

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2012-13**

COLORADO



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- o Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- o Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- o Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- o Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- o Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- o Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- o Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- o Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- o Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2012-13 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2012-13 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2012-13 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: ☒ Part I, 2012-13 ☐ Part II, 2012-13		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Colorado Department of Education		
Address: 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, CO 80202		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Patrick Chapman		
Telephone: 303-866-6780		
Fax: 303-866-6637		
e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Patrick Chapman		
Signature _____ Thursday, March 6, 2014, 6:20:09 PM Date		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2012-13



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

Response	Options		
	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.			
	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2013-14	2013-14	2013-14

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic content standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Colorado revised all academic content standards in 2009; the Colorado Academic Standards were adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education in December 2009. In August 2010, the State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards in English/language arts and mathematics. The Colorado Academic Standards in reading, writing and communicating, and mathematics were subsequently reissued in December 2011.

All standards will be implemented in the 2013-14 school year. No further revisions are anticipated this school year.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

Response	Options
	No revisions or changes to academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Colorado will administer new general and alternate assessments in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics in 2014-15. Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards for Science will be changed in 2013-2014 for the elementary and middle grade spans, and in 2014-2015 at the high school level. Academic achievement standards for new general and alternate assessments will be officially adopted following the administration of the assessments.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

Response	Options
<u>State has revised or changed</u>	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2012-13) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Colorado will administer new general and alternate assessments in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics in 2014-15.

Colorado will administer new alternate assessments for Science based on alternate achievement standards for elementary and middle school in 2013-2014 and for high school in 2014-2015.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2012-13, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by Section 1111(b)	10.00
To administer assessments required by Section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2012-13 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by Section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by Section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for assessment participation data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	505,323	501,285	99.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,969	3,922	98.82
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,166	17,064	99.41
Asian	16,045	15,957	99.45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,121	1,107	98.75
Black or African American	24,128	23,850	98.85
Hispanic or Latino	162,145	160,887	99.22
White	281,408	279,184	99.21
Two or more races	16,460	16,333	99.23
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,566	51,429	97.84
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	55,935	55,504	99.23
Economically disadvantaged students	215,437	213,440	99.07
Migratory students	1,368	1,360	99.42
Male	258,352	256,129	99.14
Female	246,917	245,106	99.27
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	16,378	31.85
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30,190	58.70
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,861	9.45
Total	51,429	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards or modified achievement standards, only alternate achievement standards.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	505,293	500,220	99.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,979	3,926	98.67
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,146	17,005	99.18
Asian	16,026	15,905	99.24
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,120	1,100	98.21
Black or African American	24,099	23,626	98.04
Hispanic or Latino	162,114	160,495	99.00
White	281,328	278,712	99.07
Two or more races	16,464	16,294	98.97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	52,558	51,192	97.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	55,934	55,332	98.92
Economically disadvantaged students	215,387	212,741	98.77
Migratory students	1,362	1,350	99.12
Male	258,327	255,467	98.89
Female	246,872	244,661	99.10

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently Arrived LEP Students	#
Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	76

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,063	35.28
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,244	55.17
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,884	9.54
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	1	0.00
Total	51,192	

