

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part I

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2003-2004



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce “red tape” and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 17, 2004. Part II is due to the Department by April 15, 2005.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 17, 2004**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of NCLB. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified

teachers.

- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2003-2004 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2004**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2003-2004 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report. Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 17, 2004**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2003-2004 school year, unless otherwise noted. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities).

States may use this format or a format of their choosing to submit the required information. If the information is available through another source, States may refer the Department to that source, e.g., State Report Cards. If a State refers the Department to another source, it must provide specific information on where the data may be accessed, e.g. the URL for the State Report Card.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to conreport@ed.gov, or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

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

Daisy Greenfield
U.S. Department of Education
Room 3E307
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is _____. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 182 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: _____
Expiration Date: _____

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Colorado Department of Education

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80203

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Patrick Chapman

Telephone: 303-866-6780

Fax: 303-866-6637

e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Signature

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2003-2004



PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2004

I. STANDARDS and ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

A. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

Colorado has a content community that we communicate with to create content standards. This content community is made up of teachers, administrators and businesses/coalitions in their respective field of expertise. The following is the new science frameworks created October/November 2004. These frameworks correlate directly to the State standards and the CSAP.

Science Standards

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/standards/sci.htm>

Science Frameworks

http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/csap/frameworks/as_g5-8-10scifrmwork.pdf -

There will be another frameworks document added soon that is easier to read and follow.

(Currently these documents do not transfer well into this document. We may cut and paste or add hard copy if needed.)

B. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

STATE RESPONSE

The Colorado Student Assessment Program Alternate for grades 3 through 10 in the areas of reading, writing and math and 8th grade science have been developed and will be administered in the spring of 2005. The 3rd and 4th grade math assessments are being piloted in an online data collection format for the 05' school year and will be administered and collected in the general format in 06. The assessments are based upon expanded benchmarks (alternate achievement standards) of the Colorado State Content Standards. These expanded benchmarks provide the foundation for the assessment frameworks and have been developed in conjunction with state advisory teams that include content experts, special educators, and representatives of the test publisher. The eligibility criteria for the CSAPA, expanded benchmarks of the Colorado State Content Standards and the CSAPA reading, writing and math assessment frameworks may be found on the CDE website at:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/StuDis-Sub2.asp>

C. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

STATE RESPONSE

Alternate Achievement Standards (cutpoints and performance level descriptors) have been set for the CSAPA through a modified bookmark process for grades 3-10 in reading and writing, grades 5-10 in math and grade 8 in science. Cutpoints and performance descriptors for grades 3 and 4 math will be set in the summer of 2005, after the first administration. The state reports and performance level descriptors are located on the CDE website at:

<http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdesped/StuDis-Sub2.asp>. All assessments will be

II. PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

A. Participation of All Students in 2003-2004 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2003-2004 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Student Participation in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	345,770	99.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,199	99.9%
Asian	10,216	99.8%
Black or African American	20,690	99.9%
Hispanic or Latino	83,142	99.3%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA
White	227,446	100%
Students with Disabilities	37,123	99.6%
Limited English Proficient	42,158	98.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	101,305	99.5%
Migrant	3,761	97.4%
Male	177,381	99.8%
Female	168,347	99.8%

2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	457214	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	5564	99.8
Asian	13791	99.8
Black or African American	27504	99.9
Hispanic or Latino	113266	99.4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA	NA
White	296991	100
Students with Disabilities	49962	99.6
Limited English Proficient	60304	98.9
Economically Disadvantaged	140829	99.5
Migrant	5450	97.7
Male	234696	99.8
Female	222471	99.8

B. Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State’s assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	34022	96.95%
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	NA	NA
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	1035	2.95%

2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	45622	92.84%

Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	NA	NA
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3461	7.04%

III. STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2003-2004 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2003-2004 school year. States should provide data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2003-2004 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Grade 3 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	NA
American Indian or Alaska Native	NA
Asian	NA
Black or African American	NA
Hispanic or Latino	NA
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	NA
Students with Disabilities	NA
Limited English Proficient	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Migrant	NA
Male	NA
Female	NA

Grade 3 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	93.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	88.7
Asian	97.5
Black or African American	85.2
Hispanic or Latino	88.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	95.1
Students with Disabilities	69.8
Limited English Proficient	88.4
Economically Disadvantaged	87.8
Migrant	86.1
Male	91.4
Female	94.8

