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 2016-17

COLORADO

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018

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) 2016-17 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 2016-17, 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 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 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:
  _X_ Part I, 2016-17   ___Part II, 2016-17

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

Wednesday, April 11, 2018, 6:54:17 PM

  Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17

☒

PART I DUE DECEMBER 14, 2017
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Content Standards	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	SY 2018-19	SY 2018-19	SY 2018-19

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

The response is limited to 1,000 characters.

Colorado will be adopting new standards in the above subjects by July 2018 per SB 08-212. However, this CAP4K statute specifies a 2-year transition process, such that implementation would not begin until 2020-2021. For more information about this review and revision cycle, go to https://www.cde.state.co.us/standardsandinstruction/standards-revision-cycle.

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.
No Revisions or changes	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., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the States academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the States 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
	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
No Revisions or changes	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., 2016-17) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	N/A	N/A	N/A
Regular Assessments in High School	N/A	N/A	N/A
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	N/A	N/A	N/A

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.

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 2016-17, 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 2016-17 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT [2]

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.

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	470,921	423,980	90.03
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,518	3,151	89.57
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,103	14,889	92.46
Asian	14,932	13,812	92.50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,171	1,077	91.97
Black or African American	21,329	19,941	93.49
Hispanic or Latino	159,706	150,026	93.94
White	251,220	218,942	87.15
Two or more races	18,965	16,965	89.45
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	52,120	45,737	87.75
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58,914	56,965	96.69
Economically disadvantaged students	203,388	189,656	93.25
Migratory students	1,775	1,705	96.06
Male	241,890	218,869	90.48
Female	229,031	205,111	89.56

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 form. Colorado statute allows parents to exclude their children from assessment participation without penalty. The increased number of students identified as Migrant was due to an overall increase in the number of identified eligible migrant students. Improved collaboration and relations with school districts resulted in more migrant students being identified.

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	9,583	20.95
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,987	69.94
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,167	9.11
Total	45,737	//

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.

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	470,981	424,428	90.12
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,519	3,159	89.77
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,110	14,909	92.55
Asian	14,930	13,818	92.55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,180	1,091	92.46
Black or African American	21,341	19,964	93.55
Hispanic or Latino	159,712	150,147	94.01
White	251,241	219,170	87.23
Two or more races	18,974	17,008	89.64
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	52,132	45,736	87.73
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58,936	56,999	96.71
Economically disadvantaged students	203,435	189,747	93.27
Migratory students	1,773	1,706	96.22
Male	241,902	219,004	90.53
Female	229,079	205,424	89.67

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 form. Colorado statute allows parents to exclude their children from assessment participation without penalty. The increased number of students identified as Migrant was due to an overall increase in the number of identified eligible migrant students. Improved collaboration and relations with school districts resulted in more migrant students being identified.

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	679

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 <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do <u>not</u> 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	16,401	35.86
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,148	54.99
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,172	9.12
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	15	0.03
Total	45,736	///

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not administer alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified 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	195,930	157,574	80.42
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,452	1,203	82.85
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,854	5,541	80.84
Asian	6,373	5,136	80.59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	481	405	84.20
Black or African American	8,954	7,551	84.33
Hispanic or Latino	64,601	56,471	87.42
White	106,613	80,957	75.94
Two or more races	7,419	5,819	78.43
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	20,039	16,352	81.60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,267	17,999	93.42
Economically disadvantaged students	78,407	68,302	87.11
Migratory students	675	627	92.89
Male	99,928	81,463	81.52
Female	96,002	76,111	79.28

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado statute allows parents to exclude their children from assessment participation without penalty. The increased number of students identified as Migrant was due to an overall increase in the number of identified eligible migrant students. Improved collaboration and relations with school districts resulted in more migrant students being identified.

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	4,831	29.54
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,853	60.26
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,668	10.20
Total	16,352	///

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT [3]

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 States 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 States reading/language arts assesment. 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 States 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.

