

Prior to submitting your comments, we invite you to read [a letter from Commissioner Anthes on Colorado's ESSA State Plan Development and release of the state plan draft](#).

## Long-term Goals

*Instructions: Each SEA must provide baseline data (i.e., starting point data), measurements of interim progress, and long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. For each goal, the SEA must describe how it established its long-term goals, including its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals, consistent with the requirements in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.13. Each SEA must provide goals and measurements of interim progress for the all students group and separately for each subgroup of students, consistent with the State's minimum number of students.*

*In the tables below, identify the baseline (data and year) and long-term goal (data and year). If the tables do not accommodate this information, an SEA may create a new table or text box(es) within this template. Each SEA must include measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency in Appendix A.*

### A. Academic Achievement.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

Colorado stakeholders indicated that normative long-term targets that are attainable, while also being ambitious, are the most appropriate measures of school improvement. Colorado's accountability calculations are anchored around the distribution of observed school results for each metric/content area. CDE previously reported on the percent of students scoring Proficient or Advanced on the CSAP/TCAP assessments, but due to student data privacy concerns and the desire to focus on the performance of all students, the state has shifted to using mean scale score as the metric for accountability reporting. By applying a percentile rank methodology to this school distribution, a consistent measuring stick is created in the baseline year which can be applied to all future assessment results to determine whether the system as a whole and/or individual schools have made progress. The cut-score for meeting state achievement expectations has historically been set at the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in the baseline year. To meet the ESSA requirements for setting long-term goals, CDE analyzed historical data using this baseline percentile ranking methodology to determine the average amount of improvement across the state and within schools over varying time frames. The average percentile rank change per year was -.05 for Reading and +.02 in Math. Colorado stakeholders generally preferred a timeline of 5-7 years to achieve long-term goals, so CDE has settled on six (6) years to achieve the 53rd percentile on the baseline scale with interim progress checks every two years. Currently only one year of assessment data was used to set the baseline percentile rank scale and all disaggregated groups will be held to the same set of interim targets. In future years, once additional results have become available, the baseline scale and subsequent interim targets and long-term goals may need to be revised.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals in the table below.

## Grade-level Table

| Subgroups                                 | Reading/<br>Language<br>Arts: Baseline<br>Data and Year | Reading/<br>Language<br>Arts: Long-<br>term Goal | Mathematics:<br>Baseline Data<br>and Year | Mathematics:<br>Long-term<br>Goal |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| All students                              | 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Economically<br>disadvantaged<br>students | 18 <sup>th</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 19 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Children with<br>disabilities             | 1 <sup>st</sup> Percentile                              | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 1 <sup>st</sup> Percentile                | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| English learners                          | 16 <sup>th</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 19 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Minority                                  | 27 <sup>th</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 27 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| American Indian<br>or Alaska Native       | 18 <sup>th</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 16 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Asian                                     | 82 <sup>nd</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 88 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Black                                     | 19 <sup>th</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 15 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Hispanic                                  | 21 <sup>st</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| White                                     | 71 <sup>st</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 72 <sup>nd</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Hawaiian/Pacific<br>Islander              | 43 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 44 <sup>th</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |
| Two or More<br>Races                      | 63 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                             | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile                      | 62 <sup>nd</sup> Percentile               | 53 <sup>rd</sup> Percentile       |

### B. Graduation Rate.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

Colorado uses the 4-year plus extended adjusted cohort rate to determine whether the system as a whole and/or individual schools have made progress in graduating students who are college and career ready. The school-level distribution of graduation rates does not follow a normal distribution like the Academic Achievement and Progress indicators, therefore can't be transformed into a percentile rank scale for setting targets. Instead, Colorado examined the annual increase in the percent of all students graduating in Colorado for the past four years (the timeframe in which the adjusted cohort rate has been in place), and on average Colorado has shown a gain of 1.3% per year. Utilizing the same 6-year timeframe used for the other indicator targets, Colorado is setting a long-term goal of increasing 7.8%, with interim targets of +2.6% every two years.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the table below.

| Subgroup                            | Baseline (Data and Year) | Long-term Goal (Data and Year) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| All students                        | 82.5%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 72.0%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Children with disabilities          | 72.2%                    | 90.3%                          |
| English learners                    | 69.2%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Minority                            | 76.1%                    | 90.3%                          |
| American Indian or Alaska Native    | 71.4%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Asian                               | 91.6%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Black                               | 76.6%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Hispanic                            | 73.6%                    | 90.3%                          |
| White                               | 87.2%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Hawaiian/Pacific Islander           | 82.8%                    | 90.3%                          |
| Two or More Races                   | 85.4%                    | 90.3%                          |

- iii. If applicable, provide the baseline and long-term goals for each extended-year cohort graduation rate(s) and describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements for such an extended-year rate or rates that are more rigorous as compared to the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress than the four-year adjusted cohort rate, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

NA

### C. English Language Proficiency.

- i. **Description.** Describe the State's uniform procedure, applied consistently to all English learners in the State, to establish research-based student-level targets on which the goals and measurements of interim progress are based. The description must include:
1. How the State considers a student's English language proficiency level at the time of identification and, if applicable, any other student characteristics that the State takes into account (*i.e.*, time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education, if any).
  2. The applicable timelines over which English learners sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within a State-determined maximum number of years and a rationale for that State-determined maximum.
  3. How the student-level targets expect all English learners to make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency within the applicable timelines.

Colorado intends to create a student level timeline for attaining English proficiency and measure whether English learners are on-track to meeting this goal based on results from the WiDA ACCESS for ELLs assessment.

2016 marked a major change in the ACCESS for ELLs assessment. WiDA transitioned

to and launched a revised assessment, ACCESS 2.0, which changed the format of the assessment to an online platform. In addition, WiDA made changes to the content of the assessment to meet language demands of college and career readiness standards. For 2016, scores were based on the original ACCESS cut scores. 2017 will be the first year that student results will be based on the newly established cut scores that will be aligned to the increased language expectations required in classrooms with the goal of ensuring all students will be college and career ready. Although final results from the standard setting have not been fully reviewed, CDE expects students will need to showcase higher language skills in 2016–2017 than prior years to achieve the same proficiency level scores (1.0–6.0). Colorado requires student data based on the new cut scores to make a data-based decision on ambitious, yet attainable timeframes for reaching English language proficiency under these new more rigorous expectations.

Information about a student’s initial language proficiency status will be used to determine the timeline in which the student is expected to attain English fluency. Students entering with higher levels of language proficiency will be expected to achieve fluency within shorter periods of time than newcomers with lower initial levels of English proficiency. The age and enrolled grade level of a student may also be used for determining the English acquisition timeline for Colorado students. Colorado has begun and will continue to review available research literature on EL acquisition timelines to determine the appropriate maximum number of years to move from non-English proficient to fully-English proficient and what would be appropriate interim targets for determining whether students are on-track to meet this long-term goal.

- ii. Describe how the SEA established ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency based on 1.C.i. and provide the State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency.

Once standard setting and 2017 student level WiDA ACCESS results are available, CDE will apply the same percentile ranking methodology as is used for achievement measures to create a baseline scale and determine the appropriate long-term goals for increasing the percentage of English learners making progress toward English fluency. Future updates to the state plan will provide additional details.

| Subgroup         | Baseline (Data and Year) | Long-term Goal (Data and Year) |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| English learners | TBD                      | TBD                            |

\*\*\*[Click here to provide feedback on this Draft Section of the ESSA State Plan](#)\*\*\*