



COLORADO
Department of Education

Improving Early Literacy: 2015 Annual Report on the Colorado READ Act





Submitted to:
State Board of Education
Governor of Colorado
President of the Senate
Speaker of the House of Representatives
House of Representatives Education Committee
Senate Education Committee

By:
Melissa Colman, Ph.D.; Executive Director of Teaching and Learning
Alisa Dorman; Executive Director of the Office of Literacy

Data analyzed by:
Whitney Westgaard; Data Analyst of the Office of Literacy

2015

Teaching and Learning Unit/Office of Literacy
201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203
303-866-6189
Dorman_A@cde.state.co.us



Table of Contents

Introduction 4

Background on the Colorado READ Act
Report Purpose

Prevalence of Significant Reading Deficiencies in 2013-14 4

Reduction of Significant Reading Deficiencies Statewide
Trends Across Demographic Groups
Instructional Value of READ Interim Assessments
Summary of 2014 Data Reported
Limitations of Data

Implementation Highlights 9

Distribution of Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
Available Resources for Colorado School Districts
Early Literacy Grant Program
Early Literacy Assessment Tool Project

Conclusion 17

Appendices 18

Appendix A: Early Literacy Grant (ELG) Districts, Schools, and Awards for 2013-2014
Appendix B: Early Literacy Assessment Tool (ELAT) Participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) 2013-2014
Appendix C: READ Act Per-Pupil Intervention Funds

Introduction

Research shows that proficiency in reading by the end of third grade enables students to shift from learning to read to reading to learn in order to master the more complex subject matter they encounter in the fourth grade curriculum. Most students who fail to reach this critical milestone falter in the later grades and often drop out before earning a high school diploma. *How do we ensure students have, by the end of third grade, the reading skills necessary to support their success in the fourth grade and beyond?* Effective early reading instruction and targeted intervention support have the greatest potential to change the trajectory of Colorado’s most at-risk readers – helping to ensure they meet the goal reading by third grade. Early literacy remains a top educational priority for Colorado as evidenced by the continued support for the READ Act and its implementation.

“Students who are not proficient in reading by the end of third grade are four times more likely to drop out of high school than proficient readers.” (Annie E. Casey Foundation)

Background on the Colorado READ Act

The Colorado READ Act passed in 2012 with the purpose of ensuring every student in Colorado reaches reading proficiency by the end of third grade. The provisions of the Act promote early identification of reading difficulties and effective intervention to quickly close reading gaps and ensure all Colorado students can demonstrate a level of competency in reading skills necessary to achieve success in school. Pursuant to the READ Act, teachers in grades kindergarten through 3 administer an interim assessment to all children in order to determine whether children are making sufficient progress to grade level reading proficiency. When students are identified as significantly below grade level (called a “significant reading deficiency” or SRD), teachers administer a diagnostic assessment to determine specific areas of need for reading improvement. Teachers use this information to collaboratively develop an intervention plan (called a READ plan) with the child’s parents to bring the child up to grade level reading proficiency. Students continue to receive intervention supports until the teacher determines that the child has met reading skill competencies of their current grade level.

Report Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of accomplishments since the last report in April 2014. The report also provides a summary and analysis of data collected through the spring 2014 READ Act data collection. Limitations of the data are also described.



Prevalence of Significant Reading Deficiencies in 2013-14

Reduction of Significant Reading Deficiencies Statewide

In spring of 2014, the assessment results for 261,343 K-3 students were reported through the READ Act data collection. Of those students, 14% (37,506) were identified as having a significant reading deficiency (“SRD”), representing a decrease of 2% (4,973) from spring 2013.

Kindergarten students were less likely to be identified than students in grades 1–3. Less than 13% (4,131) of kindergarten students were identified with an SRD with 7% attending half-day kindergarten and 6%



attending full-day kindergarten. 18% (11,619) of first grade, 16% (10,536) of second grade, and 17% (11,220) of third grade students were identified as having an SRD. These figures are represented in Table 1.


TABLE 1: Comparison of Students Identified as Having an SRD Between 2013 and 2014 Data Collections.

Grade	Number (%) of students identified with SRD in 2013	Number (%) of students identified with SRD in 2014
Half-day kindergarten	1,248 (7%)	1,210 (7%)
Full-day kindergarten	3,526 (8%)	2,921 (6%)
Grade 1	13,145 (20%)	11,619 (18%)
Grade 2	12,310 (19%)	10,536 (16%)
Grade 3	12,250 (19%)	11,220 (17%)
Total	42,479 (16%)	37,506 (14%)

Trends Across Demographic Groups

An analysis of the 2014 READ Act data reveals a number of trends across racial/ethnic groups by grades. American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino students were more likely to be identified with a significant reading deficiency than their Asian, White, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and multi-racial peers (respectively, 24%, 20%, and 22% compared to 11%, 9%, and 11%). These numbers further underscore the importance of early learning, strong initial literacy instruction for all students, and immediate intervention when challenges become apparent. Figure 1 depicts these trends.

FIGURE 1: Comparison of SRD Determination by Demographic Group from 2013 and 2014 Data Collections.