Grade 4 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	NA
American Indian or Alaska Native	NA
Asian	NA
Black or African American	NA
Hispanic or Latino	NA
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	NA
Students with Disabilities	NA
Limited English Proficient	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Migrant	NA
Male	NA
Female	NA

Grade 4 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	88.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	80.7
Asian	93.4
Black or African American	81.3
Hispanic or Latino	78.3
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	93.5
Students with Disabilities	58.6
Limited English Proficient	73.3
Economically Disadvantaged	79.2
Migrant	69.2
Male	86.6
Female	90.9

Grade 5 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	88.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	82.4
Asian	92.7
Black or African American	74.3
Hispanic or Latino	79.1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	93.7
Students with Disabilities	60.9
Limited English Proficient	76.4
Economically Disadvantaged	79.3
Migrant	70.2
Male	88.4
Female	89

Grade 5 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	88.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	81.7
Asian	92.4
Black or African American	81.4
Hispanic or Latino	78.3
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	93.4
Students with Disabilities	57.2
Limited English Proficient	72.9
Economically Disadvantaged	79.2
Migrant	65.8
Male	86.6
Female	91.0

Grade 6 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	75.6
Asian	88.8
Black or African American	62.3
Hispanic or Latino	67.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	89.9
Students with Disabilities	45.6
Limited English Proficient	64.1
Economically Disadvantaged	67.8
Migrant	56.7
Male	82
Female	83.2

Grade 6 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	88.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	83.5
Asian	93.0
Black or African American	79.4
Hispanic or Latino	76.4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	94.0
Students with Disabilities	55.7
Limited English Proficient	70.0
Economically Disadvantaged	77.4
Migrant	59.9
Male	86.0
Female	91.5

Grade 7 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	77.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	62.7
Asian	85.6
Black or African American	54.6
Hispanic or Latino	59.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	85.8
Students with Disabilities	35.1
Limited English Proficient	55.5
Economically Disadvantaged	59.4
Migrant	51.7
Male	76.8
Female	78.4

Grade 7 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	85.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	76.0
Asian	89.8
Black or African American	75.3
Hispanic or Latino	71.4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	91.5
Students with Disabilities	48.3
Limited English Proficient	64.0
Economically Disadvantaged	71.9
Migrant	57.1
Male	82.1
Female	89.4

Grade 8 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	71.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	53.1
Asian	83.0
Black or African American	44.2
Hispanic or Latino	49.1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	80.7
Students with Disabilities	25.3
Limited English Proficient	45.4
Economically Disadvantaged	49.1
Migrant	36.8
Male	70.2
Female	72.0

Grade 8 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	87.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	79.7
Asian	92.7
Black or African American	76.7
Hispanic or Latino	73.3
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	92.5
Students with Disabilities	47.3
Limited English Proficient	66.3
Economically Disadvantaged	74.3
Migrant	54.2
Male	83.4
Female	90.9

9th Grade Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	46.3
Asian	76.2
Black or African American	34.8
Hispanic or Latino	36.3
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	73.5
Students with Disabilities	18.2
Limited English Proficient	35.9
Economically Disadvantaged	38.4
Migrant	24.9
Male	62.2
Female	63.6

9th Grade Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	89.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	83.2
Asian	93.5
Black or African American	82.2
Hispanic or Latino	77.5
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	93.2
Students with Disabilities	56.6
Limited English Proficient	72.5
Economically Disadvantaged	78.4
Migrant	65.0
Male	85.6
Female	92.7

10TH Grade Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	49.2
Asian	73.7
Black or African American	32.9
Hispanic or Latino	37.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	71.9
Students with Disabilities	16.1
Limited English Proficient	36.6
Economically Disadvantaged	38.5
Migrant	23.9
Male	62.9
Female	63.0

10th Grade Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	84.8
Asian	93.3
Black or African American	77.6
Hispanic or Latino	77.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	92.0
Students with Disabilities	54.1
Limited English Proficient	73.6
Economically Disadvantaged	77.4
Migrant	66.7
Male	85.0
Female	91.9

IV. SCHOOL and DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

A. For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	1822	1440	79.03%

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	182	115	63.19%

B. For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	627	493	78.63%

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	175	109	62.29%

C. Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2004-2005 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year, please mark "Made AYP 2003-2004."

2. Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Title I schools on improvement are offered the option of having a school support team review. The review is a diagnostic assessment of all facets of the school's program to include: curriculum, assessment, instruction, school culture, family and community involvement, professional development, leadership, school organization, and comprehensive planning. Each staff person in the

school is interviewed as well as parents, students, and staff from the central office. Each instructional staff person is observed at least twice.

Following the completion of the comprehensive review the school receives a final report. Each school uses the results of the report to develop a school improvement plan for implementation of report findings. Title I School Improvement dollars flow to the school following the completion of the review process. These funds are available to support development of a plan and implementation of activities defined in the plan.

Title I schools on Improvement also receive support through a variety of other means. For example, they are invited to participate in professional development opportunities in building leadership, math, using data to drive instruction, English language learners, and others. They are also sent a quarterly newsletter entitled *Research You Can Use*. We have also created a website devoted to Professional Development and School Support. The website can be accessed to gather information about resources that can assist schools in their efforts to improve. Finally, we have published a Resource Guide that has been disseminated to all schools and districts on Improvement.

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which school missed AYP						School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Adams 12 0806900	Coronado Hills Elementary School- 01174	X				X		CA
Adams 12 0806900	Federal Heights Elementary School- 01176	X						CA
Adams 12 0806900	Mc Elwain Elementary School- 01182	X						CA

Adams 12 0806900	Thornton Middle School 01183	X		X				SI1
Adams 12 0806900	Niver Creek Middle School 001189	X		X		X		SI1
Adams 12 0806900	Thornton Elementary School- 01191	X				X		CA
Adams 14 0801950	Adams City Middle School 00009	X		X		X		SI1
Adams 14 0801950	Kearney Middle School 00015	X		X		X		SI1
Adams 14 0801950	Monaco Elementary School- 00017					X		SI2
Westminster- 0807230	Baker Elementary School- 01228	X						SI1
Westminster- 0807230	Skyline Vista Elementary School- 01247					X		SI1
Sheridan 2 0806540	Fort Logan Elementary School- 01132							SI2
Sheridan 2 0806540	Sheridan Middle School 01135	X		X		X		SI1
Arapahoe 28 - 0802340	North Middle School 00074	X		X		X		SI1
Arapahoe 28 - 0802340	Vaughn Elementary School- 00080	X				X		CA
Arapahoe 28 - 0802340	West Middle School 00082	X		X		X		SI1
St. Vrain- 0805370	Rocky Mountain Elementary School- 00921			X	X			SI1
St. Vrain- 0805370	Spangler Elementary School- 00922	X						CA
Boulder- 2- 0802490	University Hill Elementary School- 00135	X						SI1

Costilla- 0806360	Centennial Junior High School- 01457							SI2
Costilla- 0806360	Centennial High School- 01416							SI2
Denver- 0803360	Abraham Lincoln High School- 00305			X			X	SI1
Denver- 0803360	Amesse Elementary School- 00306					X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Arts And Cultural Studies Academy At Manual- 01861			X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Ashley Elementary School- 00309			X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Baker Middle School- 00310	X		X		X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Barnum Elementary School- 00311	X						SI2
Denver- 0803360	Barrett Elementary School- 00312							SI2
Denver- 0803360	Cheltenham Elementary School- 00325	X						CA
Denver- 0803360	Cole Middle School- 00326	X		X		X		CA
Denver- 0803360	College View Elementary School- 00328					X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Cowell Elementary School- 00332	X						CA
Denver- 0803360	Del Pueblo Elementary School- 00334							SI2
Denver- 0803360	Fairmont Elementary School- 00346	X						SI2
Denver- 0803360	Fairview Elementary School- 00347	X		X				SI2
Denver- 0803360	Ford Elementary School- 00350							RP

Denver- 0803360	Garden Place Elementary School-00351					X		SI2
Denver- 0803360	Gilpin Elementary School-00353			X				CA
Denver- 0803360	Godsman Elementary School- 00354	X		X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Goldrick Elementary School- 00355	X						CA
Denver- 0803360	Gove Middle School-00356	X		X		X		SI1
Denver- 0803360	Greenlee/Metro Lab Elementary School-00358					X		SI1
Denver- 0803360	Hallett Elementary School- 00360			X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Harrington Elementary School-00362	X						SI1
Denver- 0803360	Horace Mann Middle School- 00366	X		X		X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Kepner Middle School-00370	X		X		X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Knapp Elementary School-00371	X		X		X		SI2
Denver- 0803360	Kunsmiller Middle School- 00373	X		X		X		SI1
Denver- 0803360	Lake Middle School-00374	X		X		X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Leadership Academy At Manual- 01866	X		X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Mc Glone Elementary School- 01276	X		X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Millenium Quest Science Academy At Manual- 01868	X		X				SI1