---

[3] 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	65,961	26,244	39.79
American Indian or Alaska Native	442	107	24.21
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,189	1,265	57.79
Asian	2,011	1,209	60.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	178	56	31.46
Black or African American	3,069	696	22.68
Hispanic or Latino	23,158	5,592	24.15
White	34,159	17,276	50.58
Two or more races	2,936	1,305	44.45
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,033	830	11.80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,030	2,155	17.91
Economically disadvantaged students	30,585	7,176	23.46
Migratory students	280	39	13.93
Male	33,883	13,720	40.49
Female	32,078	12,524	39.04

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 form.

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	65,848	26,140	39.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	440	103	23.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,157	1,108	51.37
Asian	1,980	1,046	52.83
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	177	62	35.03
Black or African American	3,066	756	24.66
Hispanic or Latino	23,114	5,685	24.60
White	34,135	17,154	50.25
Two or more races	2,928	1,332	45.49
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,016	628	8.95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,937	1,878	15.73
Economically disadvantaged students	30,493	7,246	23.76
Migratory students	280	40	14.29
Male	33,812	11,927	35.27
Female	32,036	14,213	44.37

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 form.

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			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not test 3rd grade students in Science.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,592	22,262	33.94
American Indian or Alaska Native	444	76	17.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,163	1,162	53.72
Asian	1,993	1,112	55.80
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	170	50	29.41
Black or African American	3,055	513	16.79
Hispanic or Latino	23,186	4,344	18.74
White	33,835	15,085	44.58
Two or more races	2,899	1,081	37.29
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,211	618	8.57
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,788	879	8.98
Economically disadvantaged students	30,194	5,483	18.16
Migratory students	250	25	10.00
Male	33,737	11,830	35.07
Female	31,855	10,432	32.75
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	65,535	28,540	43.55
American Indian or Alaska Native	448	109	24.33
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,146	1,256	58.53
Asian	1,971	1,185	60.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	175	71	40.57
Black or African American	3,053	909	29.77
Hispanic or Latino	23,164	6,407	27.66
White	33,807	18,412	54.46
Two or more races	2,903	1,446	49.81
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,206	727	10.09
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,720	1,204	12.39
Economically disadvantaged students	30,134	8,075	26.80
Migratory students	250	42	16.80
Male	33,693	13,022	38.65
Female	31,842	15,518	48.73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not test 4th grade students in Science.			

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	64,046	21,402	33.42
American Indian or Alaska Native	478	72	15.06
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,134	1,159	54.31
Asian	1,980	1,110	56.06
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	154	49	31.82
Black or African American	2,944	476	16.17
Hispanic or Latino	22,176	4,103	18.50
White	33,643	14,574	43.32
Two or more races	2,660	1,015	38.16
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,210	534	7.41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,418	618	7.34
Economically disadvantaged students	29,000	5,120	17.66
Migratory students	251	32	12.75
Male	32,833	11,221	34.18
Female	31,213	10,181	32.62
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	63,992	29,515	46.12
American Indian or Alaska Native	481	130	27.03
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,119	1,278	60.31
Asian	1,964	1,208	61.51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	155	70	45.16
Black or African American	2,952	914	30.96
Hispanic or Latino	22,118	6,495	29.37
White	33,652	19,264	57.24
Two or more races	2,659	1,433	53.89
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,205	725	10.06
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,327	877	10.53
Economically disadvantaged students	28,945	8,341	28.82
Migratory students	249	39	15.66
Male	32,800	12,974	39.55
Female	31,192	16,541	53.03
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.			

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	63,842	22,317	34.96
American Indian or Alaska Native	465	76	16.34
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,126	999	46.99
Asian	1,971	955	48.45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	155	44	28.39
Black or African American	2,939	418	14.22
Hispanic or Latino	22,112	3,724	16.84
White	33,546	15,968	47.60
Two or more races	2,641	1,131	42.82
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,138	671	9.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,377	377	4.50
Economically disadvantaged students	28,817	4,835	16.78
Migratory students	248	21	8.47
Male	32,741	11,444	34.95
Female	31,101	10,873	34.96

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.

