No Child left Behind

Colorado State Report Card 2011-12

Unit of Federal Programs Administration
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450
Denver, Colorado 80202

cde Improving Academic Achievement

Table of Contents

Introduction **3**

Assessment Data **5**

Title I Accountability Data **6**

2012 Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)

- Elementary Reading 9
- Middle Reading 10
- High Reading 11
- Elementary Writing 12
- Middle Writing 13
- High Writing 14
- Elementary Math 15
- Middle Math 16
- High Math 17
- Elementary Science 18
- Middle Science 19
- High Science 20

District Accountability Measures **21**

School Accountability Measures **28**

Title II Accountability: Highly Qualified (HQ) Teacher Data **34**

Title III Accountability: Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAos) **35**

Title III Improvement **37**

2012 Title I Distinguished Schools **40**

Introduction

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) is pleased to present the No Child Left Behind 2012 Report Card. This 2012 Report Card details the progress Colorado, its districts and their schools are making toward reaching the goals of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

Public reporting is a key component of NCLB. When information and data are made public they become catalysts for change. The intent of the NCLB Report Card is to inform parents, teachers, the general public, key policy-makers and other decision-makers about the status of education in Colorado generally and in relation to NCLB goals.

As of July 2013, 39 states and the District of Columbia, including Colorado, had requested and been granted an NCLB Flexibility Waiver (http://www.cde.state.co.us/Accountability/NCLBWaiver.asp) from the U. S. Department of Education. Colorado received permission to alter how it would fulfill a number of ESEA requirements. This has resulted in significant differences between the 2011 reporting and the 2012 accountability data.

Until 2012, Colorado used two different accountability systems—our state system and the federal system established under NCLB legislation. The waiver authorized Colorado to use its state accountability system in place of key federal accountability requirements. As a result of the flexibility waiver, Colorado's rigorous state accountability system satisfies NCLB requirements for determining school and district progress in meeting annual performance targets. Further, growth is an important component of the Colorado accountability system and is reflected in the 2012 data. Specifically, schools/districts are accountable for reading, writing and math academic growth overall, as well as the academic growth of historically disadvantaged groups such as English learners, students with disabilities and those who are economically disadvantaged.

This report includes:

- **Links to Assessment Data** - results of the reading, writing, math and science state content assessments: Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP), Colorado Alternative Assessment (CoAlt) and Lectura and Escritura (Spanish reading and writing assessments)

- **Accountability Data**
  - 2010-11 Graduation Rate Data (prior year's data always apply for accountability due to timing constraints)
  - Status of individual school districts
  - Status of Title I schools, including priority, focus and reward designations
  - Status of Title III grantees, based on Annual Measurable Academic Objectives (AMAOs)

- Information about teacher qualifications and percentages of classes taught by highly qualified teachers

- Colorado's 2012 Title I Distinguished Schools

Parents, school/district staff and the general public have ready access to assessment, Title I Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) and highly qualified (HQ) teacher data for individual schools and districts through SchoolView, on the CDE website at https://edx.cde.state.co.us/SchoolView/DataCenter/reports.jspx?_afrWindowMode=0&_afrLoop=18647514452234573&_adf.ctrl-state=3wfspztiy_34 as well as at http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/index. Please explore these sites and let us know what other data that you believe would be helpful to include in the State Report Card.

If you have questions about an individual school or district, I encourage you to contact the applicable administrative office. Additionally, all Colorado districts create an Annual Report to the Public, which contains additional data and information on that specific district and its schools.

The Colorado Department of Education thanks you for your interest in the education of our students. Working together, we can provide an educational environment wherein students thrive, educators are effective, and outstanding schools and districts meet the needs of Colorado students.

Patrick Chapman, Executive Director
Unit of Federal Programs Administration
Colorado Department of Education

Assessment Data

The Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) is Colorado's standards-based assessment designed to measure student progress toward proficiency on Colorado's Content Standards. TCAP assesses 3rd – 10th grade students in reading, writing and math and 5th, 8th and 10th grade students in science. Lectura (reading) and Escritura (writing) are administered to 3rd and 4th grade Spanish speaking students with limited English fluency. State, district and school grade-level results are available at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/CoAssess-DataAndResults.asp.

Students with significant cognitive disabilities (about 1% of students) may be eligible to take the Colorado Alternate Assessment (CoAlt) which assesses them to alternate achievement standards. The school IEP team determines if a student qualifies for the alternate assessment in accordance with criteria provided by the CDE Exceptional Student Services Unit. CoAlt assesses students on modified state content standards in reading, writing, math (grades 3-10) and science (grades 5, 8 and 10). State, district and school grade-level results are available at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/assessment/CoAltAssess-DataAndResults.asp.

State-level tables that present the percentages of students scoring *unsatisfactory, partially proficient, proficient, advanced,* and *no score* on TCAP reading/Lectura, writing/Escritura, math and science, and *inconclusive, exploring, emerging, developing, novice,* and *no score* on CoAlt by grade and content area are posted at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/index under State-Level Assessment Summaries. Test booklets are marked *no score* if a student did not take the test or did not complete a minimum number of questions in all test sessions. The data are disaggregated by separate race/ethnicity categories as well as minority overall, English learners, economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, gender and migrant status.

Title I Accountability Data

Prior to 2012 and approval of Colorado's *NCLB Flexibility Waiver* request, NCLB required CDE to determine annually whether the state overall and its school districts made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets. Districts, in turn, determined whether their schools made AYP targets. AYP determinations were based on reading and math CSAP (prior to TCAP)/Lectura, CSAPA (prior to CoAlt) participation and performance and graduation rate data.

To meet AYP targets, the school/district/state, as well as any disaggregated groups of 30+ students had to meet:

1. The 95 percent reading and math participation requirement (95% of enrolled students must have been assessed with CSAP/Lectura or CSAPA).

2. Math and reading performance targets, or make *safe harbor* by decreasing the percent of students scoring non-proficient by 10 percent from the prior year. Performance targets varied by grade span (elementary, middle and high) and content area. Targets increased every three years in order to meet the goal of 100 percent proficiency in 2013-2014 (http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/dper/ayp.asp).

3. Fulfill *other indicator* requirements. In 2011, for elementary and middle school levels, the *other indicator* target was 1.33 percent of students advanced in reading and math. The high school level *other indicator* was graduation rate. For 2011, the school/district/state had to meet the 2010 4-year on-time graduation rate target (63%), the 5-year (65%) or the 6-year (67%) target, or demonstrate an increase of two percentage points from the previous year.

Participation, performance and *other indicator* targets applied to disaggregated groups only if they included 30+ students. Disaggregated groups included White, Hispanic, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, English learners, economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities. The state also reported data separately for males, females, and migrant students, although those groups were not included in AYP determinations and were not required for accountability.

Historical school and district AYP information can be found at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/dper/aypres.asp and through the SchoolView Data Center at https://edx.cde.state.co.us/SchoolView/DataCenter/reports.jspx?_afrWindowMode=0&_afrLoop=4734833378647385&_adf.ctrl-state=l886fle22_4.

NCLB Accountability Requirements beginning in 2012

With the flexibility waiver, federal school and district AYP determinations were replaced by state-developed Performance Frameworks. District and School Performance Frameworks (DPFs and SPFs) provide snapshots of academic achievement, academic growth, growth gaps (for disaggregated groups) and postsecondary readiness. District performance on these indicators leads to the following accreditation designations (highest to lowest): Accredited with Distinction, Accredited, Accredited with Improvement Plan, Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan and Accredited with Turnaround Plan. School performance determines which type of improvement plan CDE recommends (highest to lowest): Performance Plan, Improvement Plan, Priority Improvement Plan and Turnaround Plan. Title I accountability is attached to districts and schools with *Priority Improvement* or *Turnaround Plan* assignments.