Denver- 0803360	Mitchell Elementary School- 00381	X		X		X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Munroe Elementary School-00387	X						CA
Denver- 0803360	Newlon Elementary School- 00388	X				X		SI1
Denver- 0803360	Randolph Middle School- 01869	X		X		X		SI1
Denver- 0803360	Remington Elementary School- 00395	X						RP
Denver- 0803360	Rishel Middle School- 00396	X		X		X		CA
Denver- 0803360	Schenck Elementary School- 00400	X						CA
Denver- 0803360	Skinner Middle School- 00403	X		X		X		RI
Denver- 0803360	Smiley Middle School- 00406	X		X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Smith Elementary School- 00407	X		X		X		SI2
Denver- 0803360	Stedman Elementary School-00411							SI2
Denver- 0803360	Swansea Elementary School- 00414	X						CA
Denver- 0803360	Valverde- 00421							SI2
Denver- 0803360	West High School- 00423	X		X				SI1
Denver- 0803360	Castro Elementary School- 00424	X				X		CA
El Paso 11- 0803060	Roosevelt Edison Charter School- 00262		X					SI2
El Paso 60- 0805670	Miami/Yoder Elementary School- 00971							SI1

Garfield 1- 0804260	Carbondale Elementary- 00585	X						CA
Gunnison- 0804470	Gunnison Elementary School- 01600	X						SI1
Jefferson 1- 0804800	Molholm Elementary School-00758					X		SI2
Jefferson 1- 0804800	Wheat Ridge Middle School- 00802	X		X		X		SI1
Jefferson 1- 0804800	O'Connell Middle School	X	X	X	X	X		SI1
La Plata 11- 0804770	Ignacio Intermediate School-01444							SI2
Moffat- 0805730	Craig Middle School- 01553			X				SI1
Montezuma 1- 0803090	Kemper Elementary School- 00835							SI2
Montezuma 1- 0803090	Manauh Elementary School- 00838							SI2
East Otero- 0805130	La Junta Middle School- 00849	X		X				SI1
Pueblo 60 - 0806120	Corwin Middle School- 01039					X		SI1
Pueblo 60 - 0806120	James H Risley Middle School- 01051	X						CA
Pueblo 60 - 0806120	Youth & Family Academy Charter (High)- 01612	X		X				SI1
Pueblo 60 - 0806120	Youth & Family Academy Charter (Middle)- 01612	X		X				SI1
Center- 0802850	Haskin Elementary School- 00177	X		X				SI1
Center- 0802850	Skoglund Middle School- 00178			X		X		SI1

Greeley 6- 0804410	Billie Martinez Elementary School- 00633	X		X				CA
Weld 9- 0802310	Highland Middle School- 01466		X		X			CA

D. Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action).

2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

If the SEA identifies an LEA for improvement, the LEA must develop or revise an improvement plan, no later than three months after the identification. In developing or revising this plan, the LEA must consult with parents, school staff, and others.

The purpose of the LEA improvement plan is to address the deficiencies in the LEA that prevent students in its schools from achieving proficiency in the core academic subjects of reading and mathematics. The improvement plan must analyze and address LEA insufficiencies as they relate to leadership for schools, governance and fiscal infrastructures, and curriculum and instruction. The plan-writing process should result in a determination of why the LEA's previous efforts to improve were ineffective and a framework of detailed action steps to improve on those efforts.

LEA improvement plans will go through a "peer review" process to provide feedback and identify areas in which the SEA may provide technical assistance to the LEA.

CDE is in the process of matching what several units at CDE (i.e. SPED, ELL) are currently doing in the areas of training and professional development that may provide assistance to districts in the specific areas in which they were identified for improvement. This is an effort to coordinate what is currently being offered by CDE with the specific needs of the districts and at the same time will also allow us to develop new resources in those areas where we may find gaps. CDE will also meet with representatives from the districts that have been identified for improvement in order to allow them inform us of those areas they have found that they need assistance.