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards or modified achievement standards, only alternate achievement standards.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	185,389	183,301	98.87
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,475	1,454	98.58
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,381	6,323	99.09
Asian	5,939	5,891	99.19
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	442	432	97.74
Black or African American	8,909	8,780	98.55
Hispanic or Latino	58,215	57,628	98.99
White	104,501	103,271	98.82
Two or more races	5,895	5,832	98.93
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,844	18,342	97.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,287	17,096	98.90
Economically disadvantaged students	76,140	75,209	98.78
Migratory students	484	483	99.79
Male	94,856	93,760	98.84
Female	90,509	89,517	98.90
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities (IDEA) in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,776	36.94
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,902	53.99
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,664	9.07
Total	18,342	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level achievement standards or modified achievement standards, only alternate achievement standards.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for academic achievement data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b) (3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment, and the difference noted in the paragraph below.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months unless a state chooses to include these students. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans: 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) students include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,978	46,923	72.21
American Indian or Alaska Native	489	282	57.67
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,179	1,768	81.14
<i>Asian</i>	2,046	1,672	81.72
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	133	96	72.18
Black or African American	2,901	1,553	53.53
Hispanic or Latino	21,599	12,434	57.57
White	35,641	29,212	81.96
Two or more races	2,162	1,669	77.20
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,640	2,417	36.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,918	5,161	47.27
Economically disadvantaged students	29,527	17,276	58.51
Migratory students	157	70	44.59
Male	33,249	24,097	72.47
Female	31,721	22,820	71.94
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,839	47,228	72.84
American Indian or Alaska Native	491	271	55.19
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,175	1,683	77.38
<i>Asian</i>	2,043	1,584	77.53
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	132	99	75.00
Black or African American	2,894	1,693	58.50
Hispanic or Latino	21,534	12,454	57.83
White	35,584	29,417	82.67
Two or more races	2,156	1,708	79.22
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,616	1,896	28.66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,894	4,862	44.63
Economically disadvantaged students	29,434	17,336	58.90
Migratory students	157	75	47.77
Male	33,165	23,089	69.62
Female	31,667	24,134	76.21
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado only tests students in Science in 5th, 8th and 10th grades.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,086	46,612	71.62
American Indian or Alaska Native	468	252	53.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,262	1,844	81.52
<i>Asian</i>	2,117	1,743	82.33
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	145	101	69.66
Black or African American	3,022	1,578	52.22
Hispanic or Latino	21,531	12,155	56.45
White	35,527	29,072	81.83
Two or more races	2,274	1,711	75.24
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,146	2,233	31.25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,717	4,038	41.56
Economically disadvantaged students	29,369	16,628	56.62
Migratory students	197	87	44.16
Male	33,150	23,701	71.50
Female	31,931	22,908	71.74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,093	43,998	67.59
American Indian or Alaska Native	469	250	53.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,262	1,704	75.33
<i>Asian</i>	2,118	1,607	75.87
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	144	97	67.36
Black or African American	3,018	1,533	50.80
Hispanic or Latino	21,528	10,859	50.44
White	35,544	27,971	78.69
Two or more races	2,269	1,678	73.95
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,111	1,580	22.22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,699	2,911	30.01
Economically disadvantaged students	29,352	14,893	50.74
Migratory students	195	78	40.00
Male	33,137	21,106	63.69
Female	31,954	22,890	71.63
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado only tests students in Science in 5th, 8th and 10th grades.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,992	41,774	65.28
American Indian or Alaska Native	469	229	48.83
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,275	1,808	79.47
<i>Asian</i>	2,153	1,734	80.54
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	122	74	60.66
Black or African American	2,926	1,286	43.95
Hispanic or Latino	21,014	10,318	49.10
White	35,181	26,652	75.76
Two or more races	2,125	1,479	69.60
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,182	1,712	23.84
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,403	2,573	30.62
Economically disadvantaged students	28,667	14,068	49.07
Migratory students	207	78	37.68
Male	32,796	21,120	64.40
Female	31,192	20,652	66.21

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,921	44,951	70.32
American Indian or Alaska Native	471	255	54.14
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,274	1,776	78.10
<i>Asian</i>	2,152	1,691	78.58
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	122	85	69.67
Black or African American	2,926	1,578	53.93
Hispanic or Latino	20,964	11,395	54.36
White	35,159	28,340	80.61
Two or more races	2,123	1,604	75.55
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,163	1,733	24.19
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,364	2,557	30.57
Economically disadvantaged students	28,626	15,619	54.56
Migratory students	208	87	41.83
Male	32,752	21,767	66.46
Female	31,162	23,181	74.39

