

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**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 2004-2005



**PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006**

**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 is 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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- o **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.

- o **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.
- o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- o **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 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2004-2005 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 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) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
 Part I, 2004-2005 Part II, 2004-2005

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

Address:
1560 Broadway
Suite 1450

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): Dr. William Moloney

Signature

8/25/2006 11:36 AM EST

Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005



PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006

1.1. 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.

1.1.1. 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/CSAP_sci_fmwk_09_25_05.pdf

1.1.2 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

Colorado's assessment program consists of annual standards based assessments in grades 3-10 in reading, math and writing. Science assessments will be given at 5th, 8th and 10th grade in the spring of 2006.

The Colorado Student Assessment Program Alternate for grades 3 through 10 in the areas of reading, writing and math and 5th, 8th and 10th grade science have been developed and will be administered in the spring of 2006. The 3rd and 4th grade math assessments were piloted in an online data collection format for the 2005 school year and will be administered and collected in the general format in 2006. 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>

1.1.3 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 (cut points and performance level descriptors) have been set for the CSAPA through a modified bookmark process for grades 3-10 in reading and writing, grades 3-10 in math and grade 8 in science. Cutpoints and performance descriptors for grades 5 and 10 science will be set in the summer of 2006, 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>.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

Participation of All Students in 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 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 Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2004-2005 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	455710	99.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	5537	99.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	13907	97.9
Black, non-Hispanic	27816	99.5
Hispanic	114673	97.2
White, non-Hispanic	293675	99.9
Students with Disabilities	49425	99.1
Limited English Proficient	57476	94.1
Economically Disadvantaged	148413	97.9
Migrant	4376	89.0
Male	233891	99.1
Female	221743	99.2

Data includes CSAP and CSAPA results

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2004-2005 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	455778	99.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	5536	99.9
Asian/ Pacific Islander	13890	97.8
Black, non-Hispanic	27836	99.5
Hispanic	114737	97.3
White, non-Hispanic	293686	99.9
Students with Disabilities	49518	99.3
Limited English Proficient	57418	94.1
Economically Disadvantaged	148462	97.9
Migrant	4363	88.4
Male	233879	99.1
Female	221836	99.2

Data includes CSAP, Lectura and CSAPA results.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 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 Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	45694	91.6
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3731	7.5

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2004-2005 School Year Test Administration - Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	45691	91.6
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	3827	7.7

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as 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 2004-2005 school year.

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

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	49777	94.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	631	90.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	1459	96.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3342	83.2
Hispanic	10268	90.4
White, non-Hispanic	34047	96.3
Students with Disabilities	5710	73.2
Limited English Proficient	2888	91.2
Economically Disadvantaged	16219	89.1
Migrant	251	86.5
Male	25438	94.1
Female	24313	94.3

Data includes CSAP results.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	51280	92.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	626	89.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1462	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3339	82.9
Hispanic	11751	87.8
White, non-Hispanic	34094	94.5
Students with Disabilities	5829	65.9
Limited English Proficient	4387	88.4
Economically Disadvantaged	17590	86.4
Migrant	373	84.2
Male	26207	90.4
Female	25069	94.1

Data includes CSAP and Lectura results.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	54738	89.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	629	83.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	1814	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3384	77.7
Hispanic	14267	81.0
White, non-Hispanic	34636	94.1
Students with Disabilities	6566	60.8
Limited English Proficient	7446	77.8
Economically Disadvantaged	19899	81.0
Migrant	552	76.6
Male	28194	89.3
Female	26540	89.9

Data includes CSAP results.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	55063	86.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	627	80.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1813	91.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3385	77.3
Hispanic	14588	75.1
White, non-Hispanic	34638	92.2
Students with Disabilities	6558	54.9
Limited English Proficient	7757	68.2
Economically Disadvantaged	20169	75.7
Migrant	621	66.7
Male	28369	84.0
Female	26686	89.3

Data includes CSAP and Lectura results.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	55387	89.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	682	81.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1654	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3459	78.4
Hispanic	14411	80.1
White, non-Hispanic	35170	93.8
Students with Disabilities	6546	61.5
Limited English Proficient	7339	77.7
Economically Disadvantaged	20009	80.0
Migrant	503	77.3
Male	28427	88.8
Female	26952	89.5

Data includes CSAP and CSAPA results.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	55395	88.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	682	82.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1660	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3453	81.6
Hispanic	14410	77.9
White, non-Hispanic	35179	93.0
Students with Disabilities	6555	55.6
Limited English Proficient	7331	72.7
Economically Disadvantaged	19971	78.1
Migrant	508	71.5
Male	28428	85.6
Female	26959	91.0

Data includes CSAP and CSAPA results.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	56721	85.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	707	77.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	1589	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3573	69.7
Hispanic	14536	73.8
White, non-Hispanic	36314	91.9
Students with Disabilities	6426	52.3
Limited English Proficient	7015	70.8
Economically Disadvantaged	19815	73.6
Migrant	489	67.9
Male	29155	84.6
Female	27564	86.9

Data includes results from CSAP and CSAPA.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	56742	88.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	708	82.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	1587	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3577	79.0
Hispanic	14550	76.7
White, non-Hispanic	36313	93.9
Students with Disabilities	6421	56.5
Limited English Proficient	7014	71.0
Economically Disadvantaged	19849	77.5
Migrant	490	65.3
Male	29164	85.9
Female	27573	90.9

Data includes results from CSAP and CSAPA.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	58145	82.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	759	72.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	1708	89.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3543	64.4
Hispanic	14330	67.3
White, non-Hispanic	37796	89.6
Students with Disabilities	6285	45.3
Limited English Proficient	6677	64.8
Economically Disadvantaged	18990	67.4
Migrant	466	61.6
Male	29768	81.5
Female	28370	83.2

