

Colorado Department of Education Consolidated State Application Amended Accountability Workbook March 10, 2011

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

F: State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.

P: State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).

W: State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Principle 1: All Schools

- F 1.1 Accountability system includes *all schools and districts in the state*.
- F 1.2 Accountability system holds *all schools to the same criteria*.
- F 1.3 Accountability system incorporates the *academic achievement standards*.
- F 1.4 Accountability system provides *information in a timely manner*.
- F 1.5 Accountability system includes *report cards*.
- F 1.6 Accountability system includes *rewards and sanctions*.

Principle 2: All Students

- F 2.1 The accountability system includes *all students*
- F 2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of *full academic year*.
- F 2.3 The accountability system properly includes *mobile students*.

Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations

- F 3.1 Accountability system expects *all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14*.
- F 3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether *student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress*.
- F 3.2a Accountability system establishes a *starting point*.
- F 3.2b Accountability system establishes *statewide annual measurable objectives*.
- F 3.2c Accountability system establishes *intermediate goals*.

Principle 4: Annual Decisions

- F 4.1 The accountability system *determines annually the progress* of schools and districts.

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

- F 5.1 The accountability system *includes all the required student subgroups*.
- F 5.2 The accountability system holds *schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups*.
- F 5.3 The accountability system includes *students with disabilities*.
- F 5.4 The accountability system includes *limited English proficient students*.
- F 5.5 The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
- F 5.6 The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

- F 6.1 Accountability system is based *primarily on academic assessments*.

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

- F 7.1 Accountability system includes *graduation rate for high schools*.
- F 7.2 Accountability system includes an *additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools*.
- F 7.3 Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

- F 8.1 Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for *reading/language arts and mathematics*.

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

- F 9.1 Accountability system produces *reliable decisions*.
- F 9.2 Accountability system produces *valid decisions*.
- F 9.3 State has a plan for addressing *changes in assessment and student population*.

Principle 10: Participation Rate

- F 10.1 Accountability system has a means for calculating the *rate of participation* in the statewide assessment.
- F 10.2 Accountability system has a means for *applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools*.

Status Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado’s accountability system includes every public school and LEA in the state. The state has defined AYP pursuant to the statute and rules. CDE will apply AYP to all levels (elementary, middle/junior high, and high school). AYP will also be calculated for variant grade configurations and schools that serve special populations, including the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind.

K-1 or K-2 Schools

Colorado’s state assessment system (CSAP and CSAPA) does not include students until grade 3. AYP will be defined differently for Colorado’s K-1 and K-2 schools than for those schools containing grades 3 and higher. K-1 and K-2 school AYP will be determined using the third grade reading and math scores of students previously enrolled at the school. K-1 and K-2 schools will be held to the elementary school AYP targets for accountability purposes. All schools will be expected to yield annual results that meet the requirement of 100% proficiency in reading and math by 2013-2014.

New Schools

Definition at: https://cdeapps.cde.state.co.us/ade_news.htm#definition. New schools are held accountable for AYP determinations. District level numbers are used for prior year counts for the school, for Safe Harbor calculations. For continuously enrolled students, we use any student who has been enrolled in the district since the prior CSAP/CSAPA administration, and enrolled in the school on or before October 1st.

Alternative school accountability: AYP determinations for alternative schools are made in a consistent manner with all other schools in the state.

AYP determinations for **small schools** are made in a consistent manner with all other schools in the state. Specifically, the “All students” group is calculated no matter the N size.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination. If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All schools (separated by grade levels: elementary, middle, and high school) containing grades three and higher will be systematically judged based on the same criteria- the 95% participation rate, the performance targets (listed in Attachment A) and the other indicator (advanced performance for elementary and middle levels and graduation rate for high schools).

AYP results are included in the state’s School Accountability Reports and in the state’s Accreditation Annual Reports.

Amendment #1 (from 2007)

Colorado’s state assessment system (CSAP) does not include students until grade 3. AYP will be defined differently for Colorado’s K-1 and K-2 schools than for those schools containing grades 3 and higher. K-1 and K-2 school AYP will be determined using the third grade reading and math scores of students previously enrolled at the school. K-1 and K-2 schools will be held to the elementary school AYP targets for accountability purposes. All schools will be expected to yield annual results that meet the requirement of 100% proficiency in reading and math by 2013-2014.

Amendment #2 (from 2007)

School districts must miss targets in the same content area for two consecutive years to be identified for Program Improvement. However, if a school district misses math targets only at the elementary level in year one and math targets only at the high school level in year two, the district would be identified for Program Improvement in math. This has led to an over-identification of school districts for Improvement as it may reflect an anomaly of the data as opposed to a systemic failure on the part of the school district. In addition, in that the determination lacks precision, it makes it difficult for a district to focus its Title I resources in the area where targets were missed as required of districts identified for Improvement.