Students eligible for free or reduced lunch (FRL) were nearly three times more likely to be identified with an SRD than their non-eligible peers (23% compared to 8%). This trend is consistent with national data that students from low-income families are more likely to have less exposure to early reading experiences and thus may experience reading difficulties upon entering school. State data combined with national trends reinforces the importance of high-quality early prevention programs, including high-quality preschool and full-day

kindergarten, for at-risk populations of students such as children of poverty. Figure 2 depicts these trends amongst impoverished students.

FIGURE 2: Comparison of SRD Determination Among FRL Students and Non-FRL Students from 2013 and 2014 Data Collections.




Figure 3 depicts gender differences in the number of students identified with significant reading deficiencies. Male students were more likely than female students to be identified with an SRD at a rate of 16% compared with 14%.

FIGURE 3: Comparison of SRD Determination by Gender from 2013 and 2014 Data Collections.







Figure 4 depicts trends among students receiving special education services. Students receiving special education services were more likely to be identified with an SRD than their non-eligible peers (48% compared to 10%). This trend was expected as the cut-scores for an SRD are low and tend to represent the lower quartile of students.

FIGURE 4: SRD Determination Among Students Receiving Special Education Services Compared to their Non-Eligible Peers from 2013 and 2014 Data Collections.



Only 1% of students receiving gifted education services were identified with an SRD across the state at all grade levels. It should be noted that it is possible for students to be identified for gifted education services for subject areas other than reading, yet these students may demonstrate a need for additional support in reading.

Non-English Proficient (NEP) students were more likely to be identified with an SRD than their English speaking peers (41% compared to 13%). In addition, the proportion of NEP students identified as having an SRD increased by grade level with 15% of full day kindergarten NEP students identified increasing to 75% of third graders. Limited English Proficient (LEP) were also more likely to be identified with a significant reading deficiency than their English speaking peers (20% compared to 14%). This trend remained consistent across all grade levels. Similar to the trend for NEP students, as grade level increased, so too did the proportion of LEP students identified with an SRD (8% of full-day kindergarten students and 31% of grade 3 students). The trends related to English Language Learners is consistent with expectations given that English Learners must learn a new language while also transferring known concepts and skills from the first language to English. The Office of Literacy has developed guidance and resources to support districts in using the READ Act to help support the literacy and language needs of English learners.

Table 2 illustrates the percentage of NEP and LEP students identified with SRD by grade level and averaged across grade levels.



TABLE 2: Prevalence of SRD Determination among Non-English Speaking and Limited English Speaking Students in the 2014 Data Collection.

Grade	Number (percentage) of students identified with SRD also Non English Proficient (NEP) in 2014	Number (percentage) of students identified with SRD also Limited English Proficient (LEP) in 2014
Half-day kindergarten	77 (24%)	114 (11%)
Full-day kindergarten	853 (15%)	437 (8%)
Grade 1	2,934 (45%)	997 (16%)
Grade 2	1,891 (61%)	1,896 (20%)
Grade 3	1,143 (75%)	2,994 (31%)
Total	6,898 (41%)	6,438 (20%)

**Note: Table 2 displays the percentage of K-3 Non-English Proficient and Limited English Proficient students identified with a Significant Reading Deficiency as reported by districts in the 2014 Data Collection.*

Instructional Value of READ Interim Assessments

READ Act interim assessments are intended to measure critical early literacy indicators – those that are most important for future reading success. These interim assessments differ from the state summative assessment in that the summative assessment is a comprehensive assessment designed to determine students’ mastery of grade level standards. Early identification of students at-risk will serve to support better outcomes in general. Research has shown that interim assessments have a correlation with state summative assessments. For example, tests of oral reading fluency have a .80 correlation with state summative assessments. This suggests information gleaned from interim assessments can be extremely useful in identifying which students may struggle in mastering grade-level standards allowing for additional resources and services to be provided early as a means of prevention.

Summary of 2014 Data Reported

The 2013-14 school year marked the second reporting period of Colorado students with a significant reading deficiency. Pursuant to READ Act requirements, Colorado’s local education agencies (LEAs) provided data to CDE in the end-of-year data collection based on administration of READ Act assessments in the spring of 2014. The vast majority of kindergarten through third grade students participated (97%). The half-day kindergarten population had the smallest proportion of tested students (93%). Three categories of students are designated as allowable exemptions as defined by reporting guidelines:


- English Language Learners—students designated non-English proficient and in a school in the United States less than one year (4% of exemptions);
- Part-time students who did not receive reading instruction during their time at school (66% of exemptions); and
- Students who qualify for special education services and have a severe disability that prevents testing, even with an accommodation (27% of exemptions).

A small percentage of students were provided assessment accommodations (1%), with equal proportions of students across all grade levels represented.



Generally, schools within a district administered the same assessment tool. In some districts, multiple tools were used. Figure 5 illustrates district adoption of particular interim assessment as of spring 2014. The most widely adopted interim assessment by districts was DIBELS Next (81%). The second most widely adopted was DRA2 (15%). Together, these two assessments make up 96% of district interim assessment selection. As of July 1, 2016, DRA2 will no longer be a State Board-approved interim assessment and thus the adoption distribution for future collections will change.