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	61,554	18,899	30.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	471	72	15.29
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,231	1,155	51.77
Asian	2,073	1,122	54.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	158	33	20.89
Black or African American	2,865	364	12.71
Hispanic or Latino	21,771	3,224	14.81
White	31,734	13,201	41.60
Two or more races	2,476	882	35.62
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,782	391	5.77
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,867	242	3.52
Economically disadvantaged students	27,681	3,732	13.48
Migratory students	225	12	5.33
Male	31,645	9,575	30.26
Female	29,909	9,324	31.17

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.

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	61,443	24,856	40.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	471	122	25.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,220	1,249	56.26
Asian	2,061	1,200	58.22
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	159	49	30.82
Black or African American	2,856	724	25.35
Hispanic or Latino	21,709	5,317	24.49
White	31,702	16,284	51.37
Two or more races	2,479	1,159	46.75
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,771	519	7.67
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,761	369	5.46
Economically disadvantaged students	27,589	6,375	23.11
Migratory students	225	27	12.00
Male	31,584	10,388	32.89
Female	29,859	14,468	48.45

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.

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			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not test 6th grade students in Science.			

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	59,447	16,774	28.22
American Indian or Alaska Native	474	62	13.08
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,160	1,046	48.43
Asian	2,017	1,008	49.98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	143	38	26.57
Black or African American	2,713	362	13.34
Hispanic or Latino	20,915	2,779	13.29
White	30,962	11,825	38.19
Two or more races	2,215	700	31.60
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,338	280	4.42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,777	203	3.00
Economically disadvantaged students	26,045	3,230	12.40
Migratory students	236	10	4.24
Male	30,693	8,575	27.94
Female	28,754	8,199	28.51

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.

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	59,427	26,233	44.14
American Indian or Alaska Native	474	122	25.74
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,153	1,317	61.17
Asian	2,011	1,268	63.05
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	142	49	34.51
Black or African American	2,732	819	29.98
Hispanic or Latino	20,879	5,945	28.47
White	30,951	16,956	54.78
Two or more races	2,230	1,074	48.16
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,346	589	9.28
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,693	462	6.90
Economically disadvantaged students	26,016	7,027	27.01
Migratory students	235	32	13.62
Male	30,666	10,856	35.40
Female	28,761	15,377	53.46

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.

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			
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not test 7th grade students in Science.			

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	56,805	18,383	32.36
American Indian or Alaska Native	433	72	16.63
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,107	1,138	54.01
Asian	1,959	1,094	55.84
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	148	44	29.73
Black or African American	2,645	462	17.47
Hispanic or Latino	20,334	3,476	17.09
White	29,249	12,450	42.57
Two or more races	2,030	785	38.67
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,965	333	5.58
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,618	280	4.23
Economically disadvantaged students	24,632	4,013	16.29
Migratory students	241	26	10.79
Male	29,334	9,049	30.85
Female	27,471	9,334	33.98

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.

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	56,831	24,611	43.31
American Indian or Alaska Native	430	125	29.07
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,096	1,279	61.02
Asian	1,946	1,216	62.49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	150	63	42.00
Black or African American	2,636	773	29.32
Hispanic or Latino	20,301	5,815	28.64
White	29,327	15,578	53.12
Two or more races	2,034	1,041	51.18
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,968	536	8.98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,525	474	7.26
Economically disadvantaged students	24,585	6,751	27.46
Migratory students	239	37	15.48
Male	29,330	9,972	34.00
Female	27,501	14,639	53.23

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.

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	56,243	17,018	30.26
American Indian or Alaska Native	405	70	17.28
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,084	946	45.39
Asian	1,937	911	47.03
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	147	35	23.81
Black or African American	2,605	349	13.40
Hispanic or Latino	20,090	2,791	13.89
White	29,044	12,110	41.70
Two or more races	2,008	752	37.45
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,868	430	7.33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,542	114	1.74
Economically disadvantaged students	24,248	3,318	13.68
Migratory students	239	18	7.53
Male	29,078	8,481	29.17
Female	27,165	8,537	31.43
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct.			