Colorado requests the ability to exchange its “Same Subject, Any Grade Span” model of identification for District Improvement for the “Same Subject, Same Grade Span” model referenced in Henry Johnson’s letter dated March 7, 2006. Only districts that do not meet AYP targets in the same content area *and* grade span for two consecutive years will be identified for Title I Program Improvement. (For example, a district that missed only math targets at the elementary level one year and math targets at the high school level the next year would not be identified. The district would need to miss elementary math targets for two consecutive years to be identified).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i> , <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i>¹ and <i>advanced</i>.</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado's CSAP has four instructional levels designed to give the level of detail necessary for school personnel to better align the state academic content standards to instruction at the classroom level. These four levels are *Unsatisfactory*, *Partially Proficient*, *Proficient*, and *Advanced*. Colorado has defined three levels of student achievement for accountability: *non-proficient*, *proficient* and *advanced*. For the purposes of calculating and reporting AYP for schools, districts, and the state, *Partially Proficient*, *Proficient* and *Advanced* ranges will be considered *proficient*. *Unsatisfactory* scores are considered non-proficient. Additionally, Colorado assessments that are invalidated receive a *No Score*. These *No Scores* are counted as non-participants, and thus are not included for proficiency calculations.

Districts, schools, teachers, and parents receive detailed information annually regarding the progress of students toward content proficiency.

Evidence of compliance was submitted to the Peer Reviewers in 2001 and August and December of 2002 and again in October 2005.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP and CSAPA results are provided to schools and districts by the end of July each year, which is prior to the start of the academic school year.

As soon as it is available, CDE uses CSAP and CSAPA data to run school and district AYP determinations. Once validated, and before the start of the school year, CDE disseminates the data and determinations to the LEAs.

When applicable, LEAs are notified by CDE in the previous spring, that they must send letters offering choice to the parents of students enrolled in schools on Improvement before the start of the school year. In most cases, if a school will definitely be on Improvement the following year, the district sends letters offering choice prior to the end of the preceding year. LEA's are also required to provide supplemental services and take corrective actions appropriate to the number of years on school Improvement or corrective action. Established timelines are consistent with NCLB requirements.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups.</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CDE publishes the State Report Card annually. The reports can be found at www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms. All required elements are included in the report and disaggregated by required subgroups. The State Report Card is published in English and Spanish. The State Report Card is sent to all school districts and major professional organizations. Upon publication, a press release is prepared and disseminated. CDs containing the State Report Card data are sent to all school districts so that they may use the data for additional reports and projects.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <p>Set by the State; Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs.</p>	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado will continue to assess the progress of all public schools and districts in the state toward the goal of 100% proficiency in reading and math by the end of the 2013-2014 school year.

Schools that exceed AYP performance targets for two or more years or have made significant gains to close the achievement gap will be eligible for Title I Distinguished School Awards. CDE awards the two National Title I Distinguished school awards according to demonstrated high achievement and a closing of the achievement gap. Eight state regional awards for Title I schools are awarded to schools that demonstrate a closing of the achievement gap between students eligible for free/reduced meal and students who are not eligible, or demonstrate the highest proficiency in the region. As part of its Title I Distinguished Awards program, Colorado also annually identifies teachers and building principals that have had a significant impact on student academic achievement.

The John Irwin Schools of Excellence Awards target the highest performing schools and the Governor’s Distinguished Improvement Awards focus on the most improved schools.

Per the requirements of NCLB, schools and districts identified for Improvement will uniformly be held to the requirements in the law.

The state has created an extensive statewide system of support that includes:

- School Support Teams for schools identified for Improvement
- School Support Teams for schools identified as having an achievement gap
- Comprehensive Appraisals for District Improvement for districts identified for Improvement

- Regional Service Teams for school districts
- Professional Development opportunities for school and district faculty and administrators
- Additional grant opportunities
- Utilization of effective districts, schools, models, and staff in support of struggling schools
- Written and web-based publications identifying effective strategies and resources
- A list of approved, proven providers, external to CDE, that can provide support to schools and districts in increasing student achievement

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System. The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students are required to participate in the CSAP, Lectura, or the CSAP Alternate Assessment (CSAPA). All public school students are accounted for in the State’s definition of public school and LEA. An AYP determination is made for all public schools and LEAs in the state. The assessment results of all students enrolled in the school, district, or state for a full academic year are included when making AYP determinations at each of the three levels. CSAP, CSAPA, and Lectura administration guides and training activities assure compliance with these requirements along with very stringent testing administration procedures.

CRITICAL ELEMENT

**EXAMPLES FOR
MEETING STATUTORY
REQUIREMENTS**

**EXAMPLES OF
NOT MEETING
REQUIREMENTS**

2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?

The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.

The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.

LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”

The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.