FIGURE 5: Distribution of District Adoption of State Board Approved Interim Assessment as Reported in Spring 2014 Data Collection.



Note: This chart does not include the Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST) or the istation assessments because those assessments were not selected by any schools/districts.

Limitations of Data

The department has worked to resolve some of the complications with the collection of data to ensure that it is more valid and reliable in the future. Interpretations of the changes between years should be done with caution. The first year’s data, like all initial data collection efforts, was less clean than the second year and included fewer students. Improvements in the collection from year one to year two resulted in more students total in the collection. The department is working to increase communication to the field regarding reporting requirements and to provide support for an accurate count. Districts are encouraged to include all students who are enrolled at the time of reporting data regardless of whether or not the student was tested and/or changing enrollment status at the year’s end. Each year, the data will improve. After this year’s collection, we should be able to make more meaningful year over year comparisons.

Implementation Highlights

Distribution of Per-Pupil Intervention Funds

The READ Act provides per-pupil intervention funds to assist districts with interventions for students identified with a significant reading deficiency. During the 2014 legislative session, the General Assembly allocated additional funds to support Colorado’s early literacy efforts, bringing the total funds available for annual allocation to districts to approximately \$33 million, more than doubling the previous allocation. The state’s



investment in and commitment to early literacy serves to advance Colorado’s collective goal of all children reading at grade level by the end of third grade.

The department allocates the per-pupil intervention funds to LEAs by dividing the amount of moneys available by the total number of students enrolled in kindergarten through third grades in public schools identified as having a significant reading deficiency. LEAs may use the per-pupil intervention funds to provide full-day kindergarten, operate a summer school literacy program, purchase tutoring services, and/or provide other targeted, scientifically- or evidence-based intervention services as allowed in statute.

In the spring of 2014, districts reported 37,516 students as having a significant reading deficiency. Approximately \$33 million was distributed to 181 reporting LEAs at a per pupil rate of approximately \$884. This represented an increase of \$18 million in per pupil funding over the prior year. In 2014, districts began voluntarily reporting how they used their per pupil funds. Intervention services and full-day kindergarten were reported as the most frequent use of per pupil funds. A list of districts and distribution amounts is included in Appendix C.

Available Resources for Colorado School Districts

Through the READ Act funding, the Office of Literacy provides field support services statewide through regional Literacy Specialists. Specialists are available to support schools and districts upon request through onsite technical assistance and professional development. Over 300 onsite visits have been conducted this school year. Districts report that the technical assistance is a valuable resource. Onsite visits were generally focused on interpretation of reading data, professional development through coaching and modeling, and alignment of goals for improving reading outcomes.

Figure 6 shows the distribution of technical assistance support across the state. Literacy specialists have been strategically placed in different regions to make access to support services more easily available to schools and districts. As expected, the more densely populated areas, such as the Denver Metro or Pikes Peak region, have requested the most amount of support.

FIGURE 6: Percentage of On-site Technical Assistance Visits by Region.






Table 3 identifies broad categories of support requested by schools and district. The single most requested need for assistance from schools and districts is in the area of data interpretation as seen in the first two rows of the table. The second most requested need is in professional development through onsite coaching or modeling of research-based strategies. The third most requested area of need is in alignment of school/districts goals for improving reading. Regional Literacy Specialist worked with districts to support them in addressing these needs.

TABLE 3: Categories and Percentage of Technical Assistance Provided.

Analysis of student system level data to inform the effectiveness of instructional supports	16%
Interpretation of interim and/or diagnostic assessment data to inform instruction and intervention	13%
Development of individual READ plans to support students	4%
Professional development through coaching and or modeling of research-based instructional strategies	20%
Review and selection of scientifically based instructional programs to support multi-tiered instruction	5%
Alignment of school/district goals and strategies for improved reading achievement for all students	18%
Other	7%

Also, in support of effective implementation of the READ Act, the Office of Literacy continues to create resources that are easily accessible through the READ Act website managed by the CDE (see <http://cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/index.asp>). Examples include frequently asked questions, fact sheets, timelines for implementing key components of the law, and guidance for supporting diverse populations such as English Language Learners. In addition, webinars on a variety of topics have been recorded and posted the website. Specifically, webinars were conducted to support the use of each interim assessment for identification of students who have significant reading deficiencies and how data from those assessments can be used to support interventions and services through the creation of a READ plan.

Statewide Professional Development

Through READ Act funds, the Office of Literacy was able to launch a statewide, no-cost professional development opportunity for K-3 teachers to support early literacy knowledge and skills. The initiative, known as the READING Foundations Academy, is a 21 contact hour course offered over seven modules. It is designed for K-3 teachers, interventionists, special educators, student teachers, paraprofessionals and building or district level leadership.


The focus of the course is on explicit and systematic instruction in reading with an emphasis on the foundational reading skills. The foundational skills include the five essential reading components identified within the READ Act (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary including oral language, and comprehension). Academy participants are supported in applying new learning to classroom practice.