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,962	31,048	48.54
American Indian or Alaska Native	470	143	30.43
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,276	1,341	58.92
<i>Asian</i>	2,153	1,286	59.73
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	123	55	44.72
Black or African American	2,922	751	25.70
Hispanic or Latino	21,004	5,648	26.89
White	35,163	22,020	62.62
Two or more races	2,123	1,144	53.89
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,170	1,231	17.17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,395	711	8.47
Economically disadvantaged students	28,645	8,117	28.34
Migratory students	207	32	15.46
Male	32,793	16,082	49.04
Female	31,162	14,965	48.02
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,467	39,434	62.13
American Indian or Alaska Native	516	235	45.54
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,130	1,643	77.14
<i>Asian</i>	2,003	1,562	77.98
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	127	81	63.78
Black or African American	2,961	1,184	39.99
Hispanic or Latino	20,572	9,306	45.24
White	35,084	25,607	72.99
Two or more races	2,193	1,454	66.30
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,975	1,407	20.17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,169	1,767	24.65
Economically disadvantaged students	27,993	12,607	45.04
Migratory students	185	60	32.43
Male	32,209	19,687	61.12
Female	31,255	19,746	63.18
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,916	46,243	73.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	510	302	59.22
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,093	1,656	79.12
<i>Asian</i>	1,967	1,565	79.56
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	126	91	72.22
Black or African American	2,800	1,585	56.61
Hispanic or Latino	20,404	11,637	57.03
White	34,930	29,331	83.97
Two or more races	2,168	1,727	79.66
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,904	1,762	25.52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,069	1,924	27.22
Economically disadvantaged students	27,627	16,021	57.99
Migratory students	185	75	40.54
Male	31,908	22,012	68.99
Female	31,003	24,229	78.15
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado only tests students in Science in 5th, 8th and 10th grades.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,796	34,576	55.06
American Indian or Alaska Native	515	194	37.67
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,081	1,496	71.89
<i>Asian</i>	1,960	1,439	73.42
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	121	57	47.11
Black or African American	3,036	988	32.54
Hispanic or Latino	20,358	7,626	37.46
White	34,790	23,064	66.29
Two or more races	2,009	1,207	60.08
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,408	985	15.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,257	1,005	16.06
Economically disadvantaged students	26,915	9,977	37.07
Migratory students	172	44	25.58
Male	32,289	17,554	54.37
Female	30,501	17,021	55.80

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,763	42,422	67.59
American Indian or Alaska Native	515	275	53.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,081	1,554	74.68
<i>Asian</i>	1,961	1,476	75.27
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	120	78	65.00
Black or African American	3,027	1,505	49.72
Hispanic or Latino	20,348	10,212	50.19
White	34,773	27,376	78.73
Two or more races	2,010	1,496	74.43
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,389	1,317	20.61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,250	1,039	16.62
Economically disadvantaged students	26,872	13,489	50.20
Migratory students	170	53	31.18
Male	32,254	20,375	63.17
Female	30,498	22,042	72.27

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado only tests students in Science in 5th, 8th and 10th grades.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,336	31,633	51.57
American Indian or Alaska Native	515	209	40.58
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,014	1,410	70.01
<i>Asian</i>	1,851	1,326	71.64
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	163	84	51.53
Black or African American	3,087	939	30.42
Hispanic or Latino	19,397	6,394	32.96
White	34,338	21,541	62.73
Two or more races	1,979	1,138	57.50
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,093	807	13.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,984	599	12.02
Economically disadvantaged students	25,513	8,290	32.49
Migratory students	151	34	22.52
Male	31,376	16,099	51.31
Female	29,953	15,532	51.85
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,271	41,052	67.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	519	278	53.56
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,011	1,516	75.39
<i>Asian</i>	1,850	1,409	76.16
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	161	107	66.46
Black or African American	3,080	1,452	47.14
Hispanic or Latino	19,374	9,423	48.64
White	34,306	26,926	78.49
Two or more races	1,975	1,453	73.57
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,074	1,214	19.99
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,972	669	13.46
Economically disadvantaged students	25,470	12,385	48.63
Migratory students	146	38	26.03
Male	31,344	19,326	61.66
Female	29,922	21,723	72.60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,263	31,837	51.97
American Indian or Alaska Native	520	188	36.15
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,011	1,295	64.40
<i>Asian</i>	1,848	1,222	66.13
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	163	73	44.79
Black or African American	3,079	928	30.14
Hispanic or Latino	19,377	6,024	31.09
White	34,292	22,229	64.82
Two or more races	1,978	1,171	59.20
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,079	905	14.89
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,974	348	7.00
Economically disadvantaged students	25,486	8,187	32.12
Migratory students	150	24	16.00
Male	31,356	16,385	52.25
Female	29,899	15,450	51.67
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	119,630	44,089	36.85
American Indian or Alaska Native	950	215	22.63
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,123	2,309	56.00
<i>Asian</i>	3,827	2,218	57.96
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	296	91	30.74
Black or African American	5,917	1,014	17.14
Hispanic or Latino	36,416	6,810	18.70
White	68,623	32,240	46.98
Two or more races	3,591	1,501	41.80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,985	830	7.56
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,056	378	4.69
Economically disadvantaged students	45,456	8,547	18.80
Migratory students	291	22	7.56
Male	61,060	23,317	38.19
Female	58,553	20,771	35.47