Although the flexibility waiver eliminated AYP rules and performance targets, Colorado committed to setting Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) achievement targets for proficiency in reading, writing, math and science and, in accordance with NCLB regulations, reporting state/district/school and disaggregated group progress toward these goals to the U.S. Department of Education and the public. However, these are for reporting purposes only; meeting these goals does not determine Title I accountability. Colorado's participation AMOs remained 95 percent; new proficiency AMOs were based on the percentages of students who were *proficient/advanced* (TCAP/Lectura/Escritura) and *developing/novice* (CoAlt) and the *meets* targets were established by the school that performed at the 50th percentile, separately by grade span (EMH) and content area, in 2009-10. The school-level *exceeds* targets were the percentages of students who were proficient at the school that performed at the 90th percentile in 2009-10. Separate district-level AMOs were established similarly, using the percentages proficient at the 50th (meets) and 90th (exceeds) percentiles. AMOs began at the 50th percentile and will increase to the 90th over time. *Meets* and *exceeds* percentages are:

Content Area	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
Grade Span	E	M	H	E	M	H	E	M	H	E	M	H
School 50th percentile (meets)	71.65	71.43	73.33	70.89	52.48	33.52	53.52	57.77	50.00	47.53	48.00	50.00
School 90th percentile (exceeds)	89.10	88.24	87.23	89.34	75.00	54.79	76.83	79.67	72.24	75.96	75.11	72.41
District 50th percentile (meets)	71.51	70.50	71.53	70.51	50.00	32.16	54.72	56.36	48.61	48.00	45.60	48.93
District 90th percentile (exceeds)	84.37	83.57	84.78	84.60	68.84	52.06	69.66	72.27	67.56	69.72	69.09	70.39

The elementary/middle other indicator target remained what it had been under AYP, and prior to the NCLB waiver, 1.33 percent advanced, with the addition of writing and science, excluding CoAlt tests, for which there is no advanced equivalent. The high school other indicator target remained the prior year's graduation rate, but targets went from a met/not met determination to a percentage of points possible, with the expectation being 80 percent. Again, the other indicator is only used for reporting purposes. The best graduation rate (4-, 5-, 6- or 7-year) is in bold type below.

Graduation Rate 2010 - 11				
Student Group	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
All Students	73.9%	**77.1%**	76.2%	75.7%
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	52.2%	57.4%	58.2%	**58.9%**
Asian	81.7%	**87.6%**	87.5%	86.8%
Black	64.6%	**70.8%**	67.5%	64.8%
Hispanic	60.1%	**62.8%**	60.7%	58.6%
White	81.1%	**83.6%**	83.1%	83.0%
Pacific Islander	**74.8%**	<16	<16	<16
2+ ethnic/racial	**82.8%**	33.3%	22.2%	<16
Minority	63.1%	66.0%	**64.0%**	62.2%
English Learners	52.8%	**58.8%**	58.5%	58.7%
FRM Eligible	62.2%	**66.1%**	64.9%	62.9%
Students with Disabilities	53.5%	61.4%	65.2%	**67.0%**
Females	77.6%	**80.5%**	79.6%	79.0%
Males	70.3%	**73.8%**	73.0%	72.6%
Migrant	60.8%	62.7%	**64.0%**	62.3%

There were other changes as well.

1. Minimum disaggregated group N was 30 for AYP, but is now 16 for AMOs and graduation rate.

2. Under AYP regulations, performance and advanced percentages were based on the upper limit of the 95% confidence interval; under the waiver, the actual percentage is used.

3. Under AYP, when a performance target was not met, there was the possibility of making safe harbor, by decreasing the percentage of students unsatisfactory at least 10 percent from the prior year. The state system based on performance frameworks does not include such a safe harbor.

4. The original five ethnic/racial groups (Native American/American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic and White) have been expanded. There is a separate Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian group, as well as a group for students who consider themselves part of more than one ethnicity/race. In addition, Colorado reports out an overall minority group that includes all students except those who identified themselves as White.

The following chart compares requirements and outlines changes around Title I accountability, program requirements and data reporting pre- and post-NCLB waiver.

Title 1		Pre-Waiver	Post-Waiver
School and District Accountability		School and District AYP	School and District Performance Frameworks
		School and Program Improvement	Turnaround or Priority Improvement Plan type assignments
Public School Choice		Required of all Title I schools identified for Improvement, based on AYP results	Required of Title IA schools identified with Turnaround or Priority Improvement Plan Type assignments
Supplemental Education Services (SES)		Required of all Title I schools identified for Improvement Year 2 and beyond, based on AYP results	Required of all Title I schools identified as Turnaround or Priority Improvement
Data Reporting and Accountability	Participation	95% participation required in reading and math for state/district/school and any disaggregated groups with 30+	95% participation required in at least two of the four content areas, for state/district/school and any disaggregated groups with 16+
	Proficiency	Reported in conjunction with specific tri-annual targets with end point of 100%	Reported in conjunction with specific, annual targets beginning at 50th percentile and rising to 90th percentile
		Reading and Math	Reading, Writing, Math and Science
		Including Partially Proficient, Proficient, Advanced-CSAP/Lectura)	Including Proficient and Advanced-TCAP/ Lectura and Escritura
		Including Emerging, Developing, Novice (CSAPA)	Including Developing and Novice (COAlt)
		no minimum N to report district/school overall	minimum N=16 to report district/ school overall
		minimum N=30 to report disaggregated student groups	minimum N=16 to report disaggregated student groups
		use upper limit of 95% confidence interval	no confidence interval
	Growth		Reading, Writing and Math Growth Median Growth Percentiles (MGPs) and median Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGPs); minimum N=20
	Exclusions for Performance and Advanced	must be continuously enrolled in school/ district 12+ months	**District:** must be continuously enrolled in district 12+ months or enrolled in a district school by October 1. **School:** must be enrolled by October 1

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Elementary Reading

Reading 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 71.51%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	203,928	204,969	99.49	YES	144,160	203,877	70.71	NO	14,502	201,875	7.18	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	1,610	1,617	99.57	YES	882	1,610	54.78	NO	48	1,588	3.02	YES
Asian	6,617	6,649	99.52	YES	5,046	6,586	76.62	YES	736	6,537	11.26	YES
Black	8,948	9,036	99.03	YES	4,803	8,940	53.72	NO	186	8,820	2.11	YES
Hispanic	66,080	66,458	99.43	YES	35,368	66,074	53.53	NO	1,609	65,382	2.46	YES
White	113,672	114,176	99.56	YES	92,748	113,668	81.60	YES	11,311	112,630	10.04	YES
Pacific Islander	397	397	100.00	YES	255	396	64.39	NO	20	393	5.09	YES
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	6,587	6,618	99.53	YES	5,049	6,586	76.66	YES	592	6,514	9.09	YES
Minority	90,239	90,775	99.41	YES	51,403	90,192	56.99	NO	3,191	89,234	3.58	YES
English Learners	38,891	39,137	99.37	YES	17,921	38,833	46.15	NO	740	38,521	1.92	YES
FRM Eligible	89,873	90,408	99.41	YES	48,749	89,841	54.26	NO	1,982	88,749	2.23	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	21,266	21,604	98.44	YES	5,460	21,266	25.67	NO	115	19,264	0.60	NO
Females	99,940	100,398	99.54	YES	74,479	99,917	74.54	YES	8,870	99,188	8.94	YES
Males	103,967	104,549	99.44	YES	69,669	103,939	67.03	NO	5,632	102,672	5.49	YES
Migrant	641	644	99.53	YES	238	640	37.19	NO	5	637	0.78	NO

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Middle Reading

Reading 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 70.50%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	172,349	173,439	99.37	YES	118,321	172,319	68.66	NO	15,620	170,713	9.15	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	1,455	1,467	99.18	YES	792	1,454	54.47	NO	63	1,436	4.39	YES
Asian	5,370	5,389	99.65	YES	4,060	5,366	75.66	YES	855	5,335	16.03	YES
Black	8,944	9,032	99.03	YES	4,626	8,940	51.74	NO	268	8,819	3.04	YES
Hispanic	55,609	55,957	99.38	YES	27,926	55,593	50.23	NO	1,633	55,040	2.97	YES
White	95,358	95,951	99.38	YES	76,674	95,353	80.41	YES	12,169	94,516	12.88	YES
Pacific Islander	402	406	99.01	YES	258	402	64.18	NO	23	398	5.78	YES
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	5,205	5,231	99.50	YES	3,981	5,205	76.48	YES	609	5,165	11.79	YES
Minority	76,985	77,482	99.36	YES	41,643	76,960	54.11	NO	3,451	76,193	4.53	YES
English Learners	31,023	31,156	99.57	YES	12,953	30,993	41.79	NO	604	30,755	1.96	YES
FRM Eligible	73,780	74,336	99.25	YES	37,792	73,762	51.24	NO	1,942	72,867	2.67	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	17,345	17,745	97.75	YES	3,803	17,344	21.93	NO	92	15,738	0.58	NO
Females	84,242	84,664	99.50	YES	61,928	84,232	73.52	YES	9,723	83,632	11.63	YES
Males	88,098	88,766	99.25	YES	56,388	88,078	64.02	NO	5,897	87,074	6.77	YES
Migrant	493	496	99.40	YES	153	492	31.10	NO	6	487	1.23	NO