The Academy is offered regionally throughout the state. In the 2014-2015 school year, 40 sessions have been offered with more than 800 educators attending. Some participating districts include Pagosa Springs,

Steamboat, Meeker, Lakewood, Westminster, Longmont, Loveland, Peyton, Colorado Springs, Canon City, Florence, Aurora, Limon, Carbondale, Englewood, and Greeley.


Feedback from READING Foundation Academy participants has been favorable. As seen in Figure 7, 99% of participants indicated that they agree or strongly agree that they would be able to effectively apply the content of the READING Foundations Academy in their classrooms.

FIGURE 7: I will be able to effectively apply what I learned in my classroom



96% of participants strongly agree or agree that the activities and skills incorporated in the Academy were relevant to their needs as teachers of early reading development as seen in Figure 8.

FIGURE 8: The activities and skills were relevant.





The READING Foundations Academy has proven to be effective in meeting the needs of educators in the area of early reading development. The response from districts has been positive. Interest in the Academy remains high. As such, the Office of Literacy plans to continue offering Academy sessions into the next school year with a goal of reaching even more educators in the second year of implementation.

Early Literacy Grant Program

The READ Act initiated an Early Literacy Grant program designed to enable schools to better meet the literacy needs of their students. The Early Literacy Grant is designed to distribute funds to local education providers, including school districts, Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), and district charter schools or Institute Charter Schools. The grants ensure participating schools embed the essential components of reading into all elements of the primary, K-3 teaching structures including universal instruction, targeted supports and intensive interventions. The grants serve to assist all students in achieving reading competency. The Early Literacy Grant is funded every three years. The current cycle is from 2013—2016, with the first year of implementation completed during the 2013—2014 school year.

In the spring of 2013, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was released by the department to solicit applications for the Early Literacy Grant. A total of 16 grant awards were made representing 30 schools in 15 school districts in 7 regions of the state, totaling \$4 million. A list of participating districts, schools, and awards is provided in Appendix A.

Participating schools are implementing instructional programming selected from a list of highly vetted programs from CDE's Advisory List which is available on the CDE website (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readact/programming>). Schools selected a core program for universal instruction in addition to one or more intervention programs to provide targeted and intensive interventions to students determined to be reading below grade level. Participating schools also use Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Next (DIBELS Next) or the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS) to screen students at the beginning, middle, and end of the year to determine which students may need additional literacy support. DIBELS Next or PALS is also used to progress monitor students who are receiving reading intervention at least every two weeks to ensure students are making adequate progress for reaching reading proficiency. In addition to ongoing support from CDE, each school receives on-site support from an early literacy expert 1-3 days a month through an approved professional development provider from the department's Advisory List of Professional Development.

Results from Year One. As a part of the grant agreement, participating schools must meet at least one of three goals annually: (1) decrease the percentage of students scoring in the unsatisfactory range on the third grade state summative assessment by at least 20%, (2) decrease the percentage of students identified as having a significant reading deficiency in grades K-3 by at least 25%, and/or (3) decrease the percentage of students reading below benchmark by at least 50%.


After one year of implementation, twenty-four schools (80%) met at least one of the three program goals. Ten schools (33%) met at least two goals. One school met all three goals. Schools were more likely to reach the goal of reducing the percentage of students identified as having a significant reading deficiency than they were to meet the other two goals.

As a requirement of the grant, schools report the percent of students scoring below grade level expectations at the beginning of year and end of year. At the beginning of the year, assessment data indicated that 44% (3,324 of 7,490 students) in grades K-3 were performing below expectations. At the end of the year, assessment data



revealed that the percent of students performing below expectations dropped to 26% (1,903 of 7,354). Figure 9 shows the progress made by students in ELG schools from the beginning of year (BOY) to end of year (EOY) as measured by their interim assessment. All grades were able to demonstrate a reduction in those scoring below level.

FIGURE 9: Percentage of ELG Students by Grade Level Identified Below Level at Beginning of Year and End of Year.



Early Literacy Assessment Tool Project

The 2012 School Finance Act provided funding for CDE to contract with an assessment vendor to supply an early literacy assessment tool that teachers may use to obtain real-time assessment of the reading skill levels of students in kindergarten and first, second, and third grade. The intent was to support state purchase of software that provides teachers with individualized student assessments which would give immediate results and recommend learning activities based on students’ needs for continued literacy development. Through a competitive bid process, the contract was awarded to Amplify for its interim and diagnostic system of DIBELS Next and DIBELS Deep, both State Board approved assessments for the READ Act.

By participating in the Early Literacy Assessment Tool (ELAT) project, LEAs receive assessment kits and licenses to use the online assessments as well as on-going professional development opportunities associated with using the assessments and the online tool effectively. LEAs are responsible for providing the hardware.

Table 4 shows overall Colorado LEA and school participation information in the ELAT project since its inception. A list of participating LEAs and number of students tested by district is provided in Appendix B

TABLE 4: ELAT Project Participation.