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	50,575	14,245	28.17
American Indian or Alaska Native	409	42	10.27
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,905	967	50.76
Asian	1,779	933	52.45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	126	34	26.98
Black or African American	2,650	345	13.02
Hispanic or Latino	18,486	2,743	14.84
White	25,360	9,573	37.75
Two or more races	1,749	571	32.65
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,198	266	5.12
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,467	293	4.53
Economically disadvantaged students	21,519	3,048	14.16
Migratory students	222	14	6.31
Male	26,744	7,446	27.84
Female	23,831	6,799	28.53

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct. High school math is assessed in the 9th grade, so these math-tested students represent a different cohort than the 10th grade students who took the Science assessment. In addition, Colorado's 9th grade participation runs higher than its 10th grade.

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	50,673	18,317	36.15
American Indian or Alaska Native	414	78	18.84
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,902	1,004	52.79
Asian	1,777	966	54.36
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	125	38	30.40
Black or African American	2,616	604	23.09
Hispanic or Latino	18,462	4,126	22.35
White	25,492	11,756	46.12
Two or more races	1,770	746	42.15
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,209	398	7.64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,357	345	5.43
Economically disadvantaged students	21,474	4,679	21.79
Migratory students	222	23	10.36
Male	26,753	7,530	28.15
Female	23,920	10,787	45.10

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct. High school RLA is assessed in the 9th grade, so these RLA-tested students represent a different cohort than the 10th grade students who took the Science assessment. In addition, Colorado's 9th grade participation runs higher than its 10th grade.

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	37,489	9,283	24.76
American Indian or Alaska Native	333	44	13.21
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,331	450	33.81
Asian	1,228	435	35.42
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	103	15	14.56
Black or African American	2,007	201	10.01
Hispanic or Latino	14,269	1,632	11.44
White	18,367	6,598	35.92
Two or more races	1,170	358	30.60
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,346	299	8.94
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,080	35	1.14
Economically disadvantaged students	15,237	1,852	12.15
Migratory students	140	6	4.29
Male	19,644	5,069	25.80
Female	17,845	4,214	23.61

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Differences in percentages proficient and advanced that exceed 15% compared to 2016 are correct. High school science is assessed in the 10th grade, so these science-tested students represent a different cohort than the 9th grade students who took the RLA and Math assessments. In addition, Colorado's 9th grade participation runs higher than its 10th grade.

1.4 SCHOOL AND **D**ISTRICT **A**CCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on accountability.

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 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2016-17
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 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado no longer identifies schools for restructuring due to our flexibility waiver.

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.

Colorado no longer identifies districts for improvement due to our flexibility waiver.

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 2016-17 (based on SY 2015-16 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 2016-17
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 2015-16 and beginning of SY 2016-17 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.	

1.4.8 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 2016 (SY 2016-17) 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 ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS). The ED*Facts* 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 2016-17.

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. Finally, the Office of School and District Improvement and Unit of Federal Programs Administration organize quarterly "exemplar school" site visits for TIG grantees. During these visits leaders from TIG schools visit high-performing current or former TIG schools and other high-performing Title I schools to learn and observe promising practices.
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 participate in professional learning opportunities to share lessons learned from Tiered Intervention Grant development. 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 Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2016-17 that were supported by **funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Sections 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.

1.6   TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational program

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational program implemented in the State, as defined under 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.us/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
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Chinese
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	///
Yes	Structured English immersion	///
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	///
Yes	Content-based ESL	///
Yes	Pull-out ESL	///
Yes	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. Students are in regular education classrooms with differentiation; immersion; literacy-based ESL; interventionist model support through peer modeling; co-teaching; Woodcock Munoz 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).