The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP, Lectura, and CSAPA results are reported according to the students’ length of time in school as well as their length of time in the district. Categories of reporting include those students in school/district for 12 or more consecutive months, Colorado’s definition of one full academic year.

For the purpose of determining AYP of schools, CDE will use the scores of students enrolled in that school from one CSAP, Lectura, or CSAPA administration to the next, unless the student is enrolled in the lowest grade in the school. In that case, students who have been continuously enrolled in the district and have been enrolled in the school on or before October 1st are included.

For the purposes of determining AYP for school districts, the scores of all students attending district schools “continuous in district for 12 or more months” will be included in the district calculations. Students not included in the school AYP calculations will be included in the district’s AYP calculations. Students not in the school or district for one academic year will be included in the state’s AYP calculations.

These definitions and procedures apply to all schools and districts statewide.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP, Lectura, and CSAPA results are reported according to the students’ length of time in school as well as their length of time in the district. Categories of reporting include those students in school/district for 12 or more consecutive months, Colorado’s definition of one full academic year. These continuous enrollment data are collected for every student on Student October pupil membership count and precoded labels collections prior to test administration, and can be updated on the student assessment grid at the time of testing or during the SBD (student biographical data) review process after testing is completed.

For the purpose of determining AYP of schools, CDE will use the scores of students enrolled in that school from one CSAP, Lectura, or CSAPA administration to the next, unless the student is enrolled in the lowest grade in the school. In that case, students who have been continuously enrolled in the district and have been enrolled in the school on or before October 1st are included.

For the purposes of determining AYP for school districts, the scores of all students attending district schools for one academic year will be included in the district calculations. Students not included in the school AYP calculations will be included in the districts AYP calculations. Students not in the school or district for one academic year will be included in the state’s AYP calculations.

These definitions and procedures apply to all schools and districts statewide.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?	The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.	State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014. State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CDE has defined AYP as the progress necessary to move from baselines established in 2002 to 100% proficiency by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. AYP will be assessed separately in reading and math.

Annual targets through 2013-2014 for elementary, middle, and high school reading and math are available at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/danda/ayp.asp> or in Attachment A.

CRITICAL ELEMENT

EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS

3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?

For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.

However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.

State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Data collected as a part of the CSAP, Lectura, and CSAPA administration is reported by each of the required disaggregated groups to make AYP determinations and to assist the classroom teacher with his/her instructional practice.

AYP will be determined using 2002 data as the baseline. The starting points are calculated pursuant to NCLB and rule requirements. The same starting point and annual, measurable goals apply to all disaggregated groups resulting in 100% proficiency of all students by 2013-2014 (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/danda/ayp.asp>).

In calculating AYP for disaggregated groups, CDE has identified thirty as the minimum number of students for AYP accountability purposes to protect student identity and to assure high levels of reliability.

To make AYP, each district, school, and all required subgroups of 30 or more must:

1. Achieve a 95% participation rate
2. Meet or exceed the annual performance objectives in reading and math (using a 95% confidence interval). Targets are listed in Attachment A.
3. Meet or exceed annual objectives for the applicable other indicator – graduation rate for high school, advanced level of CSAP performance for elementary and middle school (using a 95% confidence interval for the advanced performance target). Targets are listed in Attachment B.

CDE will also utilize the AYP Safe Harbor provision in making AYP determinations as follows:

In calculating AYP, any disaggregated group that did not meet the AYP performance goal, and had 30 or more students in the prior year, but did decrease the percentage of non-proficient students in the applicable disaggregated group by 10% or more from the prior year, the school or district will then be judged to have made AYP if the LEA or school also meets the state's participation rate target and other indicator when using the safe harbor provision (graduation rate for high school and the appropriate percent of students scoring "advanced" on CSAP in elementary and middle schools). Goals must be met for all applicable student sub-populations. (See the AYP calculator at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/FedPrograms/danda/ayp.asp>).

CDE will calculate an additional matched Safe Harbor measure beginning with 2006-2007 data that will include only matched student records from the prior year to the current year. Section 1111 of No Child Left Behind, states that "*Each State educational agency may incorporate the data from the assessments under this paragraph into a State-developed longitudinal data system that links student*

test scores, length of enrollment, and graduation records over time.” Colorado will utilize its well-established student identifier system and a continuous assessment system from grades three through ten. We are able to track the same students’ results as they progress through the assessment system. Additionally, there is widespread support throughout the state and legislature to use longitudinal data in school and district accountability.