Project Participation	Year 1: 2013 2014	Year 2: 2014 2015
Participating LEAs	121	126
Participating Schools	415	482
Percent of all K-3 students in the state participating in the project	34%	40%

ELAT Project Results



The results of the ELAT project are measured by (1) the reduction in the number of students who are well-below grade level expectations (benchmark) and (2) the increase in the number of students reaching grade level expectations (benchmark). The figures below illustrate the results for the 2013-14 school years.

Figure 10 illustrates the reduction of students within the ELAT project who were performing well-below grade level expectations from the beginning to end of year by grade level during the 2013-14 school year. Overall there was a reduction of 12% from the beginning to end of year in K – 3 students performing well-below grade level expectations, with reductions of 19%, 12%, 6%, and 8% in grades K, 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

FIGURE 10: The Reduction of ELAT Project Students Performing Well-below Benchmark from Beginning of Year (BOY) to the End of the Year (EOY), 2013-2014.





Figure 11 displays the increase of students within the ELAT project who were performing at or above grade level expectations from the beginning to end of year by grade level during the 2013-14 school year. Overall there was an increase of 13% from the beginning to end of the year in K-3 students performing at or above grade level expectations, with increases of 26%, 15%, 4%, and 6% in grades K, 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

FIGURE 11: The Increase of ELAT Project Students Performing at Benchmark from the Beginning of the Year (BOY) to the End of the Year (EOY), 2013-2014.





Similar trends are noted in the mid-year of the 2014-15 school year. Participating schools have realized decreases in the number of students performing well-below grade level and increases in the number of students performing at or above grade level. Figure 12 illustrates the reduction of students within the ELAT project who were performing well-below grade level expectations from the beginning to middle of the year by grade level during the 2014-15 school year. There has been a reduction of 6% from the beginning to the middle of year in K-3 students performing well-below grade level expectations, with reduction of 15%, 5%, 2% and 5% in grades K, 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

FIGURE 12: The Reduction of Colorado Students Performing Well-below Benchmark from the Beginning of the year (BOY) to the Middle of the year (MOY), 2014-2015.





Figure 13 displays the increase of students within the ELAT project who were performing at or above grade level expectations from the beginning to middle of year by grade level during the 2014-15 school year. Overall there was an increase of 8% from the beginning to the middle of year in K-3 students performing at or above grade level expectations, with increases of 18%, 10%, 3%, and 4% in grades K, 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

FIGURE 13: The Increase of Colorado Students Performing at Benchmark from the Beginning of the Year (BOY) to the Middle of the Year (MOY), 2014-2015.



In summary, the schools that have participated in the ELAT project have seen significant growth in their students meeting grade level expectations. This gain resulted in students starting in 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grade at a slightly higher level in the second year of the project, indicating that the gains in kindergarten, 1st grade and 2nd grade set up an increased percentage of students to start the following year on track to reach reading proficiency.

ELAT Project Summary

The ELAT project provides implementation supports to schools along with the software licenses. Project participants receive monthly communications with timely topics. Districts and schools receive face to face trainings to support related to fidelity of assessment use; analysis of data to inform next steps at a district, school and teacher level; use of progress monitoring results to ensure that students are on track to reach proficiency; and implementation reviews which enable districts to shift resources and provide support if needed. CDE literacy office staff also support the schools through onsite visits designed to focus on data with leadership and teachers. These on sites are customized to meet the needs of an individual school and are delivered in a series of 2-4 visits over the course of a school year.

“The world economy demands a more educated workforce, and grade-level reading proficiency is the key.” (Annie E. Casey Foundation)

Conclusion

Reading proficiency by the end of third grade is critical for future educational success. The Colorado READ Act focuses on early literacy development for all students and especially for students at-risk of not achieving third grade reading proficiency. While this year’s data showed a decrease in the number of students having a significant reading deficiency statewide, we want to continue to monitor the year-over-year data as the data collection becomes cleaner, more accurate, and more robust in order make interpretations on trends. Data from the Early Literacy Grant schools is encouraging as is the data from the Early Literacy Assessment Tool project schools. Both suggest that the interventions in place in those schools are having an impact on decreasing the number of students scoring below benchmark at the end of the year. The Office of Literacy has provided guidance and direct support to schools and districts through onsite technical assistance, professional development and resource development. Through these various supports, teachers and leaders are deepening their knowledge, skills and practices to strengthen reading outcomes for all K-3 students.





Appendices

Appendix A: Early Literacy Grant (ELG) Districts, Schools, and Awards for 2013-2014.