CDE has identified the most common areas in which districts have not made AYP and will make efforts to coordinate trainings with districts that have similar demographics and similar target areas in which they need assistance. Districts that have had success with specific AYP target areas will be identified as a resource for districts that have struggled in those same areas.

CDE will use its School Support Team model to create District Support Teams. The teams will be comprised of individuals with expertise in the areas where the district fell short of making AYP. For example, expertise in math or reading, English language learners or students with disabilities. In districts that fell short in many areas the team will conduct a more comprehensive review and develop a more comprehensive report.

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
MAPLETON 1- 0805550	X		X				PI-1
ADAMS 12 FIVE STAR SCHOOLS- 0806900			X				PI-1
ADAMS COUNTY 14- 0801950	X		X		X		PI-1
BRIGHTON 27J- 0802580	X	X	X	X	X		PI-1
WESTMINSTER 50- 0807230	X		X		X		PI-1
ALAMOSA RE-11J- 0802070	X		X				PI-1
ENGLEWOOD 1- 0803780		X		X			PI-1
SHERIDAN 2- 0806540	X	X	X	X	X		PI-1
CHERRY CREEK 5- 0802910	X		X				PI-1
LITTLETON 6- 0805310	X		X	X			PI-1

ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J-0802340	X		X		X		PI-1
VILAS RE-5- 0806990					X		PI-1
ST VRAIN VALLEY RE 1J-0805370	X	X	X	X			PI-1
BOULDER VALLEY RE 2-0802490	X		X				PI-1
NORTH CONEJOS RE-1J-0805100	X						PI-1
DELTA COUNTY 50(J)-0803330	X		X	X	X		PI-1
DENVER COUNTY 1-0803360	X		X		X		PI-1
DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1-0803450	X	X	X	X			PI-1
HARRISON 2- 0804530	X		X		X		PI-1
WIDEFIELD- 0806480	X		X				PI-1
FOUNTAIN 8- 0804080	X		X				PI-1
COLORADO SPRINGS 11-0803060	X		X		X	X	PI-1
ACADEMY 20- 0801920	X		X				PI-1
FALCON 49- 0803870	X		X				PI-1
CANON CITY RE-1-0802790	X		X				PI-1
FLORENCE RE-2- 0803960	X		X				PI-1
ROARING FORK RE-1-0804260	X		X		X	X	PI-1
GARFIELD RE-2- 0806240	X		X				PI-1
GUNNISON WATERSHED RE1J- 0804470	X						PI-1

JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1-0804800	X		X				PI-1
LAKE COUNTY R-1-0805190	X		X		X	X	PI-1
DURANGO 9-R- 0803480	X		X				PI-1
IGNACIO 11 JT- 0804770	X		X				PI-1
POUDRE R-1- 0803990	X		X				PI-1
THOMPSON R-2J- 0805400	X		X				PI-1
TRINIDAD 1- 0806960	X		X				PI-1
VALLEY RE-1- 0806690	X		X			X	PI-1
MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51-0804350	X		X				PI-1
MOFFAT COUNTY RE:NO 1-0805730	X		X				PI-1
MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1-0803090	X		X		X	X	PI-1
MONTROSE COUNTY RE-1J-0805790	X	X	X	X	X		PI-1
BRUSH RE-2(J)- 0802610	X						PI-1
FORT MORGAN RE-3-0804050	X		X		X	X	PI-1
EAST OTERO R-1- 0805130	X		X				PI-1
LAMAR RE-2- 0805220			X				PI-1
PUEBLO CITY 60- 0806120			X				PI-1
PUEBLO COUNTY RURAL 70-0806150	X		X				PI-1
CENTER 26 JT- 0802850	X		X		X		PI-1

SUMMIT RE-1- 0806810	X	X		X		X	PI-1
WOODLAND PARK RE-2- 0807380	X		X				PI-1
WELD COUNTY RE-1- 0804200	X		X		X		PI-1
KEENESBURG RE-3(J)- 0804920	X						PI-1
WINDSOR RE-4- 0807350	X		X				PI-1
JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN RE- 5J- 0804830	X		X				PI-1
GREELEY 6- 0804410	X		X		X		PI-1
WELD COUNTY S/D RE-8- 0804020	X		X		X		PI-1
AULT-HIGHLAND RE-9- 0802310		X		X			PI-1

E. PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

1. Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.

___50___

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 153 How many of these schools were charter schools?