Specifically, CDE will create a Matched Safe Harbor measure comparing only the same students’ scores from the prior year to the current year. Schools and districts will need to show a 10% reduction in the percent of matched students scoring non-proficient in the prior year to the current year in order to make the additional Matched Safe Harbor target. CDE will not use any confidence intervals in these calculations. Additionally, if the school or disaggregated group meets the 95% match rate then Matched Safe Harbor will be calculated. The match rate is calculated by taking the performance denominator, minus the 3rd grade scores (since there are no matches possible for 3rd graders) and finding the number of those records that also have a matched (on student identifier and test type- CSAP or CSAPA) record from the prior year. The matched records divided by the performance denominator minus the third graders equals the match rate. Please note that CSAP and Lectura results count as matched records.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...)</p>	The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Using data from 2002, CDE has established starting points of proficiency separately in reading and math for each instructional level (elementary, middle, and high school). The same starting point for reading and math applies to each student sub-population within each of the three instructional levels.

The starting points were determined using the percentage of proficient students in the public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level. The percentage of proficient schools at the 20th percentile of enrollment was higher than the lowest performing subgroup in both reading and math at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. With the addition of the third and fourth grade math assessment in 2005, intermediate elementary AYP math targets have been re-calculated to account for the new test results. (see 9.3)

CDE is using thirty as the threshold for establishing baselines among the disaggregated groups to protect student identity and to assure accuracy and reliability of data. A 95% confidence interval is also incorporated into AYP calculations, specifically for performance and advanced performance (elementary and middle other indicator) calculations. Only those student scores that have been in the school for one full academic year will be used in AYP calculations. See Attachment A for targets.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CDE's definition of AYP is consistent with all of the above referenced criteria in that it states a minimum percentage of students that must be proficient each year, leads to 100% proficiency in reading and math by 2013-2014, and is the same for all districts and schools within each of the three grade spans.

Colorado has set annual measurable objectives that are consistent with the state's intermediate goals and specifically identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on CSAP, Lectura, and CSAPA.

AYP goals for Colorado are set so that all students must meet or exceed proficiency in reading and math by the 2013-2014 school year.

Colorado's AYP goals are the same throughout the state for each public school, each school district, each disaggregated group of students and the state.

See Attachment A for targets.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Intermediate goals have been set that increase in equal increments over equal increments of time. The first increase took place during the 2004-2005 academic year. Targets will also increase in 2007-2008, 2010-11, and 2013-2014.

See Attachment A for targets.

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually.	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Using the state’s assessment data and graduation rates, an AYP determination is made and reported annually for every public school and school district in Colorado.

Please refer to Principles 1-3 for the details of how this is calculated.

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: Economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP and CSAPA results for the AYP baseline year, 2002, were reported for all of the required disaggregated groups with the exception of socio-economic status. The data for this subgroup has been disaggregated since the 2002-2003 school year. The minimum “n” required for AYP subgroup accountability purposes is thirty. All subgroups of thirty or more at the school, district, or state level must make reach AYP targets for the school, district, or state to make AYP.

The *race/ethnicity* subgroups are defined through identification during the State's October Count data collection process and the CSAP/CSAPA testing administration.

The other required subgroups are defined as follows:

Students with disabilities: any student with an Individualized Education Plan.

Economically disadvantaged: any student coded as eligible for free or reduced lunch

English language learners: students identified as NEP (Non English Proficient), LEP (Limited English Proficient) or FEP (Fully English Proficient) who have not been formally exited from an English language acquisition program. The table below demonstrates the alignment of CELA proficiency levels to the Colorado language proficiency levels. CELA student records are matched on the annual Student October report submitted by School Districts every fall. At that time, Colorado language proficiency levels are reported, however the CELA data file is referenced to verify that appropriate language proficiency levels are reported for individual students.

Table 1: CELA English language Proficiency Levels–Definitions

Colorado English Language Fluency Level	CELA Proficiency Level	Definition of Fluency for Colorado
Non-English Proficient	Beginning and Early Intermediate levels (CELA Levels 1 and 2)	This level includes students who are just beginning to understand and respond to simple routine communication through those who can respond with more ease to a variety of social communication tasks.
Limited English Proficient	Covers the CELA Intermediate through mid-Proficient (CELA Level 3 and lower portion of LAS Links Level 4)	Students at this level are able to understand and be understood in many to most social communication situations. They are gaining increasing competence in the more cognitively demanding requirements of content areas; however, they are not yet ready to fully participate in academic content areas without linguistic support.
Fluent English Proficient	Covers from mid-Proficient to Above Proficient (Upper portion of CELA Level 4 and CELA Level 5)	Students at this level are able to understand and communicate effectively with various audiences on a wide range of familiar and new topics to meet social and academic demands. They are able to achieve in content areas comparable to native speakers, but may still need limited linguistic support.

All data is first reported through the Student October and pre-coded labels collections, and is then updated during the testing window and the SBD (student biographical data) clean-up process. CELA student records are matched on the annual Student October report submitted by School Districts every fall. At that time, Colorado language proficiency levels are reported, however the CELA data file is referenced to verify that appropriate language proficiency levels (in alignment with the above table) are reported for individual students.

