

**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 2014-15



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016

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:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2014-15 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 2014-15, 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 ED Facts 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 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, 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 2014-15 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 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2014-15 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2014-15		
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		
		<u>Tuesday, April 12, 2016, 1:30:13 PM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2014-15



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2015
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
<p><u>No Revisions or changes</u></p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>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.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.

<p>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 were implemented in the 2013-14 school year.</p>

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., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2013-14
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2013-14

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 administered new general and alternate assessments in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics in 2014-15. Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards for Science, changed in 2013-2014 for the elementary and middle grade spans, were changed in 2014-2015 at the high school level. Academic achievement standards for new general and alternate assessments were 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., 2014-15) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2013-14
Regular Assessments in High School	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	SY 2014-15	SY 2014-15	SY 2013-14

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 administered new general and alternate assessments in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics in 2014-15. Colorado administered new regular and alternate assessments, based on alternate achievement standards, for Science 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 2014-15, 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)	30.00
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	70.00
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 2014-15 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)	<u>Yes</u>
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)	<u>Yes</u>
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with Section 1111(b)(7)	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>No</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
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	<u>Yes</u>
Other	<u>No</u>
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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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	525,044	448,177	85.36
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,221	3,493	82.75
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,992	15,803	87.83
<i>Asian</i>	16,597	14,656	88.31
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	1,395	1,147	82.22
Black or African American	24,600	21,671	88.09
Hispanic or Latino	172,391	155,640	90.28
White	284,725	233,888	82.15
Two or more races	18,912	16,040	84.81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	57,936	49,719	85.82
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	60,876	57,511	94.47
Economically disadvantaged students	217,898	195,098	89.54
Migratory students	1,522	1,424	93.56
Male	268,854	231,129	85.97
Female	256,165	217,028	84.72

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity on the test booklet. In 2015, as Colorado switched to the new CMAS PARCC assessments, a large percentage of parents chose to opt-out their children for state assessments and other students chose not to participate, especially at the higher grades.

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	12,809	25.76
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	32,013	64.39
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,897	9.85
Total	49,719	////////////////////////////////////
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.		

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.

1.2.3 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	524,033	448,945	85.67
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,217	3,498	82.95
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,986	15,857	88.16
Asian	16,595	14,700	88.58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,391	1,157	83.18
Black or African American	24,596	21,795	88.61
Hispanic or Latino	171,252	154,894	90.45
White	284,876	235,113	82.53
Two or more races	18,903	16,113	85.24
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	57,890	49,746	85.93
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	59,719	56,381	94.41
Economically disadvantaged students	216,810	194,589	89.75
Migratory students	1,519	1,416	93.22
Male	268,358	231,466	86.25
Female	255,650	217,459	85.06

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity on the test booklet. In 2015, as Colorado switched to the new CMAS PARCC assessments, a large percentage of parents chose to opt-out their children for state assessments and other students chose not to participate, especially at the higher grades.

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	107

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	21,555	43.33
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	23,285	46.81
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,904	9.86
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	2	0.00
Total	49,746	////////////////////////////////////
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	186,738	168,096	90.02
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,478	1,322	89.45
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,447	5,843	90.63
Asian	5,981	5,411	90.47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	466	432	92.70
Black or African American	8,618	8,038	93.27
Hispanic or Latino	58,864	55,132	93.66
White	102,511	90,067	87.86
Two or more races	6,213	5,535	89.09
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,516	16,607	89.69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	17,734	17,013	95.93
Economically disadvantaged students	71,480	66,867	93.55
Migratory students	468	462	98.72
Male	95,109	85,938	90.36
Female	91,629	82,158	89.66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity on the test booklet. In addition, in 2015, as Colorado switched to the new CMAS PARCC assessments, a large percentage of parents chose to opt out their children for state assessments and other students chose not to participate, especially at the higher grades. The dramatically lower number of science test scores, compared to reading/language arts and math, is due to the fact that the 2014-15 science assessment was administered to only one grade (12) at the high school level, while math and reading/language arts were administered to two (9 and 10). Also, the unusually high testing opt-out frequency in 2014-15 impacted 12th grade science participation more than the lower grades' reading and math participation.