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	119,341	82,925	69.49
American Indian or Alaska Native	951	525	55.21
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,109	3,143	76.49
<i>Asian</i>	3,814	2,941	77.11
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	295	202	68.47
Black or African American	5,881	3,086	52.47
Hispanic or Latino	36,343	19,188	52.80
White	68,416	54,200	79.22
Two or more races	3,593	2,752	76.59
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,934	2,310	21.13
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,008	1,093	13.65
Economically disadvantaged students	45,301	23,852	52.65
Migratory students	288	99	34.38
Male	60,867	38,844	63.82
Female	58,419	44,042	75.39

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,076	30,287	52.15
American Indian or Alaska Native	464	164	35.34
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,036	1,322	64.93
Asian	1,890	1,258	66.56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	146	64	43.84
Black or African American	2,779	894	32.17
Hispanic or Latino	17,247	5,255	30.47
White	33,816	21,642	64.00
Two or more races	1,731	1,009	58.29
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,093	668	13.12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,727	187	5.02
Economically disadvantaged students	21,078	6,683	31.71
Migratory students	126	18	14.29
Male	29,611	15,555	52.53
Female	28,456	14,731	51.77

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The reason that the number of students tested in Science at the high school level is so much lower than the numbers of students overall and in all disaggregated groups for Reading/Language Arts and Math is that Science is only tested in 10th grade, and Reading/Language Arts and Math are tested at both 9th and 10th grades. Therefore, all numbers for science are approximately half of those for RLA and Math.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Schools			
Districts			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator ³ based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
Schools	1,712	100	5.84
Districts	183	6	3.28

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado was granted an NCLB flexibility waiver to use its state system for federal accountability. For information about Colorado's flexibility waiver, visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/NCLBwaiver.asp>. Colorado's system incorporates participation, graduation rates and performance on state reading, writing, math and science tests, as well as academic growth in reading, writing and math, overall as well as by minority students, those with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged and English learners (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/coloradogrowthmodel>) and other postsecondary workforce readiness indicators. Accountability status is based on academic achievement and growth as well as other factors, and a percentage of total performance framework points. For more information about Colorado's School and District Performance Frameworks, visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/performanceframeworks>. To view current and historical performance frameworks, visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance>. However, to fit within federal reporting requirements and the CSPR, Colorado was able to report only whether graduation rate and reading and math participation and performance targets were met, for the school/district overall as well as any disaggregated ethnic/students groups (16+). A school/district that failed to meet one of these targets on the part of even one group was considered not to have made all of its AMOs.

Participation targets remain 95% across content areas and grade spans. Other Indicator targets are: EM, percent Advanced=1.33%; H, 4-, 5-, 6- or 7-year graduation rate => 80%. AMOs began with the percent Proficient and Advanced on TCAP (Developing/Novice on CoAlt) for the all-students group in the 50th percentile school/district at each grade span/content area and increase incrementally to the 90th percentile by 2015-16. The following are the 2012-13 school performance targets, with the one-year incremental raise since 2011-12:

Reading (E=75.975, +4.375; M=75.6, +4.2; H=76.775, +3.475)

Math (E=75.5, +4.6; M=58.125, +5.625; H=38.825, +5.325)

The following are the 2012-13 district performance targets, with the one-year incremental raise since 2011-12:

Reading (E=74.7, +3.2; M=73.8, +3.3; H=74.8, +3.3)

Math (E=74.0, +3.5; M=54.7, +4.7; H=37.2, +5.0)

For more information about Colorado's accountability system under its NCLB flexibility waiver, go to: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/District%20Accountability%20Handbook2013v4.pdf>. For school- and district-level AMO data for reading, writing, math and science, go to: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/amos>. Individual School/District Performance Frameworks are available at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance>.

³ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools			
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and the other academic indicator ⁴ based on data for SY 2012-13. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by LEAs in private schools. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2012-13
All Title I schools	629	23	3.66
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	473	6	1.27
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	156	17	10.90

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado was granted an NCLB flexibility waiver to use its state system for federal accountability. For information about Colorado's flexibility waiver, visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/NCLBwaiver.asp>. Colorado's system incorporates participation, graduation rates and performance on state reading, writing, math and science tests, as well as academic growth in reading, writing and math, overall as well as by minority students, those with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged and English learners (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/coloradogrowthmodel>) and other postsecondary workforce readiness indicators. Accountability status is based on academic achievement and growth as well as other factors, and a percentage of total performance framework points. For more information about Colorado's School and District Performance Frameworks, visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/performanceframeworks>. To view current and historical performance frameworks, visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance>. However, to fit within federal reporting requirements and the CSPR, Colorado was able to report only whether graduation rate and reading and math participation and performance targets were met, for the school/district overall as well as any disaggregated ethnic/students groups (16+). A school/district that failed to meet one of these targets on the part of even one group was considered not to have made all of its AMOs.