- n 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.
- n Do <u>not</u> 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	105,785
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

In the table below, provide the 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.	105,038
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	**# LEP Students**
Spanish; Castilian	88,518
Arabic	1,838
Vietnamese	1,475
Chinese	1,159
Russian	987

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	102,906
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,884
Total	105,790
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Some of the students served during the year in Colorado left by the time of the WIDA testing window in January; similarly, there were students served who were not enrolled at the time of WIDA testing. In addition, among LEP students enrolled at the time of testing, many partially tested but were missing one or more sub-scores that prevented them from earning an overall scale score/proficiency level. Among the others were students who did not test due to language, became frustrated during testing, were excluded from testing due to parent decision, or were absent during the testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	22,163
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	21.03
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	102,168
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,835
Total	105,003
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 2,835 LEP students enrolled in Title III districts during the WIDA testing window did not receive an overall performance level and were counted as not tested. The vast majority of these students partially tested but were missing one or more sub-scores that prevented them from earning an overall scale score/proficiency level. Among the others were students who did not test due to language, became frustrated during testing, were excluded from testing due to parent decision, or were absent during the testing window.	

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. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include them in the calculations for 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.	24,273

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. **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.
2. **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.
3. **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 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.

Title III Results	Results #	Results %
Making progress		
Attained proficiency	22,043	21.58
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado was unable to measure English proficiency growth from 2016 to 2017 due to issues around changes in the WIDA ACCESSS assessment. WIDA partially transitioned to a new assessment, ACCESS 2.0, in Spring 2016, with new items and in an online testing format. However, the underlying scoring scale and proficiency level cut-points were still based on the previous ACCESS 1.0 psychometric properties. The complete transition to ACCESS 2.0 was not undertaken until 2017, when the new scoring scale and proficiency level cut-points were finally applied. Given that significant differences exist in the underlying scale assumptions and proficiency attributions between the old and new assessments, CDE determined it was inappropriate to compare the published scale score results from 2016 to 2017. Extensive analysis by CDE showed that even using revised 2016 scale scores that were purportedly calculated on the new 2.0 scoring scale did not result in believably aligned student outcomes between 2016 and 2017. CDE conducted exploratory growth calculations using these discrepant results, but the scale/test differences were again found to be significant enough to result in biased growth scores at the student, school and district levels. Additionally, 32% of Colorado students in grades 1-12 continued to test with the paper ACCESS in 2017, which is not equivalent to the online form (see explanation from 2016). The movement between students testing on paper in 2016 and online in 2017 or vice versa also compromised CDE's confidence that score results would be comparable for students across different trajectories. Because the state growth model is normatively built by comparing students to their academic peers with similar score histories, any questionable individual results based on test format, speaking/listening scoring technology issues, or scale construction in either 2016 or 2017 fundamentally undermine the accuracy of all student results. For these reasons, CDE chose not to release individual or aggregate 2017 growth results to districts and has not included them in the current submission.		

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)).

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

Native Language Testing	Yes/No
State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
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.	

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. Mathematics tests are not given in any language other than English

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science tests are not given in any language other than English

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 <u>unduplicated</u> count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in all grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

<u>**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**</u>

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
14,346	10,565	24,911
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.

<u>**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**</u>

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics.
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
15,346	4,540	29.58	10,806
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.
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
15,346	6,717	43.77	8,629
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
7,203	1,337	18.56	5,866
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.

1.6.4.3 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).

Termination of Title III Programs	Yes/No
Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

<u>Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:</u>

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 <u>not</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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
8,881	5,382	29

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.	4,067
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,000

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.

Colorado notes a significant drop in number of teachers working in the LIEP. The past requirement was certified/licensed teachers, and thus, Colorado reported the number of total certified and licensed teachers, but not those with the CLDE or CLDE bilingual endorsement. As we reviewed and reflected on data, we realize that the EDFACTS collection definition of certified and licensed meant those instructional staff with a specialty license or endorsement in ELD/CLDE/bilingual education. We have modified our data collection and extraction process to reflect the appropriated data being asked of the state.

* 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).

<u>**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**</u>

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 1.6.4.1).
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	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	
Other (Explain in comment box)	

PD Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community based organization personnel		
Total	///////////////////////////////////////	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This information will be provided before the 2nd certification.