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	5,916	35.62
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,949	53.89
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,742	10.49
Total	16,607	////////////////////////////////////

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 racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

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 and who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment. 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 once 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.

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.

1.3.1.1 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	64,352	23,578	36.64
American Indian or Alaska Native	465	73	15.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,097	1,156	55.13
<i>Asian</i>	1,943	1,101	56.66
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	55	35.71
Black or African American	2,929	543	18.54
Hispanic or Latino	21,834	4,536	20.77
White	34,419	16,215	47.11
Two or more races	2,544	1,041	40.92
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,869	784	11.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,360	2,047	16.56
Economically disadvantaged students	29,124	5,894	20.24
Migratory students	208	32	15.38
Male	32,944	12,189	37.00
Female	31,406	11,389	36.26

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	63,260	24,137	38.16
American Indian or Alaska Native	460	88	19.13
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,093	1,021	48.78
<i>Asian</i>	1,941	969	49.92
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	152	52	34.21
Black or African American	2,938	666	22.67
Hispanic or Latino	20,702	4,471	21.60
White	34,455	16,727	48.55
Two or more races	2,548	1,148	45.05
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,733	698	10.37
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,234	1,633	14.54
Economically disadvantaged students	28,030	6,014	21.46
Migratory students	208	27	12.98
Male	32,395	11,112	34.30
Female	30,863	13,025	42.20

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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 tested students in Science in 5th, 8th and 12th grades in 2015.			

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	62,943	18,995	30.18
American Indian or Alaska Native	470	66	14.04
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,202	1,080	49.05
<i>Asian</i>	2,047	1,044	51.00
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	155	36	23.23
Black or African American	2,937	418	14.23
Hispanic or Latino	21,674	3,317	15.30
White	33,184	13,251	39.93
Two or more races	2,435	857	35.20
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,171	621	8.66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,036	574	6.35
Economically disadvantaged students	28,157	4,248	15.09
Migratory students	192	15	7.81
Male	32,307	9,954	30.81
Female	30,634	9,041	29.51

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	62,944	26,246	41.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	472	132	27.97
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,205	1,227	55.65
<i>Asian</i>	2,051	1,170	57.05
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	154	57	37.01
Black or African American	2,941	722	24.55
Hispanic or Latino	21,604	5,273	24.41
White	33,241	17,656	53.12
Two or more races	2,440	1,221	50.04
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,165	761	10.62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,946	694	7.76
Economically disadvantaged students	28,112	6,733	23.95
Migratory students	185	31	16.76
Male	32,289	11,781	36.49
Female	30,653	14,464	47.19

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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 tested students in Science in 5th, 8th and 12th grades in 2015.			

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	62,602	18,847	30.11
American Indian or Alaska Native	501	69	13.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,171	1,082	49.84
<i>Asian</i>	2,014	1,037	51.49
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	157	45	28.66
Black or African American	2,857	411	14.39
Hispanic or Latino	21,433	3,383	15.78
White	33,228	13,098	39.42
Two or more races	2,254	761	33.76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,357	609	8.28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,635	386	5.06
Economically disadvantaged students	27,549	4,192	15.22
Migratory students	179	12	6.70
Male	32,137	9,632	29.97
Female	30,463	9,215	30.25

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	62,641	25,378	40.51
American Indian or Alaska Native	499	119	23.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,169	1,197	55.19
<i>Asian</i>	2,013	1,142	56.73
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	156	55	35.26
Black or African American	2,849	742	26.04
Hispanic or Latino	21,441	4,963	23.15
White	33,268	17,269	51.91
Two or more races	2,256	1,026	45.48
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,335	730	9.95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,622	408	5.35
Economically disadvantaged students	27,562	6,251	22.68
Migratory students	182	23	12.64
Male	32,161	11,272	35.05
Female	30,478	14,105	46.28

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	63,546	22,208	34.95
American Indian or Alaska Native	501	100	19.96
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,199	1,021	46.43
<i>Asian</i>	2,043	975	47.72
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	156	46	29.49
Black or African American	2,908	478	16.44
Hispanic or Latino	21,716	3,437	15.83
White	33,831	16,216	47.93
Two or more races	2,195	890	40.55
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,270	858	11.80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,909	265	3.35
Economically disadvantaged students	28,253	4,685	16.58
Migratory students	181	17	9.39
Male	32,576	11,688	35.88
Female	30,970	10,520	33.97