Participation targets remain 95% across content areas and grade spans. Other Indicator targets are: EM, percent Advanced=1.33%; H, 4-, 5-, 6- or 7-year graduation rate => 80%. AMOs began with the percent Proficient and Advanced on TCAP (Developing/Novice on CoAlt) for the all-students group in the 50th percentile school/district at each grade span/content area and increase incrementally to the 90th percentile by 2015-16. The following are the 2012-13 school performance targets, with the one-year incremental raise since 2011-12:

Reading (E=75.975, +4.375; M=75.6, +4.2; H=76.775, +3.475)

Math (E=75.5, +4.6; M=58.125, +5.625; H=38.825, +5.325)

The following are the 2012-13 district performance targets, with the one-year incremental raise since 2011-12:

Reading (E=74.7, +3.2; M=73.8, +3.3; H=74.8, +3.3)

Math (E=74.0, +3.5; M=54.7, +4.7; H=37.2, +5.0)

For more information about Colorado's accountability system under its NCLB flexibility waiver, go to: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/District%20Accountability%20Handbook2013v4.pdf>. For school- and district-level AMO data for reading, writing, math and science, go to: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/amos>. Individual School/District Performance Frameworks are available at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance>.

⁴ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

For an SEA that has not received ESEA flexibility, or an SEA that received ESEA flexibility without the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2012-13
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

For an SEA with an approved ESEA flexibility request that includes the optional waiver to not make AYP determinations for LEAs and schools:

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that met all of their AMOs, the 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator ⁵ based on data for SY 2012-13. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2012-13	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator
173	6	3.47
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado was granted an NCLB flexibility waiver to use its state system for federal accountability. For information about Colorado's flexibility waiver, visit http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/NCLBWaiver.asp . Colorado's system incorporates participation, graduation rates and performance on state reading, writing, math and science tests, as well as academic growth in reading, writing and math, overall as well as by minority students, those with disabilities, students who are economically disadvantaged and English learners (http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/coloradogrowthmodel) and other postsecondary workforce readiness indicators. Accountability status is based on academic achievement and growth as well as other factors, and a percentage of total performance framework points. For more information about Colorado's School and District Performance Frameworks, visit http://www.cde.state.co.us/accountability/performanceframeworks . To view current and historical performance frameworks, visit http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance . However, to fit within federal reporting requirements and the CSPR, Colorado was able to report only whether graduation rate and reading and math participation and performance targets were met, for the school/district overall as well as any disaggregated ethnic/students groups (16+). A school/district that failed to meet one of these targets on the part of even one group was considered not to have made all of its AMOs. Participation targets remain 95% across content areas and grade spans. Other Indicator targets are: EM, percent Advanced=1.33%; H, 4-, 5-, 6- or 7-year graduation rate => 80%. AMOs began with the percent Proficient and Advanced on TCAP (Developing/Novice on CoAlt) for the all-students group in the 50th percentile school/district at each grade span/content area and increase incrementally to the 90th percentile by 2015-16. The following are the 2012-13 school performance targets, with the one-year incremental raise since 2011-12: Reading (E=75.975, +4.375; M=75.6, +4.2; H=76.775, +3.475) Math (E=75.5, +4.6; M=58.125, +5.625; H=38.825, +5.325) The following are the 2012-13 district performance targets, with the one-year incremental raise since 2011-12: Reading (E=74.7, +3.2; M=73.8, +3.3; H=74.8, +3.3) Math (E=74.0, +3.5; M=54.7, +4.7; H=37.2, +5.0) For more information about Colorado's accountability system under its NCLB flexibility waiver, go to: http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/District%20Accountability%20Handbook2013v4.pdf. For school- and district-level AMO data for reading, writing, math and science, go to: http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/amos. Individual School/District Performance Frameworks are available at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance.		

⁵ For a high school, the other academic indicator is always graduation rate.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado no longer identifies schools for corrective action due to our flexibility waiver.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado no longer identifies schools for restructuring due to our flexibility waiver.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following describes the actions taken for districts that received Title I funds and were identified for Improvement.