The State of Colorado holds English Language Learners to the highest of standards including English proficiency and grade level academic achievement, as required by the United State Office of Civil Rights. Colorado has based its exit criteria on existing OCR laws, regulations and policy documents including the following:

- Memoranda on Schools' Obligations Toward National Origin Minority Students who are Limited-English Proficient (LEP)
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/laumemos.html>
- Policy Update on Schools' Obligations Toward National Origin Minority Students With Limited English Proficiency (LEP students)
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1991.html> (September 27, 1991)(See Exit Criteria for Language Minority LEP Students).
- Office for Civil Rights Policy Regarding the Treatment of National Origin Minority Students Who are Limited English Proficient
http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1990_and_1985.html
(April 6, 1990, transmitting and reissuing December 3, 1985 Title VI Language Minority Compliance Procedures)
- Identification of Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of National Origin
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/nationaloriginmemo.html>
(July 10, 1970)

To be exited from English Language Learner status, students must be proficient in all modalities of English, including, Reading, Writing, Reading, and Speaking. This is measured annually by the Colorado English Language Assessment for students that are attending school in Colorado during the annual assessment window. Furthermore, academic achievement at the same grade level as the students' native English speaking peers is required for students to be exited from a language instruction educational program. Grade level academic achievement is measured annually by the Colorado State Assessment Program (CSAP) for grades 3-10. Please see p. 22-25 of the Colorado ELA Guidebook, which provides explicit guidance on exiting English Language Learners. In addition, Colorado provides a list of alternate objective standards to exit students, should a CELA and/or CSAP assessment score not be available.

The guidebook can be found at:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cde_english/download/ELLGuidebook/Final_1-13-2011_Guidebook%202011.pdf

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All disaggregated groups of thirty or more students must meet the annual AYP performance targets. For regular Safe Harbor, there must be 30 or more students in both prior year and current year calculations. For Matched Safe Harbor, there must be a 95% match rate to make determinations. One year of 30 students is necessary for the advanced level of performance targets or graduation rate as applicable, in order for the school district, or state to make AYP. AYP is calculated separately for reading and math for each of the three grade spans: elementary, middle, and high school. AYP determinations are made for all public schools, school districts, and the State.

See principles 1-3 for more details.

**CRITICAL
ELEMENT**

**EXAMPLES FOR
MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

**EXAMPLES OF
NOT MEETING
REQUIREMENTS**

5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?

All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.

State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.

The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.

State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students with disabilities participate in the CSAP, Lectura, or the CSAP Alternate (CSAPA). The CSAPA is intended for a very small percentage of students (less than 1%) on Individual Education Plans who require significantly different instructional and technological supports to progress in their learning. Currently, the CSAPA is administered grades 3-11, in reading, math and writing and in science (5, 8, and 10 in 2005-2006).

CDE will discontinue the flexibility for IEP students previously received and the flexibility requested in the 2008 amendment requests that addressed bringing the target back on track to 100% proficiency in 2013-2014. Colorado's data does not support the creation of a 2% modified assessment system, as it suggests that this would lead to lower standards for students who may be able to show progress on the regular state standards. Preliminary data indicate that no school or district in the state will be able to meet high school performance targets in math for students with disabilities, thus rendering the system meaningless.

Through the AYP appeals process, districts and schools may add in students who have been exited from an IEP in the past one or two years to the IEP disaggregated group. The data needs to be consistent, i.e. all students who have been exited in the last year, or all students who have been exited in the last two years. Additionally, safe harbor prior year data also must be comparable in order to use the appeal with safe harbor.

CRITICAL ELEMENT

**EXAMPLES FOR
MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

**EXAMPLES OF
NOT MEETING
REQUIREMENTS**

5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?

All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.

LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.

State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

State Academic Accountability Process for English language learners. Colorado Senate Bill 186 mandates the assessment of students in reading, writing, language arts, math, and science.

Colorado defines an **English Language Learner as:**

English Language Learner is a student who

- (1) a. was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English; or
 - b. is a Native American or Alaskan Native or is a native resident of the outlying areas and comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on such individual's level of English language proficiency; or
 - c. is migratory and whose native language is other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; **and**
- (2) has sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language, and whose difficulties may deny such individual the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English or to participate fully in our society.

In Colorado, the USDE defined “LEP” disaggregated group is defined as “English Language Learners.” Colorado categorizes English Language Learners under three language proficiency levels: Non-English Proficient (NEP), Limited English Proficient (**LEP**) and Fluent English Proficient (**FEP**). The levels are consistent with proficiency levels on Colorado’s English Language Acquisition Assessment (CELA). See indicator 5.1 for more details about the definition of these levels.