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

High Reading

Reading 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 71.53%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total		
All Students	115,348	117,700	98.00	YES	79,497	115,315	68.94	NO
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	984	1,023	96.19	YES	567	984	57.62	NO
Asian	3,669	3,720	98.63	YES	2,763	3,660	75.49	YES
Black	5,573	5,734	97.19	YES	2,787	5,570	50.04	NO
Hispanic	33,868	34,598	97.89	YES	17,394	33,849	51.39	NO
White	67,642	68,937	98.12	YES	53,286	67,641	78.78	YES
Pacific Islander	281	287	97.91	YES	186	280	66.43	NO
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	3,312	3,382	97.93	YES	2,497	3,312	75.39	YES
Minority	47,687	48,744	97.83	YES	26,194	47,655	54.97	NO
English Learners	17,989	18,289	98.36	YES	7,714	17,956	42.96	NO
FRM Eligible	41,348	42,420	97.47	YES	21,159	41,326	51.20	NO
Students with Dis-abilities	10,131	10,560	95.94	YES	2,144	10,131	21.16	NO
Females	56,573	57,681	98.08	YES	42,262	56,563	74.72	YES
Males	58,754	59,998	97.93	YES	37,218	58,731	63.37	NO
Migrant	306	316	96.84	YES	88	306	28.76	NO

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Elementary Writing

Writing 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 54.72%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	204,052	205,002	99.54	YES	110,352	204,006	54.09	NO	17,700	202,009	8.76	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	1,606	1,612	99.63	YES	578	1,606	35.99	NO	65	1,584	4.10	YES
Asian	6,627	6,653	99.61	YES	4,379	6,601	66.34	YES	1,028	6,552	15.69	YES
Black	8,989	9,045	99.38	YES	3,369	8,981	37.51	NO	304	8,861	3.43	YES
Hispanic	66,124	66,463	99.49	YES	24,865	66,117	37.61	NO	2,219	65,428	3.39	YES
White	113,692	114,184	99.57	YES	72,963	113,689	64.18	YES	13,349	112,653	11.85	YES
Pacific Islander	396	397	99.75	YES	211	395	53.42	NO	25	392	6.38	YES
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	6,599	6,628	99.56	YES	3,980	6,598	60.32	YES	710	6,526	10.88	YES
Minority	90,341	90,798	99.50	YES	37,382	90,298	41.40	NO	4,351	89,343	4.87	YES
English Learners	38,946	39,141	99.50	YES	13,384	38,894	34.41	NO	1,226	38,586	3.18	YES
FRM Eligible	89,936	90,405	99.48	YES	33,106	89,906	36.82	NO	2,710	88,816	3.05	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	21,286	21,589	98.60	YES	3,156	21,286	14.83	NO	149	19,289	0.77	NO
Females	100,007	100,396	99.61	YES	61,093	99,987	61.10	YES	11,506	99,258	11.59	YES
Males	104,023	104,583	99.46	YES	49,249	103,997	47.36	NO	6,194	102,735	6.03	YES
Migrant	644	646	99.69	YES	163	643	25.35	NO	11	640	1.72	YES

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Middle Writing

Writing 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 54.72%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	172,172	173,457	99.26	YES	98,434	172,146	57.18	YES	18,763	170,550	11.00	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	1,452	1,467	98.98	YES	582	1,451	40.11	NO	66	1,434	4.60	YES
Asian	5,362	5,391	99.46	YES	3,751	5,358	70.01	YES	1,038	5,329	19.48	YES
Black	8,956	9,036	99.11	YES	3,652	8,952	40.80	NO	393	8,833	4.45	YES
Hispanic	55,562	55,963	99.28	YES	22,181	55,549	39.93	NO	2,222	55,001	4.04	YES
White	95,238	95,955	99.25	YES	64,724	95,234	67.96	YES	14,323	94,397	15.17	YES
Pacific Islander	402	406	99.01	YES	215	402	53.48	NO	30	398	7.54	YES
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	5,194	5,233	99.25	YES	3,326	5,194	64.04	YES	691	5,154	13.41	YES
Minority	76,928	77,496	99.27	YES	33,707	76,906	43.83	NO	4,440	76,149	5.83	YES
English Learners	31,014	31,157	99.54	YES	10,927	30,988	35.26	NO	963	30,752	3.13	YES
FRM Eligible	73,708	74,344	99.14	YES	28,781	73,694	39.05	NO	2,480	72,807	3.41	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	17,358	17,754	97.77	YES	2,541	17,357	14.64	NO	110	15,761	0.70	NO
Females	84,132	84,672	99.36	YES	54,945	84,124	65.31	YES	12,746	83,531	15.26	YES
Males	88,031	88,776	99.16	YES	43,485	88,013	49.41	NO	6,017	87,012	6.92	YES
Migrant	490	496	98.79	YES	118	489	24.13	NO	7	484	1.45	YES

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

High Writing

Writing 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 48.61%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total		
All Students	115,318	117,727	97.95	YES	58,389	115,286	50.65	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	984	1,023	96.19	YES	342	984	34.76	NO
Asian	3,653	3,720	98.20	YES	2,210	3,644	60.65	YES
Black	5,586	5,735	97.40	YES	1,715	5,583	30.72	NO
Hispanic	33,919	34,608	98.01	YES	10,593	33,901	31.25	NO
White	67,569	68,953	97.99	YES	41,478	67,568	61.39	YES
Pacific Islander	283	287	98.61	YES	133	282	47.16	NO
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	3,306	3,382	97.75	YES	1,906	3,306	57.65	YES
Minority	47,731	48,755	97.90	YES	16,899	47,700	35.43	NO
English Learners	18,040	18,294	98.61	YES	4,391	18,008	24.38	NO
FRM Eligible	41,434	42,435	97.64	YES	12,765	41,413	30.82	NO
Students with Dis-abilities	10,134	10,565	95.92	YES	1,013	10,134	10.00	NO
Females	56,552	57,695	98.02	YES	33,175	56,542	58.67	YES
Males	58,746	60,011	97.89	YES	25,200	58,724	42.91	NO
Migrant	310	316	98.10	YES	52	310	16.77	NO

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Elementary Math

Math 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 70.51%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	204,290	204,941	99.7	YES	140,941	204,256	69.00	NO	60,421	202,281	29.87	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	1,605	1,611	99.6	YES	859	1,605	53.52	NO	260	1,583	16.42	YES
Asian	6,636	6,651	99.8	YES	5,348	6,619	80.80	YES	3,031	6,570	46.13	YES
Black	8,998	9,041	99.5	YES	4,167	8,992	46.34	NO	1,066	8,873	12.01	YES
Hispanic	66,255	66,435	99.7	YES	34,879	66,249	52.65	NO	9,581	65,570	14.61	YES
White	113,787	114,164	99.7	YES	90,598	113,784	79.62	YES	44,140	112,758	39.15	YES
Pacific Islander	394	395	99.8	YES	261	393	66.41	NO	103	390	26.41	YES
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	6,604	6,632	99.6	YES	4,823	6,603	73.04	YES	2,239	6,532	34.28	YES
Minority	90,492	90,765	99.7	YES	50,337	90,461	55.64	NO	16,280	89,518	18.19	YES
English Learners	39,026	39,131	99.7	YES	19,088	38,992	48.95	NO	5,192	38,686	13.42	YES
FRM Eligible	90,036	90,351	99.7	YES	47,672	90,012	52.96	NO	12,921	88,935	14.53	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	21,333	21,589	98.8	YES	6,412	21,333	30.06	NO	1,290	19,358	6.66	YES
Females	100,109	100,378	99.7	YES	68,724	100,094	68.66	NO	28,135	99,366	28.31	YES
Males	104,173	104,554	99.6	YES	72,214	104,154	69.33	NO	32,286	102,913	31.37	YES
Migrant	645	647	99.7	YES	258	644	40.06	NO	49	641	7.64	YES

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Middle Math

Math 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 50.00%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	172,253	173,462	99.30	YES	93,774	172,238	54.44	YES	40,969	170,637	24.01	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	1,450	1,468	98.77	YES	577	1,450	39.79	NO	178	1,436	12.40	YES
Asian	5,363	5,386	99.57	YES	3,889	5,361	72.54	YES	2,288	5,331	42.92	YES
Black	8,902	9,033	98.55	YES	2,953	8,900	33.18	NO	754	8,779	8.59	YES
Hispanic	55,599	55,966	99.34	YES	20,127	55,593	36.20	NO	5,769	55,046	10.48	YES
White	95,336	95,959	99.35	YES	62,879	95,331	65.96	YES	30,452	94,489	32.23	YES
Pacific Islander	401	406	98.77	YES	207	401	51.62	YES	70	397	17.63	YES
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	5,194	5,236	99.20	YES	3,140	5,194	60.45	YES	1,458	5,153	28.29	YES
Minority	76,909	77,495	99.24	YES	30,893	76,899	40.17	NO	10,517	76,142	13.81	YES
English Learners	31,021	31,164	99.54	YES	10,549	31,006	34.02	NO	3,124	30,771	10.15	YES
FRM Eligible	73,748	74,334	99.21	YES	26,635	73,739	36.12	NO	7,263	72,846	9.97	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	17,407	17,753	98.05	YES	2,830	17,407	16.26	NO	536	15,806	3.39	YES
Females	84,169	84,670	99.41	YES	45,880	84,165	54.51	YES	19,306	83,567	23.10	YES
Males	88,074	88,782	99.20	YES	47,891	88,063	54.38	YES	21,663	87,062	24.88	YES
Migrant	494	497	99.40	YES	118	493	23.94	NO	16	488	3.28	YES