Districts receiving Priority Improvement or Turnaround District Performance Framework plans are required to submit Unified Improvement Plans (UIPs). These districts have received technical assistance in developing their UIPs. Unified Improvement Planning establishes a common approach to improvement planning required by state and federal law. More information regarding Colorado's UIP process can be found at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip>.

CDE provides grants for district improvement processes. The District Improvement Grant can be used for a diagnostic review of district programs, a self-assessment process, or implementation of the findings from either of these processes. The district appraisal and self assessment processes both use rubrics based on the characteristics of high performing districts to assess performance in: Standards and Instructional Planning, Best First Instruction, Assessment of and for learning, Tiered Support, Leadership, Culture and Climate, Educator Effectiveness, and Continuous Improvement.

Depending on district size, the diagnostic review is conducted by teams of 3 to 6 experts. The diagnostic review process is rubric-based and collects evidence through document analysis, interviews and observations/walkthroughs. Once the report is complete, the CADI team leader works with district staff to plan a "roll out" of the findings to various stakeholders (School Board members, administrative staff, teaching staff, parents and community members). Following formal roll out, district central office staff convene meetings to develop the district's UIP. Additional funding may be available to help districts focus on implementing their UIP strategies and evaluating their programs. Funding targets activities that build district capacity for leadership and system improvement and is tied to the diagnostic review findings.

Districts identified with Priority Improvement or Turnaround performance plans also are eligible to apply for 1003(a) reallocated funds to address identified leadership, culture and climate, and best first instruction needs. Participating districts must submit proposals for how they will address the specific issues that were identified as a result of a thorough needs assessment and propose an action plans for developing programs and activities that address these identified needs.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2012-13 (based on SY 2011-12 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2012-13
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2011-12 and beginning of SY 2012-13 as a corrective action)	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado no longer identifies districts for corrective action due to our flexibility waiver.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2012-13 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado no longer calculates AYP based on our flexibility waiver.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2012-13 data was complete	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" refers to Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* .

1.4.8.5 Use of Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds.**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2012 (SY 2012-13) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part I of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2012-13.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1003g Tiered Intervention Grant - Technical Assistance and Support to districts: The Office of School and District Improvement provides monthly onsite support to each grantee. Performance managers monitor implementation of the scope of work identified in the schools' UIPs. Schools are expected to review and report out monthly on all major improvement strategies and performance targets identified in their UIPs. Grantees, supported by Performance Managers, work with district leadership to organize various trainings, revise schedules and establish new practices to ensure leadership capacity is developed at the building level. Grantees have established Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and building leadership teams to assist with implementing their UIPs.

Grantees and Performance Managers co-present the initial stages and lessons learned from Tiered Intervention Grant development and implementation at a Colorado administrator conference. Grantees share grant implementation experiences, systemic changes, and lessons learned from this process during quarterly PLCs.

Performance managers developed a tool and process to support the monitoring process and subsequent rounds of grant applications, including revisions to the RFP, needs assessments/reviews, target setting, and improvement planning applications for eligible sites. Colorado utilizes information from other states to improve our monitoring process. The tool is shared with grantees and differentiated for each site based on the chosen reform model. Sites are being monitored to ensure they are meeting the requirements of their chosen reform model. Performance managers attend regional School Improvement Grants conferences and share the information with grantees. Support was provided to Cohort II sites for planning and needs assessments in preparation for the release of the RFP.

Evaluation:

Awardees are expected to collect data on the leading indicators outlined in 1003g guidance, report them to CDE and include them in the data analysis portion of the UIP (where possible).

CDE takes into account the total percent of points earned on the Colorado School Performance Framework to evaluate the effectiveness of the SIG model. SIG renewal decisions are based on fidelity to implementation as well as student performance on both state and locally administered assessments.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2012-13 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following describes the actions taken for Title I schools identified for Improvement supported by funds other than sections 1003(a) and 1003(g).

Unified Improvement Planning: Schools assigned a Priority Improvement or Turnaround School Performance Framework plan must submit a Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). Districts have received technical assistance in developing their UIPs including how to assist their schools. Unified improvement planning provides a common approach for schools to prepare improvement plans required by state and federal law. More information regarding the Unified Improvement Plan process can be found at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip>.

