction in the fall of each year, as a result, we are able to report results for the current fiscal year. The four items selected for targeting were the lowest rated measures of the survey that staff agreed needed to be addressed.

\*\*These measures are for informational and tracking purposes. We will monitor them to determine if it is appropriate to set targets for these measures.