___**unknown**___ (Answer of 153 public schools may contain possible duplicates)

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. ___368___

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. ___31,763___

Optional Information: If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

1. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. ___368___

2. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2003-2004 school year.

___368___

2. Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. ___37___

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.

___2,149___

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. ___16,990_____

Optional Information: If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

1. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. ___2,149_____

V. TEACHER and PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

A. Highly Qualified Teachers. NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

1. In the following table, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” and “low-poverty” schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and “low-poverty” schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	217,8423	198,975	91%
By Poverty Status			
High-Poverty Schools	54,127	48,501	90%
Low-Poverty Schools	60,420	55,525	92%
By Level			
Elementary	133,059	126,133	95%
Secondary	84,783	72,842	86%

4

2. Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty schools used in the table above.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
State Poverty Quartile Breaks	More than 53.38%	Less than 12.37%
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced lunch eligibility	

3. Please provide the State’s definition of elementary and secondary school level as used in the chart above.

a. Elementary Level

Elementary data consists of all classrooms taught by teachers that just teach at the elementary level (k-6)

b. Secondary Level

Secondary data consists of all classrooms taught by teachers that teach at the secondary level (7-12) and teachers that teach at both elementary and secondary.

B. High-Quality Professional Development. In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

Colorado did not collect the percent of teachers who received high quality professional development. The reason we did not collect this is that these data would have been self-reported. We did not believe that these data would be accurate. We therefore collected the percent of Title II Part A funds used for high quality professional development by poverty level of school.. We screened the activities the districts were using through the consolidated federal programs report. The total allocation for the districts is \$30,669,400.32.

This table represents the percent of funds from the Title II Part A program that were used for high quality professional development.

76 - 100	51 - 75%	26 - 50%	0 - 25%	Total Title II Part A funds used for professional development
\$4,735,736.05	\$4,466,819.34	\$6,133,057.85	\$5,208,061.38	\$20,543,674.62
15.44%	14.56%	20.00%	16.98%	66.98%

	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2003-2004 School Year	See Note Above

C. Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate’s (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2003-2004 School Year	29.28%

VI. English Language Proficiency

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Please provide an updated description of the State's progress since September 1, 2003, in developing and implementing ELP standards as required under section 3113(b)(2). Please describe the progress the State has made in linking the ELP standards to academic content in reading/language arts and mathematics. Provide a description of the State's progress in developing ELP standards that are linked to academic content in science. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**

STATE RESPONSE

Colorado has set high linguistic and academic expectations for our English Language Learners (ELL). The department completed English Language Development (ELD) Standards in April 2004 and submitted to the Colorado State Board of Education for review and approval in September 2004. The ELD Standards were developed with the assistance of administrators, classroom teachers, highly qualified ESL/Bilingual educators, higher learning educators, and the Colorado Department of Education staff. Furthermore, external consultants with a strong and deep understanding of linguistic and academic expectations of ELL students provided a further review of the standards.

The ELD Standards are designed for K-12 students and target the five domains of listening, reading, writing, speaking and comprehension. They outline a basic framework for the instruction of students who have been identified as eligible for linguistic and academic support in English and provide parameters for tracking student progress towards the acquisition of English.

The ELD Standards provide classroom teachers with benchmarks on which to focus instruction and allows teachers to establish a foundation for student achievement. The ELD Standards are linked and aligned to the Colorado Language Arts Content Standards and are research-based.

B. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. Please describe how the State ensures:

- The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12;
- The ELP assessment(s) address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension

2. If the State is using multiple ELP assessments, please describe how the State:

- Set technical criteria for the assessments (validity and reliability);
- Ensured the assessments are equivalent to one another in their content, difficulty, and quality;
- Reviewed and approved each assessment; and
- Ensured that data from all assessments can be aggregated for comparison and reporting purposes as well as disaggregated by ELP levels and grade levels

3. Please provide an updated description, including a timeline, of the State's progress in developing and implementing new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency standards as required by section 3113(b)(2)(C)(iii).

STATE RESPONSE (next page)

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE), English Language Acquisition Unit (ELAU) ensures that districts assess limited English proficient (LEP) students through the State Consolidated Application Process which is submitted annually (June 30th) and through the English Language Proficiency Act (ELPA) report (submitted bi-annually). Districts delineate a plan of how they will assess our LEP students, provide support and monitor growth patterns in the five domains of listening, reading, writing, speaking and comprehension.