Statewide System of Accountability and Support: The CDE Statewide System of Accountability and Support provides incentives, opportunities and support for districts and schools as they manage their performance. By engaging in a continuous improvement cycle to manage their performance, districts and schools will improve their effectiveness and the outcomes for their students. That cycle includes:

- Focus attention on the right things.
- All learners prepared for postsecondary learning or to enter the workplace.
- Intermediate results evaluated based on state-defined performance indicators.
- Evaluate performance - gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data about performance in each indicator area (metrics) to evaluate/monitor performance.
- Plan improvement strategies based on data and root cause analysis and defining implementation benchmarks.
- Implement planned improvement strategies.

More information regarding the Statewide System of Accountability and Support can be found at:

<http://www.schoolview.org/documents/SSASSystemComponents.pdf>.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	55,744
Applied to transfer	1,621
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,572
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA.

Transportation for Public School Choice		Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice		\$ 995,277

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	11

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. *How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice?* In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The number of students who received supplemental educational services should include all students who were enrolled with a provider and participated in some hours of services. States and LEAs have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation needed by a student to be considered as having received services.

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	31,677
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,860
Received supplemental educational services	5,267
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 5,263,348
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	256,223	254,919	99.49	1,304	0.51
All elementary classes	159,643	158,935	99.56	708	0.44
All secondary classes	96,580	95,984	99.38	596	0.62

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The percentage of classes taught by HQ teachers at the secondary level overall is lower than the percentage in either the highest or lowest poverty quartiles because the middle quartiles have a lower percentage of HQ teachers than either the highest or lowest poverty. Also, Colorado considers 6-8 and 7-8 schools secondary, but K-8 schools elementary. However, any school that includes grades 9-12 is considered secondary. Therefore, K-12 schools are considered secondary.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado uses a departmentalized approach where an elementary classroom is counted multiple times so that the data is comparable from the elementary to secondary level.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

1.5.2.1 Elementary School Classes	
Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	19.80
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	9.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	52.10
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.5.2.2 Secondary School Classes	
Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	16.80
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	4.60
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	57.20
Other (please explain in comment box below)	21.40
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes both regular education and special education teachers who do not have subject-matter competency and are not fully certified.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	40,659	40,623	99.91
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	43,862	43,614	99.43
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	21,221	21,126	99.55
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	34,915	34,787	99.63

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	73.11	21.70
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced cost lunch	
Secondary schools	63.74	25.66
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced cost lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- c. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- d. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- 1. Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
- 2. Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Chinese
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	////////////////////////////////////
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	////////////////////////////////////

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Push-in ELL teachers team-teach and provide instruction in the regular classroom.
 District students are in regular education classroom with differentiation.
 Immersion
 Literacy-based ESL
 Interventionist model support through peer modeling
 Co-teaching
 Woodcock Muñoz Model School(s)
 A content strand of systematic English language development
 Sheltered Content Instruction, Daily ELD Blocks
 Heritage Language support, as needed

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	114,415
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	114,254
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	96,188
Vietnamese	1,876
Arabic	1,710
Chinese	1,324
Russian	1,027

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	102,939
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	890
Total	103,829
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number tested on WIDA ACCESS is lower than the number receiving services throughout the year because our English learners are highly migratory, often leaving Colorado and the U.S. for extended periods of time and, in so doing, were not here during the WIDA ACCESS testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	17,086
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.46
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		102,789
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		888
Total		103,677
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado's English learner population is highly mobile, often leaving Colorado and the U.S. for extended periods of time. As such, many were not here during the testing window for WIDA ACCESS.		

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested		#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.		18,171

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	39,218	46.35		
Attained proficiency	17,064	16.60	11,307	11.00

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In alignment with Colorado's NCLB Flexibility Waiver, AMAO 1 (making progress) for 2013 was based on the amount of English learning growth that occurred. LEAs must have earned 62.5% of the growth points possible to meet the target. Growth points are determined for each grade span by the median growth percentile. For more information on calculating AMAOs, visit: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tiii/amaos>.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes <u> </u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No <u> </u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No <u> </u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado offers Lectura and Escritura, Spanish language reading and writing assessments, to eligible 3rd and 4th graders, although Colorado currently has an NCLB flexibility waiver and does not calculate AYP. Lectura scores are included in reading AMOs, but neither Lectura or Escritura scores are included in the reading and writing growth percentiles that go into calculating AMAO 3, as the Colorado Growth Model is based on TCAP reading, writing and math growth only, and cannot be applied to Lectura/Escritura or CoAlt data.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for ESEA accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not offer a non-English mathematics assessment.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not offer a non-English science assessment.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
11,067	9,404	20,471
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,345	8,065	56.22	6,280
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,276	10,135	70.99	4,141
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,055	1,840	36.40	3,215
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