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	61,440	19,481	31.71
American Indian or Alaska Native	464	84	18.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,226	1,123	50.45
<i>Asian</i>	2,063	1,077	52.21
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	163	46	28.22
Black or African American	2,861	416	14.54
Hispanic or Latino	20,905	3,390	16.22
White	32,545	13,596	41.78
Two or more races	2,252	814	36.15
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,063	559	7.91
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,863	297	4.33
Economically disadvantaged students	26,756	4,151	15.51
Migratory students	181	15	8.29
Male	31,385	9,862	31.42
Female	30,051	9,618	32.01

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	61,536	24,119	39.19
American Indian or Alaska Native	466	125	26.82
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,230	1,184	53.09
<i>Asian</i>	2,066	1,122	54.31
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	164	62	37.80
Black or African American	2,867	665	23.19
Hispanic or Latino	20,932	4,765	22.76
White	32,613	16,229	49.76
Two or more races	2,242	1,063	47.41
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,087	695	9.81
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,894	345	5.00
Economically disadvantaged students	26,775	5,948	22.21
Migratory students	185	12	6.49
Male	31,438	10,288	32.72
Female	30,094	13,830	45.96

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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 tested students in Science in 5th, 8th and 12th grades in 2015.			

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	57,809	16,975	29.36
American Indian or Alaska Native	445	55	12.36
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,161	1,086	50.25
<i>Asian</i>	2,026	1,050	51.83
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	135	36	26.67
Black or African American	2,793	399	14.29
Hispanic or Latino	19,955	2,917	14.62
White	30,181	11,692	38.74
Two or more races	2,031	715	35.20
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,440	454	7.05
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,962	234	3.36
Economically disadvantaged students	25,299	3,574	14.13
Migratory students	171	10	5.85
Male	29,869	8,573	28.70
Female	27,937	8,402	30.07

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	57,976	23,855	41.15
American Indian or Alaska Native	449	102	22.72
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,162	1,232	56.98
<i>Asian</i>	2,027	1,175	57.97
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	135	57	42.22
Black or African American	2,795	734	26.26
Hispanic or Latino	19,931	4,979	24.98
White	30,353	15,686	51.68
Two or more races	2,040	999	48.97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,441	688	10.68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,920	335	4.84
Economically disadvantaged students	25,317	6,118	24.17
Migratory students	171	24	14.04
Male	29,970	9,964	33.25
Female	28,003	13,891	49.61

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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 tested students in Science in 5th, 8th and 12th grades in 2015.			

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	55,040	17,272	31.38
American Indian or Alaska Native	447	83	18.57
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,954	1,058	54.15
<i>Asian</i>	1,815	1,018	56.09
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	139	40	28.78
Black or African American	2,704	425	15.72
Hispanic or Latino	19,137	3,224	16.85
White	28,575	11,607	40.62
Two or more races	1,929	709	36.75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,047	424	7.01
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,344	288	4.54
Economically disadvantaged students	23,275	3,774	16.21
Migratory students	189	16	8.47
Male	28,394	8,577	30.21
Female	26,642	8,694	32.63

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	55,150	22,651	41.07
American Indian or Alaska Native	444	119	26.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,962	1,150	58.61
<i>Asian</i>	1,823	1,094	60.01
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	139	56	40.29
Black or African American	2,724	717	26.32
Hispanic or Latino	19,148	4,887	25.52
White	28,659	14,676	51.21
Two or more races	1,919	915	47.68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,047	664	10.98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,316	352	5.57
Economically disadvantaged students	23,307	5,820	24.97
Migratory students	187	30	16.04
Male	28,432	9,423	33.14
Female	26,714	13,226	49.51