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

High Math

Math 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 32.16%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total		
All Students	115,369	117,716	98.01	YES	41,253	115,343	35.77	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	988	1,020	96.86	YES	212	988	21.46	NO
Asian	3,666	3,722	98.50	YES	2,041	3,659	55.78	YES
Black	5,605	5,726	97.89	YES	898	5,603	16.03	NO
Hispanic	33,974	34,612	98.16	YES	6,151	33,959	18.11	NO
White	67,528	68,953	97.93	YES	30,500	67,527	45.17	YES
Pacific Islander	282	289	97.58	YES	82	281	29.18	NO
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	3,308	3,375	98.01	YES	1,365	3,308	41.26	YES
Minority	47,823	48,744	98.11	YES	10,749	47,798	22.49	NO
English Learners	18,066	18,296	98.74	YES	3,037	18,040	16.83	NO
FRM Eligible	41,536	42,427	97.90	YES	7,462	41,517	17.97	NO
Students with Dis-abilities	10,166	10,557	96.30	YES	714	10,166	7.02	NO
Females	56,564	57,696	98.04	YES	19,611	56,554	34.68	YES
Males	58,787	60,001	97.98	YES	21,637	58,771	36.82	YES
Migrant	312	317	98.42	YES	29	312	9.29	NO

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Elementary Science

Science 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 48.00%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	63,224	63,415	99.70	YES	30,720	63,206	48.60	YES	8,741	62,594	13.96	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	529	530	99.81	YES	173	529	32.70	NO	29	521	5.57	YES
Asian	2,030	2,034	99.80	YES	1,186	2,022	58.65	YES	432	2,011	21.48	YES
Black	2,912	2,922	99.66	YES	711	2,910	24.43	NO	88	2,869	3.07	YES
Hispanic	20,554	20,609	99.73	YES	5,514	20,548	26.83	NO	881	20,353	4.33	YES
White	35,006	35,116	99.69	YES	21,964	35,005	62.75	YES	6,953	34,672	20.05	YES
Pacific Islander	123	124	99.19	YES	52	123	42.28	NO	13	122	10.66	YES
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	2,066	2,076	99.52	YES	1,119	2,065	54.19	YES	345	2,045	16.87	YES
Minority	28,214	28,295	99.71	YES	8,755	28,197	31.05	NO	1,788	27,921	6.40	YES
English Learners	12,134	12,163	99.76	YES	2,689	12,116	22.19	NO	415	12,028	3.45	YES
FRM Eligible	28,110	28,199	99.68	YES	7,927	28,099	28.21	NO	1,248	27,768	4.49	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	6,884	6,960	98.91	YES	1,150	6,884	16.71	NO	138	6,272	2.20	YES
Females	31,110	31,187	99.75	YES	14,831	31,105	47.68	NO	4,052	30,875	13.12	YES
Males	32,107	32,221	99.65	YES	15,888	32,094	49.50	YES	4,689	31,715	14.78	YES
Migrant	190	191	99.48	YES	24	190	12.63	NO	3	189	1.59	YES

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

Middle Science

Science 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 48.00%)				Advanced (Target = 1.33%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target	Number		Percent AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total			Advanced	Valid Scores		
All Students	60,005	60,471	99.23	YES	29,548	59,994	49.25	YES	4,418	59,446	7.43	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	516	524	98.47	YES	174	516	33.72	NO	9	511	1.76	YES
Asian	1,875	1,880	99.73	YES	1,182	1,874	63.07	YES	283	1,862	15.20	YES
Black	3,018	3,061	98.60	YES	835	3,017	27.68	NO	58	2,976	1.95	YES
Hispanic	18,566	18,711	99.23	YES	5,271	18,560	28.40	NO	405	18,381	2.20	YES
White	34,151	34,402	99.27	YES	21,058	34,148	61.67	YES	3,509	33,849	10.37	YES
Pacific Islander	121	121	100.00	YES	53	121	43.80	NO	1	121	0.83	NO
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	1,755	1,769	99.21	YES	975	1,755	55.56	YES	153	1,743	8.78	YES
Minority	25,851	26,066	99.18	YES	8,490	25,843	32.85	NO	909	25,594	3.55	YES
English Learners	10,228	10,292	99.38	YES	2,442	10,217	23.90	NO	188	10,145	1.85	YES
FRM Eligible	24,387	24,623	99.04	YES	7,066	24,380	28.98	NO	442	24,084	1.84	YES
Students with Dis-abilities	5,800	5,936	97.71	YES	845	5,800	14.57	NO	54	5,252	1.03	NO
Females	29,421	29,609	99.37	YES	14,518	29,416	49.35	YES	2,062	29,209	7.06	YES
Males	30,580	30,858	99.10	YES	15,029	30,574	49.16	YES	2,356	30,233	7.79	YES
Migrant	184	185	99.46	YES	25	183	13.66	NO	0	180	0.00	NO

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants. Advanced percentages are based on TCAP only and exclude students who took CoAlt.

2012 ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES (AMOS)

High Science

Science 2012	Participation (Target = 95%)				Performance (Target = 48.00%)			
Student Group	Number		Percent Tested	Met Target	Number		Percent PR + AD	Met Target
	Tested	Total			PR + AD	Total		
All Students	57,045	58,273	97.89	YES	28,687	57,031	50.30	YES
Am. Indian/ Alaskan Native	503	521	96.55	YES	181	503	35.98	NO
Asian	1,835	1,860	98.66	YES	1,052	1,830	57.49	YES
Black	2,807	2,881	97.43	YES	710	2,806	25.30	NO
Hispanic	16,341	16,690	97.91	YES	4,511	16,333	27.62	NO
White	33,781	34,492	97.94	YES	21,225	33,781	62.83	YES
Pacific Islander	135	138	97.83	YES	59	135	43.70	NO
2+ Ethnic/ Racial	1,637	1,684	97.21	YES	948	1,637	57.91	YES
Minority	23,258	23,774	97.83	YES	7,461	23,244	32.10	NO
English Learners	8,582	8,705	98.59	YES	1,788	8,568	20.87	NO
FRM Eligible	19,788	20,286	97.55	YES	5,743	19,776	29.04	NO
Students with Dis-abilities	4,846	5,053	95.90	YES	664	4,846	13.70	NO
Females	28,025	28,629	97.89	YES	13,736	28,019	49.02	YES
Males	29,014	29,637	97.90	YES	14,950	29,006	51.54	YES
Migrant	150	151	99.34	YES	17	150	11.33	NO

Note: Numbers accountable for Performance may be slightly lower than Number of Participants.

District Accountability Measures

The following table shows the Title I accountability status of all Colorado districts, percent of points earned and number of years on improvement, if applicable. The percentages of points required for each accreditation category are:

Accredited with Distinction	80% or higher
Accredited	64% - 79.99%
Accredited with Improvement	52% - 63.99%
Accredited with Priority Improvement	42% - 51.99%
Accredited with Turnaround	below 42%

Districts that accept Title I funds and are accredited with Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans are identified for Title I accountability. District performance frameworks (DPFs) detail each district's performance on measures of academic achievement, academic growth and graduation rate, overall and disaggregated by ethnic/racial groups, English learners, students with disabilities, etc. To view DPFs, go SchoolView at: http://www.schoolview.org/performance.asp.

District Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	2012 Accreditation Category	Percentage of Points Earned 2012	Improvement Status
0010	MAPLETON	Priority Improvement	47.4	Year 2
0020	ADAMS 12	Improvement	55.0	
0030	ADAMS 14	Turnaround	39.5	Year 3
0040	BRIGHTON	Improvement	53.4	
0050	BENNETT	Accredited	70.0	
0060	STRASBURG	Accredited	76.2	
0070	WESTMINSTER	Priority Improvement	46.4	Year 3
0100	ALAMOSA	Improvement	53.3	
0110	SANGRE DE CRISTO	Accredited	69.8	
0120	ENGLEWOOD	Priority Improvement	43.8	Year 3
0123	SHERIDAN	Priority Improvement	45.7	Year 3
0130	CHERRY CREEK	Accredited	71.5	
0140	LITTLETON 6	Distinction	81.1	
0170	DEER TRAIL	Accredited	64.2	
0180	AURORA	Priority Improvement	46.1	Year 2
0190	BYERS	Accredited	70.9	
0220	ARCHULETA COUNTY	Accredited	65.2	
0230	WALSH	Improvement	63.7	
0240	PRITCHETT	Priority Improvement	49.3	Year 1
0250	SPRINGFIELD	Accredited	68.5	
0260	VILAS	Turnaround	28.6	Year 4
0270	CAMPO	Improvement	55.9	
0290	LAS ANIMAS	Improvement	52.8	
0310	MC CLAVE	Accredited	73.2	
0470	ST VRAIN	Accredited	66.4	
0480	BOULDER	Accredited	79.2	
0490	BUENA VISTA	Accredited	70.5	
0500	SALIDA	Accredited	78.4	
0510	KIT CARSON	Accredited	66.3	
0520	CHEYENNE COUNTY	Accredited	64.8	
0540	CLEAR CREEK	Accredited	72.9	

District Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	2012 Accreditation Category	Percentage of Points Earned 2012	Improvement Status
0550	NORTH CONEJOS	Accredited	70.8	
0560	SANFORD	Accredited	69.8	
0580	SOUTH CONEJOS	Improvement	57.9	
0640	CENTENNIAL	Improvement	58.4	
0740	SIERRA GRANDE	Improvement	55.0	
0770	CROWLEY COUNTY	Improvement	61.6	
0860	CUSTER COUNTY	Accredited	75.2	
0870	DELTA COUNTY	Accredited	67.7	
0880	DENVER	Priority Improvement	51.7	Year 3
0890	DOLORES COUNTY 2	Improvement	58.7	
0900	DOUGLAS COUNTY	Accredited	73.7	
0910	EAGLE COUNTY	Accredited	66.8	
0920	ELIZABETH	Accredited	71.0	
0930	KIOWA	Distinction	83.0	
0940	BIG SANDY	Accredited	69.6	
0950	ELBERT	Accredited	70.4	
0960	AGATE	Accredited	100	
0970	CALHAN	Accredited	70.6	
0980	HARRISON	Improvement	59.7	
0990	WIDEFIELD	Improvement	61.6	
1000	FOUNTAIN	Accredited	68.2	
1010	COLORADO SPRINGS 11	Improvement	58.1	
1020	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12	Distinction	88.1	
1030	MANITOU SPRINGS 14	Accredited	73.5	
1040	ACADEMY 20	Distinction	83.3	
1050	ELLICOTT 22	Improvement	58.9	
1060	PEYTON 23 JT	Accredited	72.5	
1070	HANOVER 28	Improvement	63.0	
1080	LEWIS-PALMER 38	Distinction	85.1	
1110	FALCON 49	Accredited	71.1	

District Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	2012 Accreditation Category	Percentage of Points Earned 2012	Improvement Status
1120	EDISON 54 JT	Accredited	71.9	
1130	MIAMI/YODER 60 JT	Improvement	57.4	
1140	CANON CITY	Improvement	52.6	
1150	FREMONT	Improvement	53.0	
1160	COTOPAXI RE-3	Distinction	85.4	
1180	ROARING FORK RE-1	Accredited	69.4	
1195	GARFIELD RE-2	Improvement	54.8	
1220	GARFIELD 16	Improvement	60.5	
1330	GILPIN COUNTY RE-1	Improvement	63.0	
1340	WEST GRAND 1-JT.	Accredited	69.0	
1350	EAST GRAND 2	Accredited	74.2	
1360	GUNNISON WATERSHED RE1J	Accredited	73.2	
1380	HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1	Distinction	93.9	
1390	HUERFANO RE-1	Improvement	53.3	
1400	LA VETA RE-2	Accredited	66.2	
1410	NORTH PARK	Distinction	82.7	
1420	JEFFERSON COUNTY	Accredited	68.7	
1430	EADS	Distinction	80.5	
1440	PLAINVIEW	Accredited	76.8	
1450	ARRIBA-FLAGLER	Accredited	71.3	
1460	HI-PLAINS	Accredited	71.8	
1480	STRATTON	Accredited	67.9	
1490	BETHUNE	Improvement	59.2	
1500	BURLINGTON	Improvement	55.6	
1510	LAKE COUNTY	Priority Improvement	49.3	Year 1
1520	DURANGO	Improvement	62.5	
1530	BAYFIELD	Accredited	76.6	
1540	IGNACIO	Priority Improvement	43.3	Year 3
1550	POUDRE	Accredited	70.4	
1560	THOMPSON	Accredited	66.7	

District Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	2012 Accreditation Category	Percentage of Points Earned 2012	Improvement Status
1570	PARK (ESTES)	Accredited	67.4	
1580	TRINIDAD	Improvement	55.4	
1590	PRIMERO	Improvement	58.8	
1600	HOEHNE	Accredited	64.7	
1620	AGUILAR	Turnaround	40.5	Year 3
1750	BRANSON	Priority Improvement	51.9	Year 1
1760	KIM	Accredited	79.3	
1780	GENOA-HUGO	Improvement	58.7	
1790	LIMON	Accredited	77.0	
1810	KARVAL	Turnaround	40.2	Year 4
1828	VALLEY	Improvement	61.5	
1850	FRENCHMAN	Accredited	78.0	
1860	BUFFALO	Accredited	72.3	
1870	PLATEAU	Distinction	81.6	
1980	DE BEQUE	Improvement	52.0	
1990	PLATEAU VALLEY	Improvement	59.9	
2000	MESA COUNTY VALLEY	Improvement	62.3	
2010	CREEDE	Accredited	68.6	
2020	MOFFAT COUNTY 1	Improvement	63.0	
2035	MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ	Priority Improvement	48.3	Year 3
2055	DOLORES 4A	Accredited	76.0	
2070	MANCOS	Accredited	69.2	
2180	MONTROSE COUNTY	Improvement	61.0	
2190	WEST END	Improvement	60.7	
2395	BRUSH	Improvement	55.6	
2405	FORT MORGAN	Improvement	52.0	
2505	WELDON VALLEY	Accredited	74.8	
2515	WIGGINS	Accredited	72.6	
2520	EAST OTERO	Improvement	54.2	
2530	ROCKY FORD	Priority Improvement	44.1	Year 3

District Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	2012 Accreditation Category	Percentage of Points Earned 2012	Improvement Status
2535	MANZANOLA 3J	Priority Improvement	51.9	Year 1
2540	FOWLER R-4J	Accredited	68.7	
2560	CHERAW 31	Accredited	67.0	
2570	SWINK 33	Distinction	85.0	
2580	OURAY	Distinction	86.7	
2590	RIDGWAY	Distinction	91.0	
2600	PLATTE CANYON	Accredited	78.5	
2610	PARK COUNTY RE-2	Distinction	81.0	
2620	HOLYOKE	Improvement	62.2	
2630	HAXTUN	Distinction	86.3	
2640	ASPEN 1	Distinction	91.0	
2650	GRANADA	Accredited	72.7	
2660	LAMAR	Improvement	54.0	
2670	HOLLY	Accredited	75.2	
2680	WILEY	Accredited	71.5	
2690	PUEBLO CITY 60	Priority Improvement	46.2	Year 3
2700	PUEBLO COUNTY 70	Improvement	59.3	
2710	MEEKER	Accredited	73.4	
2720	RANGELY	Accredited	67.4	
2730	DEL NORTE	Accredited	68.1	
2740	MONTE VISTA	Priority Improvement	45.7	Year 2
2750	SARGENT	Accredited	74.6	
2760	HAYDEN	Accredited	66.5	
2770	STEAMBOAT SPRINGS	Distinction	88.2	
2780	SOUTH ROUTT	Accredited	76.3	
2790	MOUNTAIN VALLEY	Improvement	61.4	
2800	MOFFAT 2	Distinction	81.3	
2810	CENTER	Improvement	58.8	
2820	SILVERTON	Accredited	70.1	
2830	TELLURIDE	Distinction	88.7	

District Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	2012 Accreditation Category	Percentage of Points Earned 2012	Improvement Status
2840	NORWOOD	Accredited	69.6	
2862	JULESBURG	Priority Improvement	52.5	Year 3
2865	PLATTE VALLEY 3	Improvement	62.9	
3000	SUMMIT	Accredited	70.8	
3010	CRIPPLE CREEK-VICTOR	Improvement	63.8	
3020	WOODLAND PARK	Accredited	68.5	
3030	AKRON	Accredited	72.6	
3040	ARICKAREE	Accredited	75.6	
3050	OTIS	Accredited	64.4	
3060	LONE STAR	Accredited	69.0	
3070	WOODLIN	Accredited	69.1	
3080	WELD COUNTY 1	Improvement	57.6	
3085	EATON	Accredited	69.8	
3090	KEENESBURG	Improvement	57.9	
3100	WINDSOR	Accredited	67.5	
3110	JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN	Improvement	63.1	
3120	GREELEY	Priority Improvement	48.7	Year 1
3130	PLATTE VALLEY 7	Accredited	74.3	
3140	WELD COUNTY 8	Priority Improvement	48.3	Year 2
3145	AULT-HIGHLAND	Accredited	64.4	
3146	BRIGGSDALE	Accredited	76.4	
3147	PRAIRIE	Accredited	76.8	
3148	PAWNEE	Accredited	77.4	
3200	YUMA	Accredited	68.5	
3210	WRAY	Improvement	63.4	
3220	IDALIA	Accredited	69.8	
3230	LIBERTY	Improvement	61.1	
8001	CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	Priority Improvement	53.5	Year 3
9030	MOUNTAIN BOCES	Turnaround	37.0	Year 4
9050	SAN JUAN BOCES	Accredited. with Improvement*	33.3	
9130	EXPEDITIONARY BOCES	Accredited	78.4	

** Rating assigned per Board Rule 4.02*

School Accountability Measures

Schools that are served with Title I funds, if assigned a School Performance Framework (SPF) plan rating of *Priority Improvement* or *Turnaround,* must offer Public School Choice and Supplemental Education Services (SES). Public School Choice must be offered the first year a *Priority Improvement* or *Turnaround Plan* is assigned. In 2011-12, under this provision, 1,470 students (of 88,459 eligible) were granted transfer and provided transportation to another higher performing school in the district, at a total cost of $1,432,831.