District	School	Award
Academy 20	Frontier Elementary, High Plains Elementary, Pioneer Elementary	\$284,564
Adams County School District 50	Skyline Vista Elementary, Sherrelwood Elementary, Harris Park Elementary	\$416,772
Bennett School District 29J	Bennett Elementary	\$109,634
Bethune School District	Bethune Elementary	\$160,555
Burlington School District Re-6J	Burlington Elementary	\$203,491
Delta County School District	Lincoln Elementary	\$167,290
Denver Public Schools	Cole Arts and Sciences Academy, Cesar Chavez Academy	\$276,720
Harrison School District 2	Bricker Elementary School, Giberson Elementary School, Stratmoor Hills Elementary School	\$416,208
Jefferson County Public School District	Westgate Elementary	\$245,994
Lamar School District Re-2	Washington Elementary, Parkview Elementary, Alta Vista Charter School	\$196,185
Mesa County Valley School District	Rocky Mountain Elementary	\$252,336
Morgan County School District Re-3	Sherman Early Childhood Center, Columbine Elementary	\$315,251
Park County School District Re-2	Edith Teter Elementary	\$109,237
Re-1 Valley School District	Campbell Elementary, Ayres Elementary, Caliche Elementary	\$366,346
Roaring Fork School District	Basalt Elementary, Crystal River Elementary, Sopris Elementary, Glenwood Springs Elementary	\$477,062



Appendix B: Early Literacy Assessment Tool (ELAT) Participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) 2013-2014

Participating LEA	Number of Participating Students K-3
Adams 12 Five Star School	12,161
Adams County School District 50	3,158
Alamosa School District RE-11J	717
Archuleta School District 50 JT	408
Arickaree School District R-2	30
Aspen School District	127
Bayfield School District 10-Jt-R	427
Bennett School District	288
Branson RE-82 School District	99
Brighton 27J School District	5,609
Burlington School District RE-6J	232
Calhan School District	109
Campo School District RE-6	14
Canon City Schools	1,123
Centennial School District	61
Center School District	195
Charter School Institute	4,474
Cheraw School #31	69
Cheyenne County School District RE 5	63
Cheyenne Mountain School District	1,459
Clear Creek School District	281
Colorado Springs School District 11	9,243
Cotopaxi Consolidated Schools/Fremont RE-3	49
Crowley County Elementary	127
Custer County Public Schools	102
DeBeque School District 49JT	51
Deer Trail School School District 26J	53
Del Norte Schools C7	128
Delta County School District	1,432
Denver Public Schools	30,098
Dolores County School District RE-2J	92
Dolores School District RE 4A	234
Douglas County School District	19,590
Durango School District 9-R	1,562
Eagle County Schools	2,096
East Grand School District 2	383
Eaton RE-2	601
Edison Elementary School	31
Elbert School District #200	52



Participating LEA	Number of Participating Students K-3
Ellicott School District 22	323
Falcon School District 49	5,270
Fowler Elementary School	119
Fremont Re-2 School District	439
Garfield Re 2	1,538
Genoa-Hugo School District C-113	51
Global Village Academy - Aurora	604
Granada RE-1 School District	51
Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6	7,168
Hanover School District 28	64
Harrison School District Two	4,383
Haxtun Elementary School	92
Hayden School District RE-1	116
Hoehne School District R-3	100
Holly Elementary School	77
Holyoke School District	186
HOPE Online Learning Academy	1,066
Huerfano School District Re-1	164
Idalia School District RJ-3	68
Ignacio School District	250
Jefferson County Public Schools	25,355
Julesburg School District/Julesburg Elementary	86
Karval School District Re-23	19
Kim School District	13
Kiowa C-2 District (Kiowa)	65
Kiowa County School District Re-1 (Eads)	43
Kiowa County School District RE-2 ,(Plainview)	20
Kit Carson School District	31
Lake County School District	331
Lamar RE-2 School District	478
Las Animas School District	155
Lewis-Palmer School District	1,525
Limon Public Schools	158
Lone Star School District #101	42
Mancos Schools	146
McClave School District Re2	73
Meeker School District	226
Mesa County Valley SD 5	6,517
Miami Yoder School	73
Moffat Consolidated SD #2	68
Moffat Consolidated SD RE 1	667



Participating LEA	Number of Participating Students K-3
Monte Vista C-8	298
Montezuma-Cortez School District RE-1	863
Morgan County School District Re-3	919
Mountain Valley School District	35
North Conejos School District RE – J 1	272
North Park SD	50
Otis School District R-3	80
Ouray School District R-1	54
Park County School District RE2	208
Pawnee School District R-12	28
Peyton Elementary School	113
Plateau Valley Elementary	91
Platte Canyon SD 1	268
Poudre School District	8,963
Prairie SD RE 11	58
Pritchett School District RE-3	5
Pueblo City 60	6,051
Pueblo Rural School District 70	2,668
Rangely School District, RE4	208
Revere School District	32
Ridgway School District R-2	86
Roaring Fork School District	1,708
Salida R-32J	363
Sanford School District 6-J	129
Sangre de Cristo School District	99
Sargent RE 33J	126
Sierra Grande	80
South Conejos School District RE-10	72
South Routt School District RE- 3	110
Springfield Elementary	80
Steamboat Springs School District RE-2	764
Stratton School District R-4	75
Thompson School District	4,760
Trinidad School District	358
Walsh School District	49
Weld County School District RE-1 (Gilcrest)	559
Weld County School District RE3J (Keenesburg)	763
Weld Re 7 Schools (Platte Valley)	319
Weld Re-4 School District (Windsor)	1,587
Weld RE-5J School District (Johnstown-Milliken)	1,273



Participating LEA	Number of Participating Students K-3
Weld RE9 School District (Highland)	199
Weldon Valley RE-20j	60
West Grand School District	131
Wiggins School District RE-50J	175
Wiley School District	61
Woodland Park School District Re-2	632
Wray School District	218
Yuma School District-1	253



Appendix C: READ Act Per-Pupil Intervention Funds Distribution Based on 2014 Collection

Numbers from districts reporting fewer than 16 students with identified with significant reading deficiencies are suppressed for student privacy considerations.