All students are given a home language survey upon enrollment, as required by United States Office of Civil Rights. If the home language survey indicates that a language other than English is present in the home or in the life of a child, further probing is required to determine if the student is an English Language learner. The Colorado English Language Assessment Placement test is administered to students that indicate another language is spoken in the home. Should the assessment render results that indicate the student is not English proficient; the student is coded as NEP or LEP, as determined by the CELA Place assessment. Please see p. 25 of the Colorado ELA Guidebook for specific guidance regarding, the identification, re-designation and exit criteria for ELLs. Furthermore, Appendix G, page 80 of the Colorado ELA Guidebook, defines the identification process in a flowchart that all Districts are expected to implement, as to comply with Federal and State laws.

The guidebook can be found at:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cde_english/download/ELLGuidebook/Final_1-13-2011_Guidebook%202011.pdf

Colorado law makes specific provisions for the assessment of Non-English Proficient or Limited English Proficiency students participating in Spanish/Bilingual Language Instruction Educational Programs to be assessed with the Spanish version of the CSAP, Lectura, (grades 3 and 4), if their background language is Spanish and they have been in Colorado for less than three years. For AYP purposes, they may count Lectura scores only if the student is NEP or LEP, and has been in the US for less than three years, per No Child Left Behind.

All ELL students must take the Lectura, CSAP English or CSAPA in order to count as a participant for AYP. Any ELL student for whom Colorado does not have a valid achievement assessment result will be counted as not participating in the state assessment and will be included in the denominator when making calculations of participation rates. The assessment results for all students taking the Lectura, CSAP, and CSAPA are included in the equation when making AYP determinations.

Recently arrived English Language Learners (students who have been in the US for less than 1 year), and are NEP or LEP, may count as participants for reading calculations if they have an overall score on CELA. To count as a participant for math, they must have a valid math score. Recently arrived English language learners are not included in performance and other indicator calculations because they have not been continuously enrolled in a school or district for a full academic year. They are included in state AYP calculations.

The State of Colorado holds English Language Learners to the highest of standards including English proficiency and grade level academic achievement, as required by the United State Office of Civil Rights. Colorado has based its exit criteria on existing OCR laws, regulations and policy documents including the following:

- Memoranda on Schools' Obligations Toward National Origin Minority Students who are Limited-English Proficient (LEP)
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/laumemos.html>
- Policy Update on Schools' Obligations Toward National Origin Minority Students With Limited English Proficiency (LEP students)
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1991.html> (September 27, 1991)(See Exit Criteria for Language Minority LEP Students).
- Office for Civil Rights Policy Regarding the Treatment of National Origin Minority Students Who are Limited English Proficient
http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1990_and_1985.html (April 6, 1990, transmitting and reissuing December 3, 1985 Title VI Language Minority Compliance Procedures)
- Identification of Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of National Origin
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/nationaloriginmemo.html> (July 10, 1970)

To be exited from English Language Learner status, students must be proficient in all modalities of English, including, Reading, Writing, Reading, and Speaking. This is measured annually by the Colorado English Language Assessment for students that are attending school in Colorado during the annual assessment window. Furthermore, academic achievement at the same grade level as the students' native English speaking peers is required for students to be exited from a language instruction educational program. Grade level academic achievement is measured annually by the Colorado State Assessment Program (CSAP) for grades 3-10. Please see p. 22-25 of the Colorado ELA Guidebook, which provides explicit guidance on exiting English Language Learners. In addition, Colorado provides a list of alternate objective standards to exit students, should a CELA and/or CSAP assessment score not be available.

The guidebook can be found at:

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cde_english/download/ELLGuidebook/Final_1-13-2011_Guidebook%202011.pdf.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

For accountability purposes, the minimum N is thirty students in a disaggregated group, at the school, district and state levels. The minimum N is the same for all required disaggregated groups. For reporting of assessment data, the minimum N is 16.

CDE's data analyses indicate that thirty best meets the criteria for validity, reliability, and accountability, coupled with the application of 95% confidence intervals. In addition, the reporting policy will assure the privacy of individual student results.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

For accountability purposes, the minimum N is thirty students in a student subgroup, at the school, district and state levels. The minimum N is the same for all required subgroups. For reporting assessment of data, the minimum N is 16.

CDE’s data analyses indicate that thirty best meets the criteria for validity, reliability, and accountability, coupled with the application of 95% confidence intervals. In addition, the reporting policy will assure the privacy of individual student results.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado’s assessment system was reviewed in late 2005 and approved on December 18th, 2006.

CSAP and CSAPA span grades 3 – 10 in reading and writing, and math. CSAP and CSAPA science assessments are administered in grades 5 and 8, and 10. Lectura (reading) and Escritura (writing) are administered to a limited number of ELL students in grades 3 and 4.

CSAP and CSAPA are designed to measure the degree to which all students have met Colorado’s academic content standards. All students are required to participate in the state assessments. The Performance Level Descriptors, determined by Colorado stakeholders, are the required achievement levels (cut scores and descriptions).