Under the flexibility waiver, Title I schools are allowed to offer SES the first year they are assigned a *Priority Improvement* or *Turnaround Plan,* but schools assigned a *Priority Improvement* or *Turnaround Plan* for two consecutive years must use a portion of their Title I funds to provide SES. SES is tutoring offered outside of the regular school day to provide extra academic assistance for students who are unsatisfactory or partially proficient in reading or math on the most recent state assessment, or below grade level as measured by an early literacy assessment. In 2011-12, 9,420 of 56,123 students eligible for SES services received them, at a total cost of $10,123,022. Once a school is assigned an *Improvement* or *Performance Plan,* the school no longer has to offer Public School Choice or SES.

Additionally, as a condition of the waiver, CDE must identify certain Title I schools as focus, priority and reward schools. To be removed from *focus* or *priority* status, a school must receive an *Improvement* or *Performance Plan* assignment for two consecutive years.

Priority Schools: Schools implementing Title I Tiered Intervention Grants (TIGs). TIGs are competitive grants (funded from Title I, 1003g of ESEA) for schools identified as among the lowest performing five percent of Title I or Title I eligible schools, to implement one of four reform models defined by the U.S. Department of Education: Turnaround, Transformation, Restart and Closure.

Focus Schools: Ten percent of Colorado's Title I schools that are identified by:

1. Low graduation rate (regardless of plan type) and/or
2. *Turnaround* or *Priority Improvement* plan type with low-achieving disaggregated student groups (i.e., minority, ELL, IEP and FRL) and/or low disaggregated graduation rate.

Reward Schools: Colorado recognizes two types of Title I Reward Schools—High Performance and High Progress.

The ESEA High-Performance designation is awarded annually to schools in the state that meet the following criteria:

- Receive any of the following award designations: Governor's Distinguished Improvement Award, John Irwin School of Excellence Award, Centers for Excellence Award, Blue Ribbon School designation, or, the National Title I Distinguished School Awards;
- Receive Title I funds;
- Earn an *exceeds* ratings on Academic Achievement (*exceeds* is greater than the current year AMO, until 2015-16 when it equals the AMO);
- Have all disaggregated groups with 16+ students meeting or exceeding the current year AMO; and
- Earn a high school Graduation Rate *exceeds* rating (90% or higher).

The ESEA High-Progress designation is awarded annually to schools that:

- Improve their Academic Achievement rating, between three years prior and the current year, from *does not meet* to *meets/exceeds,* or *approaching* to *meets/exceeds;*
- Meet the minimum n-count for at least one disaggregated group;

- Have all disaggregated groups meeting or exceeding the current year AMO; and
- Have improved their Graduation Rate indicator rating (high schools only), between three years prior and the current year, from *does not meet* to *meets/exceeds*, or *approaching* to *exceeds*.

The following table lists all 2011-12 Title I schools that were designated *Priority*, *Focus* or *Reward* as a result of 2011-12 assessment performance, with their SPF Plan type assignments. For a complete list of all Title I schools and their SPF Plan assignments, go to: http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/index and click on "Title I schools 2011-12 SPF plans with 2012-13 Accountability Status." For more information about priority, focus and reward designation, go to the CDE website at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/ti/a and http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/ti/sitig. You can find historic school-level AYP and improvement results on the CDE website at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/dper/index and on SchoolView at: http://www.schoolview.org/.

School Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	School Number	School Name	Grade Span	Title I Span (if not all)	2011-12 Title I Status	2011-12 School Performance Framework Plan	Title I School Status 2012-13
0010	Mapleton	0263	Global Leadership Academy	EMH	EM	SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		0502	Meadow Community	EM	E	SW	Improvement	Priority
		0504	Welby Montessori	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		0505	Achieve Academy	EM	E	SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		0509	Clayton Partnership	EM	E	SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
0020	Adams 12	1878	Coronado Hills Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Focus
		2918	Federal Heights Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		4000	Hillcrest Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Focus
		5814	Thornton Middle	M		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		8361	Stukey Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		8842	Thornton Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
0030	Adams 14	0020	Adams City Middle	M		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		1426	Central Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		6534	Hanson Elementary	E		SW	Performance	Priority
		7500	Rose Hill Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
0040	Brighton	6294	North Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		6395	Northeast Elementary	E		TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
0070	Westminster	2876	Fairview Elementary	E		SW	Performance	Priority
		3144	Francis M. Day Elementary	E		SW	Performance	Priority
		4465	Josephine Hodgkins Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		5388	M. Scott Carpenter Middle	M		TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
		9462	Westminster Elementary	E		SW	Improvement	Priority
0123	Sheridan	3054	Sheridan Elementary AT/FL	E		SW	Improvement	Priority

School Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	School Number	School Name	Grade Span	Title I Span (if not all)	2011-12 Title I Status	2011-12 School Performance Framework Plan	Title I School Status 2012-13
0180	Aurora	0914	Boston K-8	EM		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		1948	Crawford Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		2995	Fletcher Intermediate Science & Technology	EM		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		3272	Fulton Elementary	E		SW	Performance	Priority
		4646	Kenton Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		6728	Paris Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		7932	Sixth Avenue Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
0250	Springfield	8164	Springfield Junior High	M		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
0290	Las Animas	4986	Las Animas Middle	M		SW	Turnaround	Focus
0470	St. Vrain	8140	Spangler Elementary	E		TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
0640	Centennial	1396	Centennial Junior High	M		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		7588	Centennial Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
0870	Delta	6298	North Fork Montessori	E		TA	Performance	Reward
0880	Denver	0418	Ashley Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Focus
		1295	Collegiate Preparatory Academy	H		SW	Performance	Priority
		1319	Fred N. Thomas Career Education Center	H		SW	Performance	Reward
		1400	Centennial K-8	EM		SW	Turnaround	Focus
		1748	Colorado High	H		SW	AEC: Turnaround	Focus
		1788	College View Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		1846	Columbine Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Focus
		2789	Escuela Tlatelolco	EMH		SW	Turnaround	Focus
		3426	Gilpin Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Priority
		3655	Greenlee Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Priority
		4450	Johnson Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Focus

School Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	School Number	School Name	Grade Span	Title I Span (if not all)	2011-12 Title I Status	2011-12 School Performance Framework Plan	Title I School Status 2012-13
0880	Denver	4910	Lake Middle School	M		SW	N/A School closed 2012-13	Priority
		5255	Lake International	M		SW	Improvement	Priority
		5995	Montbello High	H		SW	Turnaround	Priority
		6188	Munroe Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		6239	Noel Community Arts	MH		SW	Improvement	Priority
		6314	North High	H		SW	Improvement	Priority
		6784	Noel Middle	M		SW	Turnaround	Priority
		8909	Trevista ECE-8 at Horace Mann	EM		SW	Priority Improvement	Priority
		9390	West Denver Prep - Lake	M		SW	Performance	Priority
		9496	Castro Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Priority
0890	Dolores 2	7764	Seventh Street Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
0900	Douglas	3995	Hope On-Line	EMH	E	SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
1010	Colorado Springs	8457	Jack Swigert Aerospace Academy	M		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
1120	Edison	2526	Edison Junior-Senior High	MH		TA	Performance	Reward
1420	Jefferson County	4422	Jefferson High	H		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
1490	Bethune	0832	Bethune Elementary	E		TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
1500	Burlington	1150	Burlington Middle	EM	M	TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
1510	Lake County	9486	Westpark Elementary	E		TA	Turnaround	Focus
1520	Durango	3012	Florida Mesa Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
1540	Ignacio	4252	Ignacio Intermediate	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
1560	Thompson	5992	Monroe Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
1620	Aguilar	0066	Aguilar Junior-Senior High	MH		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
2000	Mesa County Valley	1686	Clifton Elementary	E		SW	Performance	Priority
2035	Montezuma-Cortez	4546	Kemper Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		5436	Manaugh Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus

School Accountability Measures

District Number	District Name	School Number	School Name	Grade Span	Title I Span (if not all)	2011-12 Title I Status	2011-12 School Performance Framework Plan	Title I School Status 2012-13
2180	Montrose	6807	Passage Charter	H		TA	AEC: Improvement	Focus
2395	Brush	1438	Beaver Valley Elementary	E		TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
2530	Rocky Ford	5114	Jefferson Intermediate	E		SW	Turnaround	Focus
2560	Cheraw	1538	Cheraw Elementary	E		TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
2660	Lamar	6794	Parkview Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
2690	Pueblo City	0822	Bessemer Elementary	EM		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		4302	Irving Elementary	E		SW	Turnaround	Focus
		4376	James H. Risley Middle	M		SW	Turnaround	Priority
		5048	Lemuel Pitts Middle	M		SW	Turnaround	Priority
		8142	Spann Elementary School	E		SW	N/A School closed 2012-13	
2810	Center	1412	Haskin Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Priority
3080	Weld 1	3398	Gilcrest Elementary	E		TA	Turnaround	Focus
3110	Johnstown-Milliken	5896	Milliken Elementary	E		TA	Priority Improvement	Focus
3120	Greeley	5412	Madison Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		6774	Martinez Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
3140	Weld 8	8930	Twombly Elementary	E		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
3148	Pawnee	6812	Pawnee Junior-Senior High	MH		SW	Performance	Reward
8001	Charter School Institute	1376	Scholars To Leaders Academy	EM		SW	Priority Improvement	Focus
		1882	Community Leadership Academy	EM		SW,TA	Performance	Reward
		3475	Goal Academy	MH		SW	AEC: Priority 9000 Improvement	Focus
		8929	Pikes Peak Prep	EMH		TA	Performance	Focus
9000	Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind	9999	Colorado School For The Deaf and Blind	EMH		SW	AEC: Performance	Focus

Title II Accountability: Highly Qualified (HQ) Teacher Data

NCLB requires that all core academic subject teachers be highly qualified (HQ). Core academic subject areas are defined as English, reading or language arts; mathematics; science; foreign languages; social studies (civics, government, history, geography, economics); and the arts (visual, drama, music).

Generally, to be considered HQ, teachers must: (1) hold at least a bachelor's degree; (2) hold a valid Colorado teaching license; and (3) demonstrate subject matter knowledge. The table below shows the number of core academic classes and the number and percentage of them taught by HQ teachers in 2011-12. Districts' and schools' individual HQ data can be found at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tii/a_hqt_hqtd.asp, as well as on SchoolView at: https://edx.cde.state.co.us/SchoolView/DataCenter/reports.jspx. For more information about Colorado's definition of an HQ teacher, go to: http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tii/a_hqt.

School Type	Total # of Core Academic Classes	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by HQ Teachers	% of Core Academic Classes Taught by HQ Teachers	% of Core Academic Classes Not Taught by HQ Teachers
All Schools in State	262,584	261,718	99.67%	0.33%
Elementary Level				
High Poverty Schools	41,021	40,966	99.89%	0.11%
Low Poverty Schools	43,146	43,011	99.69%	0.31%
All Elementary Schools	156,826	156,362	99.70%	0.30%
Secondary Level				
High Poverty Schools	25,501	25,395	99.58%	0.42%
Low Poverty Schools	36,909	36,842	99.82%	0.18%
All Secondary Schools	105,758	105,356	99.62%	0.38%

Educational Level of Teachers in Colorado

In 2011-12, there were 45,785 Colorado public elementary and secondary school teachers of core and non-core academic classes. Of that teaching force, 47.23 percent held Bachelor's degrees, 51.67 percent had earned Master's degrees, and 0.75 percent had a Ph.D./Ed.D.

Certification of Teachers in Colorado

Colorado teachers may hold either a professional or provisional license to be HQ. Teachers with alternative licenses may be considered HQ for the two years during which they hold the license.

Certification	Number of Core Academic Public School Elementary and Secondary Teachers	Percent of All Teachers
Initial License	6,649	15.81%
Professional License	34,876	82.94%
Alternative License	337	0.80%

Title III Accountability: Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)

States that receive Title III funds to serve limited English proficient children must establish annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for developing and attaining English proficiency, meeting challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards [Section 1111(b)(1)]. AMAOs are targets which English learners in districts and consortia that receive Title III sub-grants must meet each year. District-level AMAOs measure English learners' progress in:

- Acquiring English, as measured by CELApro growth between 2011 and 2012 (AMAO 1).
- Attaining English proficiency as measured by CELApro (AMAO 2).
- Making adequate academic progress in reading, writing and math, as measured by TCAP and achieving targets for test participation and graduation rate (AMAO 3).

Districts must have been members of their consortium for two years to be included in the consortium's AMAOs calculations. Under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver, AMAOs 1 and 3 now are aligned with the Colorado District Performance Frameworks, as a result of the U.S. Department of Education's approval of Colorado's ESEA Flexibility Waiver and amendment requests. For more information about 2012 AMAO calculations, go to: http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/fedprograms/dl/tiii_amaos_manual2011-2012.pdf.

Title III		Pre-Waiver	Post-Waiver
Title III Data Reporting and Accountability	AMAO 1	Percentage of English learners making one performance level increase in Overall scores since previous CELApro test must meet 50% target, using 95% confidence interval	English Learners' CELApro Median Growth Percentile, taking into account whether or not adequate growth was met, is sufficient to earn a *meets* or *exceeds* rating
		minimum grantee N=30	minimum grantee EMH N=20
	AMAO 2	Percent scoring 5 Overall (highest level) on CELApro (Target=6%); use upper limit of 95% confidence interval; N=30+	Percent scoring 5 Overall (highest level) on CELApro (Target=7%); use upper limit of 95% confidence interval; N=30+
	AMAO 3	English learners make all applicable AYP targets	English Learners meet TCAP Reading, Writing, Math and Science participation rates, and make sufficient points for Reading, Writing and Math academic growth and graduation rate to earn a *meets* or *exceeds* rating
		minimum grantee EMH N=30	minimum grantee EMH N=20 (16 for graduation rate)

AMAO 1: Annual Progress in Learning English

AMAO 1 captures the district's progress in moving English learners toward English proficiency. The AMAO 1 calculation changed for 2011-12, based on Colorado's flexibility wavier application to the U.S. Department of Education. Before the waiver, making AMAO 1 required that a set percentage of ELs improve at least one CELApro performance level from the prior year's testing. The 2011-12 method determines progress toward English proficiency as measured by the district's performance on the *Academic Growth-English Language Proficiency* sub-indicator on the DPF report. The district/consortium is expected to receive a rating of meets or exceeds based on growth points summed across grade spans (EMH). The State of Colorado received a *meets* rating for AMAO 1 in 2012, with 67.5 percent of CELApro growth points possible.

AMAO 1	CELApro 2012					
	number of students	MGP	median AGP	met AGP	points earned	points possible
Elementary	50,353	51	21	Yes	1.5	2.0
Middle	15,129	52	40	Yes	1.5	2.0
High	10,343	53	44	Yes	1.5	2.0
				total	4.5	6

AMAO 2 – Percentage of English Learners Attaining Proficiency (CELApro Performance Level 5)

AMAO 2 is the target percentage of English learners scoring at Level 5 (CELApro proficient). The AMAO 2 calculation did not change with the flexibility waiver and is not calculated at the grade span (EMH) level, like AMAOs 1 and 3. The 2012 AMAO 2 target was 7 percent of students enrolled at the time of the CELApro administration scoring a 5 (highest performance level) overall. The minimum number of students required to calculate AMAO 2 was 30, regardless of grade span (EMH). The State of Colorado met its AMAO 2 target (7%); 9.56 percent (9,524 of 99,658 ELs) scored proficient on CELApro.

AMAO 3 – English Learners Group Making Sufficient Academic Growth

AMAO 3 holds Title III LEAs accountable for English learners making sufficient academic progress in reading, writing and math and toward postsecondary readiness, as measured by graduation rate. Prior to 2011-2012, AMAO 3 required that groups of 30+ English learners, at the district level by EMH, make all AYP targets: CSAP reading and math participation, performance and the other indicator, which was the percentage advanced in reading and math at the elementary and middle grades and graduation rate at the high school level. Because Colorado has an NCLB Flexibility Waiver and did not calculate AYP for 2011-2012, AMAO 3 requirements have been aligned with state required performance framework indicators based on academic growth in reading, writing and math, as well as TCAP participation and graduation rates.