District	Number of Eligible Students	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
ACADEMY 20	393	\$346,989.02
ADAMS 12 FIVE STAR SCHOOLS	2,355	\$2,079,285.31
ADAMS COUNTY 14	420	\$370,827.96
ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	3,637	\$3,211,193.57
AGATE 300	N<16	N<16
AGUILAR REORGANIZED 6	N<16	N<16
AKRON R-1	N<16	N<16
ALAMOSA RE-11J	123	\$108,599.62
ARCHULETA COUNTY 50 JT	20	\$17,658.47
ARICKAREE R-2	N<16	N<16
ARRIBA-FLAGLER C-20	N<16	N<16
ASPEN 1	22	\$19,424.32
AULT-HIGHLAND RE-9	35	\$30,902.33
BAYFIELD 10 JT-R	44	\$38,848.64
BENNETT 29J	42	\$37,082.80
BETHUNE R-5	N<16	N<16
BIG SANDY 100J	N<16	N<16
BOULDER VALLEY RE 2	847	\$747,836.39
BRANSON REORGANIZED 82	N<16	N<16
BRIGGS DALE RE-10	N<16	N<16
BRIGHTON 27J	790	\$697,509.74
BRUSH RE-2(J)	47	\$41,497.41
BUENA VISTA R-31	54	\$47,677.88
BUFFALO RE-4J	N<16	N<16
BURLINGTON RE-6J	19	\$16,775.55
BYERS 32J	16	\$14,126.78
CALHAN RJ-1	17	\$15,009.70
CAMPO RE-6	N<16	N<16
CANON CITY RE-1	145	\$128,023.94
CENTENNIAL R-1	18	\$15,892.63
CENTER 26 JT	N<16	N<16
CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	558	\$492,671.43
CHERAW 31	N<16	N<16
CHERRY CREEK 5	1,553	\$1,371,180.54
CHEYENNE COUNTY RE-5	N<16	N<16
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12	73	\$64,453.43



District	Number of Eligible Students	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
CLEAR CREEK RE-1	27	\$23,838.94
COLORADO SPRINGS 11	1,466	\$ 1,294,366.17
COTOPAXI RE-3	N<16	N<16
CRIPPLE CREEK-VICTOR RE-1	17	\$15,009.70
CROWLEY COUNTY RE-1-J	N<16	N<16
CUSTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT C-1	16	\$14,126.78
DE BEQUE 49JT	N<16	N<16
DEER TRAIL 26J	N<16	N<16
DEL NORTE C-7	19	\$16,775.55
DELTA COUNTY 50(J)	215	\$189,828.60
DENVER COUNTY 1	5,172	\$4,566,481.48
DIGITAL BOCES	N<16	N<16
DOLORES COUNTY RE NO.2	18	\$15,892.63
DOLORES RE-4A	28	\$24,721.86
DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	1,649	\$1,455,941.21
DURANGO 9-R	136	\$120,077.63
EADS RE-1	N<16	N<16
EAGLE COUNTY RE 50	400	\$353,169.49
EAST GRAND 2	33	\$29,136.48
EAST OTERO R-1	84	\$74,165.59
EATON RE-2	73	\$64,453.43
EDISON 54 JT	N<16	N<16
ELBERT 200	N<16	N<16
ELIZABETH C-1	58	\$51,209.58
ELLICOTT 22	60	\$52,975.42
ENGLEWOOD 1	261	\$230,443.09
ESTES PARK R-3	55	\$48,560.80
EXPEDITIONARY BOCES	N<16	N<16
FALCON 49	530	\$467,949.57
FORT MORGAN RE-3	106	\$93,589.91
FOUNTAIN 8	427	\$377,008.43
FOWLER R-4J	N<16	N<16
FREMONT RE-2	78	\$68,868.05
FRENCHMAN RE-3	N<16	N<16
GARFIELD 16	65	\$57,390.04
GARFIELD RE-2	288	\$254,282.03
GENOA-HUGO C113	N<16	N<16
GILPIN COUNTY RE-1	20	\$17,658.47
GRANADA RE-1	N<16	N<16
GREELEY 6	1,247	\$1,101,005.88