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	58,497	17,063	29.17
American Indian or Alaska Native	466	72	15.45
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,028	893	44.03
<i>Asian</i>	1,887	855	45.31
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	141	38	26.95
Black or African American	2,806	340	12.12
Hispanic or Latino	19,865	2,653	13.36
White	31,088	12,320	39.63
Two or more races	2,006	711	35.44
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,882	466	7.92
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,573	126	1.92
Economically disadvantaged students	24,893	3,308	13.29
Migratory students	204	10	4.90
Male	30,066	8,916	29.65
Female	28,431	8,147	28.66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	83,991	19,547	23.27
American Indian or Alaska Native	701	92	13.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,992	1,205	40.27
<i>Asian</i>	2,748	1,163	42.32
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	244	42	17.21
Black or African American	4,590	503	10.96
Hispanic or Latino	30,702	3,527	11.49
White	41,756	13,257	31.75
Two or more races	2,595	741	28.55
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,772	537	6.12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,311	257	3.09
Economically disadvantaged students	34,938	3,951	11.31
Migratory students	304	14	4.61
Male	44,093	10,108	22.92
Female	39,895	9,438	23.66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	85,331	32,129	37.65
American Indian or Alaska Native	708	181	25.56
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,031	1,514	49.95
<i>Asian</i>	2,774	1,429	51.51
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	257	85	33.07
Black or African American	4,669	1,125	24.10
Hispanic or Latino	31,054	7,245	23.33
White	42,518	20,507	48.23
Two or more races	2,666	1,194	44.79
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	8,936	983	11.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,342	315	3.78
Economically disadvantaged students	35,414	8,268	23.35
Migratory students	303	26	8.58
Male	44,723	13,847	30.96
Female	40,605	18,281	45.02

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity 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	46,053	11,369	24.69
American Indian or Alaska Native	355	52	14.65
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,616	533	32.98
<i>Asian</i>	1,481	510	34.44
<i>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</i>	135	23	17.04
Black or African American	2,324	247	10.63
Hispanic or Latino	13,551	1,508	11.13
White	25,148	8,238	32.76
Two or more races	1,334	392	29.39
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,455	264	7.64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,531	45	1.78
Economically disadvantaged students	13,721	1,681	12.25
Migratory students	77	2	2.60
Male	23,296	6,043	25.94
Female	22,757	5,326	23.40

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Discrepancies around the sum of male/female students or ethnic/racial groups not equaling the total number of students exactly is due to occasional failures to mark gender or race/ethnicity on the test booklet.

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 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
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 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
Schools	1,709		
Districts	184		

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

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 2014-15. 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 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2014-15
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 2014-15. 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 2014-15	Percentage of Title I Schools that Met All AMOs, 95 Percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
All Title I schools	634		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	496		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	138		

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

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 2014-15. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2014-15

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 indicator⁵ based on data for SY 2014-15. The percentage will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2014-15	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Met All AMOs, 95 percent Participation Rate, and Other Academic Indicator in SY 2014-15
177		

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

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2014-15
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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 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 corrective action 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.

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 2014-15 (based on SY 2013-14 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 2014-15
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 2013-14 and beginning of SY 2014-15 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 2014-15 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 due to our flexibility waiver.		

In the table below, provide the data by which processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 data was complete.

Processing Appeals completion	Date
Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2014-15 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 2014 (SY 2014-15) 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 2014-15.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1003g Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) - Technical Assistance and Support to districts: The Office of School and District Improvement and Unit of Federal Programs Administration provide onsite support to each grantee. Turnaround Support Managers and Title I Program Specialists provide support to districts and schools as they implement their TIG plans and to gather information on implementation progress to determine what further support is needed. Schools use a brief, common documentation tool to track plan implementation and progress monitor data. The tool is emailed by the school to the school's Turnaround Support Manager in advance of the quarterly site visits. Based on evidence in the documentation tool, onsite visits can be increased or decreased to meet the needs of the school sites. Progress monitoring site visits and formative assessment data are used to establish a rigorous, annual grant renewal process. Turnaround Support Managers attend regional School Improvement Grants conferences and share the information with grantees.