AYP calculations are based on CSAP, Lectura, and CSAPA results. Colorado’s Other Indicator for elementary and middle schools is the percent of students scoring advanced on the CSAP in reading and math. The only AYP target not based on state assessments is the graduation rate used in making high school AYP determinations. No other indicators or data are used in making AYP determinations.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado’s graduation rate calculation is a 4-year on-time rate, calculated in accordance with the USDE guidance. The new four-year formula defines “on time” as only those students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. Under this four-year “on-time” formula, a student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade. The graduating class is assigned by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. In other words, the formula anticipates that a student entering ninth grade in fall 2010 will graduate with the Class of 2014.

The Graduation Rate Calculation:

Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate =	$\frac{\text{students graduating within four years or prior with a high school diploma}}{\text{first-time entering ninth graders four years earlier (minus transfers out, plus transfers in)}}$
---	---

See Attachment B for targets.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates ⁹ or attendance rates. An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.	State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado's Other Indicator for elementary and middle schools is the percentage of students performing at the advanced level on CSAP reading and math assessments.

Setting targets for advanced level of performance will help to assure all students achieve to their highest potential. Targets have been set for schools and districts as a whole as well as each required disaggregated group of 30 or more students.

See attachment B for targets.

**CRITICAL
ELEMENT**

**EXAMPLES FOR
MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

**EXAMPLES OF
NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS**

7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?

State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.

State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.

State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.

State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.

State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado's assessment program was reviewed, and received full approval by the United States Department of Education in 2001. The review included information regarding the assessments' validity and reliability. The USDE reviewed Colorado's assessment program again during October and November of 2005 and granted full approval on December 18, 2006.

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

AYP is calculated – and a determination made annually – separately for reading and math for the state, all school districts, schools, and all required disaggregated groups of 30 or more students.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP data is the basis of AYP calculations. The reliability of CSAP is very high, and the standard error of measurement in the central score ranges is small, approximately ten scale score points. This information is reported to the public.

Sample data runs submitted to the Peer Reviewers on December 17, 2002, describe acceptable levels of decision consistency for AYP decisions. Confidence intervals are a part of the decision process. This information will give CDE a level of consistency it deems acceptable. The sample data runs document that these levels of decision consistency are acceptable with professional standards and practice. CDE will continue to run data on the information submitted with this application to work out any technical "bugs" that may be identified in the future. Making proper judgments on AYP is of paramount importance to CDE.

CDE will annually analyze the level of consistency and make appropriate modifications, as appropriate.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CSAP assessments meet all nationally recognized standards for assessment validity.

The state runs AYP data as soon as CSAP, Lectura, and CSAPA data are loaded into CDE’s data warehouse. CDE internally validates the data and determinations, and also works with districts and vendors to validate it as well. After thorough validation has been completed, AYP data is released to school districts.

Any school or district may appeal decisions made regarding AYP to the state and/or school district, based on data error or statistical error. In the case of AYP decisions regarding schools, the school district must consider the appeal and render a final decision within 30 days of AYP data release to districts.

Similarly, if a district appeals a decision regarding AYP, CDE must make a final determination within 30 days of the date of the appeal.

CDE provides ongoing technical assistance to districts regarding assessment administration, AYP data and determinations, and all associated procedures, including appeals of initial AYP determinations.

CRITICAL ELEMENT

EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS

9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?

State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹

State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.

State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.

State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.

State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Colorado's state testing program (CSAP) expanded to include math assessments in grades 3 and 4 during spring of 2005. Prior to 2005, elementary school math AYP determinations were made using only data from the 5th grade math CSAP.

New elementary math AYP starting points were calculated in a manner consistent with NCLB requirements. Data from 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade math CSAP results were aggregated for all Colorado elementary schools. Based on performance, schools were ranked from highest proficiency levels to lowest proficiency levels. Starting from the bottom school, school enrollments were added together until 20 percent of the state's elementary enrollment had been captured. The proficiency level of that school was used as the starting point as that percentage was higher than the lowest performing subgroup of students. Targets were set such that, given an increase once every three years, they would lead to 100% proficiency by 2013-2014. Elementary math AYP determinations for 2006 will include 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade math CSAP data and will be made using the new elementary math targets presented below. Safe Harbor determinations will be made using 2005 and 2006 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade math CSAP data when applicable.

	New Target	Old Target
2006-2007	83.64%	81.90%
2008-2010	89.09%	87.94%
2011-2013	94.54%	93.98%
2014	100%	100%

Baselines for new schools will be based upon the district's most recent CSAP data. The district's most recent CSAP data, for reading and math, will become the baseline data applied to the new school for the first year of the school's operation. This data will be compared to the school's actual data generated during the first year of operation for first year AYP calculations. The data for the school in its second and subsequent years will be the data generated by the school's actual student assessment results. Future AYP determinations will be calculated based upon that school's actual student performance data.