District	Number of Eligible Students	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
GUNNISON WATERSHED RE1J	86	\$75,931.44
HANOVER 28	N<16	N<16
HARRISON 2	692	\$610,983.21
HAXTUN RE-2J	N<16	N<16
HAYDEN RE-1	20	\$17,658.47
HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1	N<16	N<16
HI-PLAINS R-23	N<16	N<16
HOEHNE REORGANIZED 3	N<16	N<16
HOLLY RE-3	N<16	N<16
HOLYOKE RE-1J	N<16	N<16
HUERFANO RE-1	25	\$22,073.09
IDALIA RJ-3	N<16	N<16
IGNACIO 11 JT	53	\$46,794.96
JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	2,386	\$2,106,656.00
JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN RE-5J	220	\$194,243.22
JULESBURG RE-1	18	\$15,892.63
KARVAL RE-23	N<16	N<16
KEENESBURG RE-3(J)	114	\$100,653.30
KIM	0	0.00
KIOWA C-2	N<16	N<16
KIT CARSON R-1	N<16	N<16
LA VETA RE-2	N<16	N<16
LAKE COUNTY R-1	128	\$113,014.24
LAMAR RE-2	44	\$38,848.64
LAS ANIMAS RE-1	N<16	N<16
LEWIS-PALMER 38	132	\$116,545.93
LIBERTY J-4	0	0.00
LIMON RE-4J	N<16	N<16
LITTLETON 6	304	\$268,408.81
LONE STAR 101	N<16	N<16
MANCOS RE-6	30	\$26,487.71
MANITOU SPRINGS 14	49	\$43,263.26
MANZANOLA 3J	0	0.00
MAPLETON 1	477	\$421,154.61
MC CLAVE RE-2	N<16	N<16
MEEKER RE1	30	\$26,487.71
MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51	1,130	\$997,703.80
MIAMI/YODER 60 JT	19	\$16,775.55
MINERAL	0	0.00
MOFFAT 2	N<16	N<16



District	Number of Eligible Students	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
MOFFAT COUNTY RE:NO 1	112	\$98,887.46
MONTE VISTA C-8	96	\$84,760.68
MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1	233	\$205,721.23
MONTROSE COUNTY RE-1J	251	\$221,613.85
MOUNTAIN VALLEY RE 1	N<16	N<16
NORTH CONEJOS RE-1J	40	\$35,316.95
NORTH PARK R-1	N<16	N<16
NORWOOD R-2J	N<16	N<16
OTIS R-3	N<16	N<16
OURAY R-1	N<16	N<16
PARK COUNTY RE-2	24	\$21,190.17
PAWNEE RE-12	N<16	N<16
PEYTON 23 JT	N<16	N<16
PLAINVIEW	0	0.00
PLATEAU RE-5	0	0.00
PLATEAU VALLEY 50	35	\$30,902.33
PLATTE CANYON 1	29	\$25,604.79
PLATTE VALLEY RE-3	N<16	N<16
PLATTE VALLEY RE-7	53	\$46,794.96
POUDRE R-1	910	\$803,460.59
PRARIE RE-11	N<16	N<16
PRIMERO REORGANIZED 2	0	0.00
PRITCHETT	0	0.00
PUEBLO CITY 60	809	\$714,285.29
PUEBLO COUNTY 70	301	\$265,760.04
RANGELY RE-4	60	\$52,975.42
RIDGWAY R-2	N<16	N<16
ROARING FORK RE-1	302	\$266,642.96
ROCKY FORD R-2	32	\$28,253.56
SALIDA R-32	41	\$36,199.87
SANFORD 6J	N<16	N<16
SANGRE DE CRISTO RE-22J	21	\$18,541.40
SARGENT RE-33J	N<16	N<16
SHERIDAN 2	70	\$61,804.66
SIERRA GRANDE R-30	N<16	N<16
SILVERTON 1	N<16	N<16
SOUTH CONEJOS RE-10	N<16	N<16
SOUTH ROUTT RE 3	N<16	N<16
SPRINGFIELD RE-4	N<16	N<16
ST VRAIN VALLEY RE 1J	1,186	\$1,047,147.53



District	Number of Eligible Students	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2	85	\$75,048.52
STRASBURG 31J	26	\$22,956.02
STRATTON R-4	N<16	N<16
SUMMIT RE-1	128	\$113,014.24
SWINK 33	N<16	N<16
TELLURIDE R-1	44	\$38,848.64
THOMPSON R2-J	581	\$512,978.68
TRINIDAD 1	57	\$50,326.65
VALLEY RE-1	51	\$45,029.11
VILAS RE-5	23	\$20,307.25
WALSH RE-1	N<16	N<16
WELD COUNTY RE-1	65	\$57,390.04
WELD COUNTY S/D RE-8	144	\$127,141.02
WELDON VALLEY RE-20(J)	N<16	N<16
WEST END RE-2	N<16	N<16
WEST GRAND 1-JT.	30	\$26,487.71
WESTMINSTER 50	890	\$785,802.11
WIDEFIELD 3	214	\$188,945.68
WIGGINS RE-50(J)	N<16	N<16
WILEY RE-13 JT	N<16	N<16
WINDSOR RE-4	167	\$147,448.26
WOODLAND PARK RE-2	99	\$87,409.45
WOODLIN R-104	N<16	N<16
WRAY RD-2	N<16	N<16
YUMA 1	51	\$45,029.11
STATE TOTAL minus N<16 districts	36,993	\$32,661,997.08
STATE TOTAL	37,516	\$33,123,766.17