Grantees, supported by Turnaround Support 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 building leadership teams and district support networks to assist with implementing their TIG plans. Grantees, with the help of Turnaround Support Managers present "bright spots" and lessons learned from Tiered Intervention Grant development and implementation at professional learning communities (PLCs). Grantees share grant implementation experiences, systemic changes, and lessons learned from this process during quarterly PLCs. Turnaround Support Managers developed a site visit protocol 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. Title I Program Specialists check in on use of TIG funds and answer any questions the school might have on allowable use of funds.

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 2014-15 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	42,476
Applied to transfer	696
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	468
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	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 551,537

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	14

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. LEAs that were not able to offer public school choice had only one school per grade span and were located in rural areas far from neighboring districts.

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	17,736
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,927
Received supplemental educational services	5,426
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	Dollars Spent
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,572,628
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	253,363	248,550	98.10	4,813	1.90
All elementary classes	152,870	150,210	98.26	2,660	1.74
All secondary classes	100,493	98,340	97.86	2,153	2.14

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

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

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

--

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.

For 2014-15, Colorado counted a full-day self-contained classroom using a departmentalized approach where the classroom was counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

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	89.20
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	7.10
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	3.70
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
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)	39.90
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	34.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	25.90
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	40,440	40,320	99.70
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	41,869	39,998	95.53
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	21,357	20,965	98.16
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	37,125	36,602	98.59

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	72.80	20.90
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced cost lunch.	
Secondary schools	63.60	24.50
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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the October 1 count of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- o 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.
- o 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	104,964
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of LEP students is significantly lower for 2014-15 than it was in 2013-14 because file specs for 13-14 were taken from student End-of-Year counts and included all eligible students who were enrolled at any time during the year. 2014-15 specs were taken from Student October Count, and included only students enrolled at the time of the October Count. Students who left prior to October Count or arrived after then were not included in the 2014-15 numbers.	

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

In the table below, provide the October 1 count 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.	99,290
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of LEP students who received Title III services is significantly lower for 2014-15 than it was in 2013-14 because file specs for 13-14 were taken from student End-of-Year counts and included all eligible students who were enrolled at any time during the year. 2014-15 specs were taken from Student October Count, and included only students enrolled at the time of the October Count. Students who left prior to October Count or arrived after then were not included in the 2014-15 numbers.	

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	88,690
Arabic	1,625
Vietnamese	1,533
Chinese	1,155
Russian	933

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	105,579
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,669
Total	107,248
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	20,273
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	19.21
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 and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing		#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment		105,260
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment		1,648
Total		106,908
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The reason that the number of Title III LEP students assessed on the annual English language proficiency assessments is lower than 95% of the students served is that Colorado does not test their Monitored Year 1 and Year 2 students, who already are considered FEP, but continues to serve them.		

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.		26,911

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	40,650	51.88		
Attained proficiency	20,242	19.23		

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Since Colorado moved to a growth model for making progress, growth points are calculated at the grade span level based on median growth percentile within the context of the median adequate growth percentile [For more information on calculating AMAOs, visit: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tiii/amaos>]. As a result, it is not possible to establish growth targets based on numbers/percentages of students, which is why the target fields above remain blank.

For EdFacts reporting requirements, a growth percentile => 50 is considered to have been progress. However, Colorado's calculation for percent of Title III students making progress differs from the 47.13% reported above, which was calculated by dividing the number of students Colorado reported as making progress by the total number who tested minus those who tested for the first time. Colorado's growth calculations only can be applied to students who have two sequential years of valid test scores. As a result, Colorado feels it is more meaningful to divide the number that made growth by the number that had the opportunity to make growth, meaning students with two sequential years of valid scores. Therefore, Colorado would recommend dividing the number of students with a growth percentile =>50 (39,967) by the number of students who had two sequential years' WIDA scores (79,310) which is 50.39%. At the time of this Part I certification, the U.S. Department of Education had not approved Colorado's 2015 AMAO calculations and targets.

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).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Up until the 2013-14 academic year, Colorado offered Lectura and Escritura, Spanish language reading and writing assessments, to eligible 3rd and 4th graders. Lectura/Escritura scores were included in reading and writing AMOs, but neither Lectura or Escritura were included in reading and writing growth percentiles that went into calculating AMAO 3, as the Colorado Growth Model is based on TCAP reading, writing and math growth only, and could not be applied to Lectura/Escritura or CoAlt data. Further, at the time of the 2014-15 PARCC testing, no Spanish language assessment had yet been developed, although it is scheduled for 2015-16.	