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 <u>intended school year</u>. 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 U.S. 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 2016-17 funds July 1, 2016, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2016, for SY 2016-17 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/1/17	7/1/17	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.doc.

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	106	106
LEAs with subgrants	77	77
Total	183	183
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of subgrant LEAs includes two regional agencies that partner with 63 districts. Colorado acknowledges there have been some data collection issues around homeless students. At this time, we are relying on district-reported numbers and therefore, without student-level data, cannot identify duplicates. The State Coordinator is working diligently with CDE's Senior Data Analyst and districts regarding student-level data collection moving forward. Colorado has utilized two data collections to target discrepencies in data reporting at the district level. It was discovered that two school districts contributed to a significant discrepency when comparing data collections. These errors have been identified and corrected. The State Coordinator has provided technical assistance to 25 districts regarding collecting complete and accurate data. For the 2017-18 data collection, it will be possible to provide State-level unduplicated numbers.		

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 <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	186	716
K	465	1,222
1	552	1,249
2	501	1,207
3	525	1,257
4	482	1,150
5	484	1,117
6	437	1,031
7	417	985
8	393	894
9	407	1,009
10	363	923
11	376	889
12	526	1,299
Ungraded		
Total	6,114	14,948
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youth

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing	973	1,689
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,932	11,627
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	373	746
Hotels/Motels	836	886
Total	6,114	14,948
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. It was determined that data reported for SY 15-16 from 2 school districts contained significant over-reporting of numbers of students living in hotels. The 22% decrease is a result of accurate numbers being reported for SY 16-17. For example, one major metro district reported 316 living in motels/hotels for SY 15-16, which was an over-count; in SY 16-17, they reported 70 students living in motels/hotels. Similarly, another district reported 325 for SY 15-16 and 131 for SY 16-17.		

FAQ on reporting homeless students:

When should States use S or STH to report homeless students? The primary nighttime residence of students who are deemed homeless under the awaiting foster care provision should be indicated as "S" for shelters, transitional housing, and awaiting foster care. After a state is no longer permitted to use the awaiting foster care placement designation for students, the primary nighttime residence of students who are in shelters or transitional housing should be coded as "STH". The majority of states may only include children and youth identified as homeless due to their status as awaiting foster care placement if they were identified prior to December 10, 2016. States covered under P.L. 114-95, Section 9105(c) may include children awaiting foster care placement until December 10, 2017. Covered states are those states that have a law that describes or defines the phrase awaiting foster care placement for the purposes of a program under the McKinney-Vento Act.

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youth - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Unaccompanied homeless youth	659	1,375
Migratory children/youth	37	443
Children with disabilities *(IDEA)*	943	2,319
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	907	2,133
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In 15-16, one major metro district incorrectly identified 2243 (out of 2519) as LEP. This inaccurate data issue was addressed and resolved for SY 16-17, when only 201 LEPs were reported. Focused trainings, monitoring, and grantee meetings have improved identification of Unaccompanied Homeless Youth. Colorado has seen an increased number of students identified as unaccompanied since SY09-10, in alignment with national trends.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Young Homeless Children 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	83
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	751
Total	834
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	384	61	15.89	799	135	16.90
4	353	61	17.28	863	189	21.90
5	374	86	22.99	869	194	22.32
6	308	49	15.91	622	88	14.15
7	299	62	20.74	737	147	19.95
8	241	46	19.09	629	129	20.51
High School	219	32	14.61	522	85	16.28
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	386	54	13.99	806	110	13.65
4	359	39	10.86	867	130	14.99
5	379	48	12.66	869	94	10.82
6	309	21	6.80	629	54	8.59
7	304	24	7.89	749	54	7.21
8	244	27	11.07	630	60	9.52
High School	222	16	7.21	527	58	11.01
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	375	59	15.73	871	101	11.60
6						
7						
8	234	21	8.97	607	71	11.70
High School	167	8	4.79	445	42	9.44
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not administer the science assessment in grades 4, 6 or 7.						