Specifically, the following indicators from the performance frameworks for English learners are calculated for AMAO 3: 1) Academic Growth Gaps sub-indicator ratings in reading, writing and math, 2) disaggregated graduation rate sub-indicator, and 3) reading, writing, math and science participation rates. The expectation is that the district receives a rating of *meets* or *exceeds* on these sub-indicators and meets or exceeds the 95 percent participation rate on at least three of the four content areas (including science). The State of Colorado scored only 20 (50%) of the 40 AMAO 3 points possible, for a rating of *approaching:*

AMAO 3	TCAP Reading 2012						TCAP Writing 2012						TCAP Math 2012					
	number of students	MGP	median AGP	met AGP	points earned	points possible	number of students	MGP	median AGP	met AGP	points earned	points possible	number of students	MGP	median AGP	met AGP	points earned	points possible
Elem.	23,270	51	50	yes	3	4	23,414	54	61	no	2	4	24,671	51	65	no	2	4
Middle	29,170	49	56	no	2	4	29,160	54	74	no	2	4	29,223	50	84	no	2	4
High	16,226	53	60	no	2	4	16,286	54	91	no	2	4	16,324	50	99	no	2	4

Grad rates	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
	52.8%	58.8%	58.5%	58.7%

Colorado English learners made 19 academic growth points out of 36 possible, plus one of four possible points for graduation rate. For district-level AMAO results, go to SchoolView or the CDE website at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/tiii/amaos.asp.

Title III Improvement

A district/consortium that accepts Title III funds is identified for Title III Improvement if it does not make AMAOs for two consecutive years. A Title III grantee that fails to meet state defined AMAO targets for two consecutive years must develop a Unified Improvement Plan(UIP) that specifically addresses the factors that prevented it from achieving AMAOs, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of its current plan. Identified districts must complete the Title III addendum as part of their UIP submissions.

If a grantee fails to meet AMAO targets for four consecutive years, Title III law requires the State to take additional action. Specifically, Section 3122(b)(4) requires that the State provide additional review of the grantee's language instruction program and technical assistance on any reform that should take place regarding the education of English learners.

The table below includes Colorado's Title III grantees that are on improvement as a result of 2012 AMAO determinations and their status. For additional AMAO information as well as an index of which districts are included in the various consortia, go to: http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/tiii/amaos and click on the "district-consortium" key tab in the "AMAO 1, AMAO 2 and AMAO 3 - Final Results" document under the "2011-2012 AMAO Information" heading.

Title III Grantee - Improvement Plan Status					
Grantee		Made 2011-12 AMAO targets			Improvement Status 2012-2013
Code	Name	AMAO 1	AMAO 2	AMAO 3	
0010	Mapleton	yes	yes	no	Year 5
0020	Adams 12	yes	yes	no	Year 5
0030	Adams 14	yes	yes	no	Year 5
0040	Brighton	no	yes	no	Year 5
0070	Westminster	yes	yes	no	Year 5
0100	Alamosa	no	yes	no	Year 4
0120	Englewood	no	yes	no	Year 2
0123	Sheridan	yes	yes	no	Year 5
0130	Cherry Creek	yes	yes	yes	
0140	Littleton	yes	yes	yes	
0180	Aurora	yes	yes	no	Year 5
0470	St. Vrain	no	yes	no	Year 5
0480	Boulder	no	yes	no	Year 5
0870	Delta	no	yes	yes	Year 1
0880	Denver	yes	yes	yes	
0910	Eagle	no	yes	yes	Year 1
0980	Harrison	no	yes	yes	Year 1
0990	Widefield	yes	yes	no	Year 4
1000	Fountain	yes	yes	yes	
1010	Colorado Springs	yes	yes	no	Year 4

Title III Improvement

Title III Grantee - Improvement Plan Status					
Grantee		Made 2011-12 AMAO targets			Improvement Status 2012-2013
Code	Name	AMAO 1	AMAO 2	AMAO 3	
1020	Cheyenne Mountain	yes	yes	yes	
1040	Academy	yes	yes	yes	
1080	Lewis-Palmer	yes	yes	no	
1110	Falcon	yes	yes	no	Year 4
1180	Roaring Fork	yes	no	yes	Year 5
1195	Garfield 2	no	no	no	Year 5
1220	Garfield 16	no	yes	yes	Year 3
1360	Gunnison	no	yes	yes	Year 1
1420	Jefferson County	yes	yes	no	Year 5
1510	Lake County	no	yes	no	Year 5
1550	Poudre	no	yes	no	Year 5
1560	Thompson	yes	yes	no	Year 5
1570	Estes Park	no	no	no	
2000	Mesa County Valley	yes	yes	no	Year 5
2020	Moffat 1	no	no	yes	Year 4
2035	Montezuma-Cortez	no	yes	no	Year 5
2405	Fort Morgan	yes	yes	no	Year 4
2640	Aspen	yes	yes	yes	
2690	Pueblo 60	yes	yes	no	Year 5
2700	Pueblo 70	yes	yes	no	Year 4
2740	Monte Vista	no	yes	no	Year 2
2770	Steamboat Springs	yes	yes	yes	
2810	Center	no	yes	yes	Year 5
3000	Summit	yes	yes	no	Year 5
3090	Keensburg	no	yes	no	Year 3
3110	Johnstown - Mlliken	no	yes	no	Year 3
3120	Greeley	no	no	no	Year 5
3140	Weld 8	no	yes	no	Year 5
3200	Yuma	yes	yes	yes	

Title III Improvement

Title III Grantee - Improvement Plan Status					
Grantee		Made 2011-12 AMAO targets			Improvement Status 2012-2013
Code	Name	AMAO 1	AMAO 2	AMAO 3	
8001	Charter School Institute	no	yes	no	Year 3
0900C	Douglas County Consortium	yes	yes	yes	
1350C	East Grand Consortium	yes	yes	no	
2180C	Montrose	no	yes	yes	Year 5
2530C	Rocky Ford Consortium	yes	yes	no	
9025C	East Central BOCES	no	yes	no	Year 1
9035C	Centennial BOCES	no	yes	no	Year 5
9040C	Northeast BOCES	yes	yes	no	Year 1
9050C	San Juan BOCES	yes	yes	no	Year 2
9055C	San Luis Valley BOCES	yes	yes	no	
9060C	South Central BOCES	no	yes	no	
9095C	Northwest BOCES	yes	yes	no	

2012 Title I National Distinguished Schools

In 2011-12, CDE recognized two Title I schools; one that showed exceptional student performance and one for success in closing the achievement gap, as measured by the Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP). Each school received $10,000 and was honored locally and nationally. Eligibility for Title I National Distinguished School designation required that schools have 35+ percent eligible for free/reduced cost lunch. The 2012 awards went to Wiggins Elementary School (Wiggins School District) and Montview Math and Health Sciences (Aurora Public Schools).

Wiggins Elementary School Staff

Wiggins Elementary School (Exceptional Student Performance)

Wiggins Elementary students consistently scored high (proficient and advanced) on CSAP reading 2010 (76%) and 2011 (85%) and TCAP reading 2012 (83%). Math performance was equally impressive. In 2010, 76 percent scored proficient or advanced on CSAP Math, as did 78 percent in 2011 and 2012 (TCAP). Wiggins Elementary consistently made AYP, received the highest possible *Performance Plan* rating in 2011-12 (School Performance Framework), and met academic achievement targets in reading, writing, math and science. Wiggins exceeded its academic growth targets for math and writing, as did English learners on CELApro. Economically disadvantaged students met or exceeded academic growth gap targets in writing and math. Wiggins operated a school-wide Title I program, had a 56 percent poverty rate, and 37 percent of its 284 (K-5) students were minorities.

Dr. Keith Owen, Deputy Commissioner, Colorado Department of Education; Montview Elementary School students; Principal Michelle Barone; and Aurora Public Schools Superintendent John L. Barry

Montview Math and Health Sciences Elementary School (Closing the Achievement Gap)

Montview Math and Health Sciences Elementary School students excel in math. Montview is the top math performing school in north Aurora. An online lab affords students access to math exercises and games by content area. Students also have access to literacy, social studies and science sites. Montview went from 66 percent math proficient and advanced in 2010, to 70 percent in 2011 and 82 percent in 2012, when 86 percent of Montview's English learners also scored at or above proficient in math. Across the board, Montview Math and Health Sciences' achievement and growth exceed all but a few within Aurora Public Schools. Montview met its academic achievement targets for math and writing, and exceeded its academic growth targets in reading, writing and math. All Montview disaggregated groups exceeded academic growth targets.

Montview Math and Health Sciences Elementary School also received a 2012 CDE Center of Excellence Award for the 3rd year in a row. The vast majority of Montview students (92%) was eligible for free or reduced cost meals. The school operated a school-wide Title I program and 90 percent of its 447 (K-5) students were minorities.