Furthermore, CDE provides technical assistance as well as professional development on an on-going basis to all districts that must meet the requirements that have been set forth by the State as well as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

The State is currently using multiple assessments and include: Woodcock-Muñoz, LAS and IPT. In SY 2000-2001 representatives from the three assessment companies met to support CDE in creating general guidelines for the use of the instruments. A crosswalk for each of the three measures was created and has served as guidance to date.

Woodcock-Muñoz – The standard score for the Woodcock-Muñoz is based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. They are peer comparison statements derived from raw scores. The Woodcock scores are recalculated based on the Rash Logistic Scales to net individual domain scores, Grade and Age Equivalencies, NCE and Composite Scores.

LAS – The LAS is computed on a standard score, based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. It is weighted in a similar fashion to the Woodcock as a ratio of the proficiency of subject score to proficiency of the comparison group. The manufacturer provides NCE or composite scores.

IPT – The IPT is computed on a standard distribution and raw scores. It shows how a standard score departs from the mean of the distribution. It nets a percentile, standard scores, rank and normal curve equivalencies and composites.

Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State selected ELP assessment(s)).

The number of identified students for school year 2003-2004 as collected on the October 1, 2003 count is 91,751.

The Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment) is 97,576.

*There is a difference of 5,828 students between those identified and assessed. The reason for the difference in numbers is that the information for those students identified as LEP was done October 1, 2003. The information for those students that were assessed was provided in June 2004.

In the spring of 2006 the State will implement a new assessment which measures and monitors language proficiency in the following domains: listening, reading, writing, speaking and comprehension. The new assessment is divided into Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced levels and the following configuration is used: K – 2nd, 3rd – 5th, 6th – 8th and 9th – 12th grade.

Timeline for implementation of new State Assessment:

Spring/Summer 2005 – Professional Development

Spring 2006 - Implementation

C. English Language Proficiency Assessment Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2003-2004** school year test administration. English language proficiency data should include **all** students in the State who were assessed and identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments. The State must also disaggregate ELP data by number and percentage of students who participated in Title III programs.

The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level and should include the following:

1. Total number and percentage of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency (“assessed” refers to the number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments)
2. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) (“identified” refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments)
3. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s)
4. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year
5. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III
6. Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2003-2004 school year.

States may use the sample formats below or another format to report the requested information.

Table C-1: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 1, 2, and 3 on the previous page

2003-2004 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State										
Name of LEP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of ALL Students Assessed (2)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency					
					Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 NEP (4)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 LEP (5)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 FEP (6)			
IPT, LAS, Woodcock-Munoz	97576	100%	97576	100%	27975	28.67%	46034	47.18%	23567	24.15%

Table C-2: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 4, 5, and 6 on the previous page

2003-2004 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III										
Name of LEP Assessment(s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (3)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency					
					Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 NEP (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 LEP (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 FEP (6)	
IPT, LAS, Woodcock-Munoz	97460	100%	97460	100%	27951	28.68%	45973	47.17%	23536	24.15%

D. Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111(c).

1. Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2003-2004 ___15,642__
2. Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2003-2004 ___9,541__
3. Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2003-2004 ___53__

E. Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments
- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English
- Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English

STATE RESPONSE

A student is reclassified as proficient when the following criteria have been met:

- a. Has reached a "fluent" level of proficiency on a valid, reliable language proficiency assessment in the areas of reading, comprehension, writing, speaking and listening.
- b. Has achieved a level of partially proficient or proficient on the Colorado State Assessment Program (CSAP) test in the areas of reading, comprehension, writing, listening and speaking.

See Attachment (Excel document) Assessment Cut Scores and Identification Matrix

F. Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English in Title III served schools as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:

- A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments
- A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)
- A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next

STATE RESPONSE

Limited English proficient students will make adequate progress if they:
Successfully participate in a standards-based Language Instruction Educational Program that provides an on-going opportunity to develop comprehensive language skills.
Consistently move from one level of proficiency to another as outlined in our Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives.
Consistently meet the benchmarks and skills described in the English Language Development and Language Arts Content Standards and make significant progress from the emergent levels of proficiency through Fluent, Redesignation and Formal Exit.
The State of Colorado will map the movement of students from one proficiency level to another through a seven year continuum.