Title III Subgrantees		#
Total number of subgrantees for the year		61
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs		12
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1		20
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2		49
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3		24
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs		10
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2011-12 and 2012-13)		46
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2012-13 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years		46
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13)		37

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Consortium members counted only as part of their consortium. Each consortium counted as one sub-grantee.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
9,060	2,305	33

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term ' Language instruction educational program ' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

Title III Teachers		#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.		5,615
Estimate number of <u>additional</u> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.		1,500

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Professional Development (PD) Topics	# Subgrantees
Instructional strategies for LEP students	117
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	117
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	100
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	63
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	54
Other (Explain in comment box)	14

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	127	19,771
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	96	3,689
PD provided to principals	109	1,519
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	73	734
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	49	3,491
PD provided to community based organization personnel	24	501
Total	//////////	29,705

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Responses to Other PD topics (above) include:
 Cultural diversity and proficiency training, SIOP, ACCESS Data Interpretation, AMAOs, Systematic English Language Development Instructional Practices, Co-teaching, Best Practices, PD 360, differentiated instruction, job embedded professional development (instructional coaching, lesson study and peer observation), Educators for Social Responsibility--Guided Discipline and Advisory, ACCESS/WIDA training, Leading the Learning and Educator Effectiveness, School Reform/School Improvement, instruction that supports higher order thinking skills

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2012-13 funds July 1, 2012, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2012, for SY 2012-13 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/12	07/01/12	30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

USDE's preliminary allocations are available to districts in the Spring of each year for budgeting and application process purposes. These are provided with anticipation that LEAs applying for funds will have Substantial Approval by July 1st. Applications and budgets are due by June 30th of each year. However, application extensions are granted to LEAs that request them. Each LEA application is reviewed on a case-by-case basis within 30 days of receipt. After review, each LEA is notified that its application has been given final approval, substantial approval, or no approval. If the Department is unable to give an application final approval, the LEA is notified of the changes that must be made in order to give the application final approval.

Substantial approval means that an LEA may obligate but not draw down funds. Once an LEA has received final application approval, funds are available for draw down. However, any carryover funds continue to be made available to districts prior to final approval of its current application. Also, Colorado does not allow an LEA to draw down funds until Colorado receives grant award notification from USDE, which typically occurs mid-July. However, funds are available for LEA draw down as soon as Colorado receives its award notification from USDE and the Department has established that the LEA has met federal and state NCLB requirements for release of the funds.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools		#
Persistently Dangerous Schools		0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youth and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youth and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	131	131
LEAs with subgrants	51	51
Total	182	182
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Information includes two regional sub-grantees		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youth in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	175	946
K	508	1,551
1	523	1,598
2	475	1,549
3	435	1,459
4	454	1,395
5	434	1,231
6	391	1,158
7	386	1,034
8	345	1,053
9	371	1,121
10	299	1,032
11	288	910
12	470	1,367
Ungraded		
Total	5,554	17,404
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	631	2,389
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,312	13,438
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	128	354
Hotels/Motels	483	1,223
Total	5,554	17,404
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.3 Subgroups of Homeless Students Enrolled

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students enrolled during the regular school year.

Special Population	# Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	496	1,394
Migratory children/youth	77	249
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	404	2,231
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	385	2,983
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youth Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youth by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	177
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	979
K	1,574
1	1,609
2	1,561
3	1,475
4	1,406
5	1,249
6	1,172
7	1,048
8	1,062
9	1,129
10	1,044
11	919
12	1,450
Ungraded	
Total	17,854
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,463
Migratory children/youth	528
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,231
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,983
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youth.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youth who were tested on the State reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for ESEA.

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	247	137	1,093	563
4	254	143	1,031	424
5	253	138	953	435
6	222	134	935	480
7	191	97	859	371
8	203	93	826	346
High School	343	182	1,555	671

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	247	141	1,107	525
4	252	151	1,031	473
5	251	118	953	369
6	221	88	937	346
7	192	72	863	229
8	201	62	835	183
High School	342	57	1,571	188

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs Without Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3				
4				
5	251	78	951	212
6				
7				
8	204	62	826	200
High School	135	40	714	185

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado administers a science assessment in grades 5, 8 and 10 only.