Students who attend a new school will be accounted for in year one of the school's operation if they had been continuously enrolled in the district for 12+ months and had enrolled in the school on or before October 1. The goal of 100% proficiency for all students will remain consistent with the 2013-2014 timeline.

CDE will continue to annually review how AYP and other accountability decisions are made and applied to ensure consistency, validity and reliability.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).	The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.
	State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).	Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.
	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.	

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

State law requires that “every student enrolled in a public school shall be required to take the assessments.” This fact is stressed again in the CSAP Procedures Manual and communications related to AYP. There is a CSAP or CSAPA test booklet for all enrolled students in Colorado public schools.

CDE calculates the participation rate by analyzing the number of students who do not participate in the appropriate assessments. All students in the school/district, at the tested grade levels, are included in the denominator for percentages. Students who were coded as test deferred due to language (test invalidation code 1) are counted as non-participants, unless they are newly arrived English language learners who have an overall CELA score, in reading participation only. Additionally, students who have been in the US for more than three years are counted as non-participants if they take the Lectura (Spanish) assessment. Colorado’s definition of AYP requires that 95% of all students in all required disaggregated groups of 30 or more as well as the school or school district as a whole participate in CSAP or CSAPA.

Additionally, If students are coded with a test invalidation code of 4 (parent refusal), 5 (test not completed), 7 (extreme frustration), 8 (non-approved accommodation or modification), 9 (misadministration), or B (District Ed. Services) they are not counted as participants. They are also excluded from the performance and other indicator calculations.

If a student is coded as test invalidation B (district Ed. Services) and has suffered a significant medical emergency which prevents them from attending school and

participating in the assessment during the entire testing window, including the make-up dates, the district may appeal the record and have it excluded from participation calculations. Documentation that such students have been determined by a medical practitioner to be incapacitated to the extent they are unable to participate in the appropriate State assessment must be included with the appeal.

School districts and schools that fail to reach the 95% participation threshold for the school or district as a whole and for all required disaggregated groups of thirty or more students cannot make AYP.

Through the AYP appeals process, districts and schools can appeal to make the participation rate target by averaging their participation rates over the past two or three years.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The 95% requirement is applied to all schools and districts as a whole and to any of the required disaggregated groups of thirty or more students. Schools, school districts and the state cannot make AYP if the 95% participation requirement is not met.

Attachment A

<i>AYP Proficiency Performance Targets by Grade Level, Content Area, and Year</i>						
Year	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
*2002	76.92	75.86	73.61	59.51	79.65	47.00
2003	76.92	75.86	73.61	59.51	79.65	47.00
2004	76.92	75.86	73.61	59.51	79.65	47.00
2005	82.69	81.90	80.21	69.63	84.74	60.25
2006	82.69	83.64	80.21	69.63	84.74	60.25
2007	82.69	83.64	80.21	69.63	84.74	60.25
2008	88.46	89.09	86.81	79.75	89.83	73.50
2009	88.46	89.09	86.81	79.75	89.83	73.50
2010	88.46	89.09	86.81	79.75	89.83	73.50
2011	94.23	94.54	93.41	89.88	94.92	86.75
2012	94.23	94.54	93.41	89.88	94.92	86.75
2013	94.23	94.54	93.41	89.88	94.92	86.75
2014	100	100	100	100	100	100

Attachment B

"Other Indicator" Performance Targets for Elementary and Middle School – Advanced Level of Proficiency by Grade Span, Content Area, and Year

Year	Elementary School		Middle School	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
*2002	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
2003	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
2004	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
2005	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%
2006	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%
2007	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%	1.10%
2008	1.21%	1.21%	1.21%	1.21%
2009	1.21%	1.21%	1.21%	1.21%
2010	1.21%	1.21%	1.21%	1.21%
2011	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%
2012	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%
2013	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%
2014	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%

* Starting Point

"Other Indicator" Performance Targets High School - Graduation Rate**

Year	Graduation Rate
*2002	55.30%
2003	55.30%
2004	55.30%
2005	57.40%
2006	57.40%
2007	57.40%
2008	59.50%
2009	59.50%
2010	63.00%
2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 63% 4-year rate• 2% point increase from prior 4 year rate• 65% 5-year rate• 67% 6-year rate
2012	TBD
2013	TBD
2014	80.00%

* Starting Point

Disaggregated groups/schools/districts may still make the graduation rate component of AYP if they increase by 2% points from their prior year's 4-year graduation rate, even if they do not meet the target above. Additionally, Colorado is incorporating targets for the 5-year and 6-year rates, as noted in the table above. One of the four targets must be met by all applicable disaggregated groups in order for the school/district to make AYP.

For more information about Colorado's graduation rate calculations, please go here: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/rv2010GradLinks.htm>.