Levels of Proficiency:
NEP – Non English Proficient
LEP - Limited English Proficient
FEP – Fluent English Proficient
Redesignated: Monitored year 1 and year 2
Formal Exit

Each spring, students given the state language proficiency assessment become the cohort for the upcoming year and the base for all calculations. In year two of the assessment program the progress of these students will be compared to the targets designated by our annual measurable objectives designed in the enclosed chart. Each year students will be assessed and a year added to their academic history.

See attachment (Word Document) AMAO Timeline

G. Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

- Cohorts are determined by looking at students enrolled in the district from one October count to the next (using SASID) AND coded as "Continuously enrolled in the district" the second year.
- There are three cohorts established each year: NEP, LEP and FEP.
- The cohorts contain all students K-12 who fit the above requirements.
- Each year the cohorts are adjusted for students graduating or moving out of the district.
- Students who move from NEP to LEP, or LEP to FEP, become part of a new cohort the next year.
- A cohort must contain (and maintain over time) a minimum of 16 students.

H. Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

Yes No

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency. and provide the data from that evaluation.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual	
2003-2004 School Year	7306	40%	8714	48.43%	2422	10%	3924	16.67%	2034	25%	4394	55.09%

J. Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: All K-12 students, continuously enrolled (see G)**

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III NEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual	
2003-2004 School Year	6313	40%	7649	49.25%	2174	10%	3441	16.32%	1839	25%	4012	55.68%

K. Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2003-2004 School Year

1. Number of Title III subgrants _____134_____
2. Number of Title III subgrants that met Title III annual measurable achievement objectives _____102_____
3. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives _____32_____
4. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives Due to large increases in the number of LEP Immigrant students _____29_____

VII. Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2004-2005 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2004-2005 School Year	0

VIII. Graduation and Dropout Rates

A. Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, 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,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2002-2003 school year.

.2 For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	83.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	65.8%
Asian	87.0%
Black or African American	76.8%
Hispanic or Latino	69.6%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	87.5%
Students with Disabilities	57.9%**
Limited English Proficient	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Migrant	NA
Male	80.3%
Female	87.0%

For those sections where we do not collect any data a NA has been provided.

Data for the 2003-2004 school year will include comparable graduation rates for those students classified as Disabled, Migrant, Economically Disadvantaged, and Limited in their Proficiency of English.

*Graduation rates for migrant students will be collected beginning 2003-2004.

**This is the graduation rate that OSEP will calculate from our most recent exit report that was due to be submitted to them on November 1, 2004. It tracks students that were in an LEA on December 1, 2002 to that LEA's December 1, 2003 count.

The formula that OSEP uses for dropouts is number of children 14 and above that dropped out of school or moved and are not known to be continuing in special education divided by the number of children 14 and above that dropped out of school, moved and are not known to be continuing in special education, graduated with a diploma, graduated with a certificate of completion, or reached maximum age. The calculation of a graduation rate has the same denominator, but the numerator, of course, is the number of students 14 and above that graduated with a diploma.

B. Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2002-2003 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

DROPOUT RATE

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	2.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.8%
Asian	1.5%
Black or African American	3.0%
Hispanic or Latino	4.2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	NA
White	1.7%
Students with Disabilities	37.9%**
Limited English Proficient	NA
Economically Disadvantaged	NA
Migrant	NA
Male	2.6%
Female	2.1%

The dropout rates do not adhere to the NCES' definition of a drop out as stipulated in the previous section, they do however comply with the State of Colorado's definition of a dropout.

For the 2003-2004 school year dropout rates will reflect the NCES definition of a dropout. These rates will also include data for those students who are classified as Disabled, Migrant, Economically Disadvantaged, and those Limited in their Proficiency of English.

For those sections where we do not collect any data a NA has been provided.

*Dropout rates for migrant students will be collected beginning 2003-2004.

**This is the dropout rate that OSEP will calculate from our most recent exit report that was due to be submitted to them on November 1, 2004. It tracks students that were in an LEA on December 1, 2002 to that LEA's December 1, 2003 count.

The formula that OSEP uses for dropouts is number of children 14 and above that dropped out of school or moved and are not known to be continuing in special education divided by the number of children 14 and above that dropped out of school, moved and are not known to be continuing in special education, graduated with a diploma, graduated with a certificate of completion, or reached maximum age. The calculation of a

graduation rate has the same denominator, but the numerator, of course, is the number of students 14 and above that graduated with a diploma.