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.

1.6.3.6 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
16,376	8,384	24,760
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
17,119	4,282	25.01	12,837
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
17,164	6,061	35.31	11,103
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
6,151	1,194	19.41	4,957
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	58
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 1	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 2	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3	
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	
////////////////////////////////////	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2013-14 and 2014-15)	
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2014-15 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15)	

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. If applicable, also please note if this method is the same or different from the previous year.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Subgrantees were counted at the consortia level; each consortia counted as one subgrantee, regardless of how many districts were members. This is the same method that was used in 2013-14.

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
8,410	1,641	14

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.	5,800
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	2,000

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	53
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	53
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	41
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	41
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	33
Other (Explain in comment box)	14

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	53	23,075
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	50	3,272
PD provided to principals	50	1,687
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	41	836
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	39	4,484
PD provided to community based organization personnel	21	535
Total	//////////	33,889

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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 2014-15 funds July 1, 2014, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2014, for SY 2014-15 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/14	07/01/14	0
<p>Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. When final allocations are distributed to states, the Colorado Department of Education makes appropriate modifications and notifies LEAs. If this time frame falls within the time subgrantees submit their consolidated applications and July 1, the LEA may need to modify their Consolidated budget, based on any modifications to the allocations. All allocations are available to districts on July 1 of every fiscal year, unless the LEA does not submit the required plan or declines ESEA funding.</p>		

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.

USED'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 CDE 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 USED, which typically occurs mid-July. However, funds are available for LEA draw down as soon as Colorado receives its award notification from USED and CDE 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 automatically calculated.

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	102	102
LEAs with subgrants	80	80
Total	182	182

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Of the 80 grantees, two are regional grantees (BOCES) representing 63 partner districts. Therefore, Colorado has 15 school district grantees, plus two regional grantees with 63 partner districts, equaling 80 grantees as reflected in the data.

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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	224	1,079
K	440	1,746
1	420	1,662
2	419	1,650
3	440	1,473
4	396	1,432
5	336	1,369
6	363	1,381
7	366	1,286
8	298	1,184
9	310	1,315
10	276	1,180
11	301	993
12	408	1,399
Ungraded		
Total	4,997	19,149

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All Colorado students are assigned a grade; Colorado does not have ungraded students.

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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	583	2,440
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,618	14,417
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	175	582
Hotels/Motels	621	1,710
Total	4,997	19,149

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	499	1,460
Migratory children/youth	55	643
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	566	2,549
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	622	2,402

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	46
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,091
K	1,783
1	1,703
2	1,698
3	1,512
4	1,473
5	1,408
6	1,427
7	1,332
8	1,219
9	1,358
10	1,221
11	1,017
12	1,446
Ungraded	
Total	19,734

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. All Colorado students are assigned a grade; Colorado does not have ungraded students.

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	1,553
Migratory children/youth	1,026
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2,586
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,478

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 and percentage of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	213	45	21.13	1,142	138	12.08
4	198	41	20.71	1,090	184	16.88
5	172	41	23.84	1,128	184	16.31
6	199	35	17.59	1,030	148	14.37
7	162	29	17.90	947	169	17.85
8	129	24	18.60	836	145	17.34
High School	188	36	19.15	1,339	232	17.33

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	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3	216	39	18.06	1,162	140	12.05
4	198	23	11.62	1,099	114	10.37
5	169	27	15.98	1,134	96	8.47
6	198	23	11.62	1,037	94	9.06
7	162	14	8.64	949	93	9.80
8	131	17	12.98	831	78	9.39
High School	189	15	7.94	1,317	91	6.91

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	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs Without Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs Without Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	LEAs With Subgrants - # of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient	LEAs With Subgrants - % of Homeless Students Scoring at or above Proficient
3						
4						
5	199	35	17.59	1,152	140	12.15
6						
7						
8	146	12	8.22	873	77	8.82
High School	143	11	7.69	543	45	8.29

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not test Science in 3rd, 4th, 6th or 7th grades.