Data include results from CSAP and CSAPA.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	58127	86.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	758	79.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	1710	90.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3544	74.9
Hispanic	14339	72.3
White, non-Hispanic	37767	92.4
Students with Disabilities	6279	49.6
Limited English Proficient	6672	67.3
Economically Disadvantaged	19013	73.0
Migrant	467	57.6
Male	29750	83.5
Female	28367	88.9

Data includes results from CSAP and CSAPA.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	57886	75.7
American Indian/Alaska Native	722	62.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	1649	84.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3505	52.4
Hispanic	13803	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	38195	84.7
Students with Disabilities	6111	35.1
Limited English Proficient	6054	53.7
Economically Disadvantaged	17858	56.3
Migrant	437	51.5
Male	29755	74.2
Female	28124	77.4

Data includes results from CSAP and CSAPA.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	57898	86.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	727	79.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	1649	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3505	77.4
Hispanic	13804	73.1
White, non-Hispanic	38201	92.6
Students with Disabilities	6111	52.7
Limited English Proficient	6047	67.3
Economically Disadvantaged	17898	73.8
Migrant	437	59.7
Male	29755	83.6
Female	28138	90.2

Data includes results from CSAP and CSAPA.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	113465	64.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	1342	49.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	3339	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6826	36.3
Hispanic	24570	39.5
White, non-Hispanic	77358	74.4
Students with Disabilities	11325	23.3
Limited English Proficient	10041	37.3
Economically Disadvantaged	27461	41.0
Migrant	648	30.2
Male	58204	63.5
Female	55239	65.1

Data includes CSAP and CSAPA results for ninth and tenth graders.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 04-05
All Students	113450	88.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	1341	83.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	3337	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6846	81.2
Hispanic	24577	77.0
White, non-Hispanic	77314	93.4
Students with Disabilities	11318	57.4
Limited English Proficient	10028	71.8
Economically Disadvantaged	27473	78.0
Migrant	647	64.8
Male	58168	85.9
Female	55257	92.1

Data includes CSAP and CSAPA results for ninth and tenth graders.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 School Year Data	1851	1394	75.3

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 2004-2005 School Year Data	182	108	59.3

1.4.2 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 2004-2005 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 2004-2005 School Year Data	655	477	72.8

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 2004-2005 School Year Data	176	104	59.1

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

- 1.4.3.1** In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2005-2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 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 2005 - 2006 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 2005 - 2006 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP 2004-2005."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

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

Schools that are identified for Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring are eligible to receive a School Support Team visit and a Title I School Improvement Grant. The school support visits provide a comprehensive examination of factors related to academic achievement, learning environment, and organizational efficiency.

Following the development of a report, the schools select a trained facilitator to conduct a debriefing for the staff on the report findings. The facilitator also assists the schools with the development of goals and actions to address the findings of the report. These goals and strategic actions become a part of the schools' improvement plans.

Each school that receives a school support team visit also receives grant dollars; \$30,000 for the first year and up to \$100,000 for the second year.

In addition to the school support team visit and the School Improvement grant, schools have access to a web site that provides resources for areas addressed in the school support team review.

Finally, all schools in need of improvement are invited to attend high quality professional development in math. Academic achievement issues in reading are addressed through the Reading First Grant. School principals are also invited to attend professional development on leading in a culture of change.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1.4.4.1 In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2005 - 2006 school year, based upon data from the 2004-2005 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 2005 - 2006 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action). Additionally for any Title I district identified for improvement or corrective action for the 2005 - 2006 school year that made AYP based on data from the 2004-2005 school year, please add "Made AYP for 2004-2005."

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2005 - 2006 based on the data from 2004-2005)

See attached file

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

Districts placed on Program Improvement submit a Program Improvement plan. The districts have received technical assistance in the development of the plan. CDE is in the process of piloting a district review process similar to the school review process described above.

Districts moving on to Corrective Action will be offered the comprehensive appraisal for district improvement to assist them in the identification of barriers that are impeding academic achievement.

Districts on Program Improvement are also invited to send staff to the professional development options described above.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 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 2004-2005 school year. 83

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 2004-2005 school year. 42 How many of these schools were charter schools? 0

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 2004-2005 school year. 364

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 2004-2005 school year. 50801

Optional Information :

5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

6. 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 2004-2005 school year. _____

7. 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 2004-2005 school year. _____

Number of students eligible for public school choice included kindergarten.

1.4.5.2 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 2004-2005 school year. 67

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 2993

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. 26942

Optional Information :

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

4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2004-2005 school year. _____

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2004-2005 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 for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary 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	224029	210730	94.1
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	31563	30003	95.1
Low-Poverty Schools	34974	33739	96.5
All Elementary Schools	143692	137052	95.4
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	12629	10891	86.2
Low-Poverty Schools	26275	25079	95.4
All Secondary Schools	80337	73678	91.7

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [*Title IX*, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes; or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003.

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2005, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are being taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (note: percentages should add to 100 percent of the classes taught by not highly qualified teachers).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	13.0
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	18.1
d) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	40.1
e) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
f) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.9
g) Other (please explain)	

Non-Highly Qualified elementary and secondary Special Education teachers are included in a) and d) respectively.

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty *elementary and secondary* schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary Schools	More than <u>61.6%</u>	Less than <u>14.9%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Poverty level was determined by percent of free and reduced lunch at the school level.	
Secondary Schools	More than <u>49.4%</u>	Less than <u>13.2%</u>
Poverty Metric Used	Poverty level was determined by percent of free and reduced lunch at the school level.	

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 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 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2004-2005 School Year	48.2

1.6 English Language Proficiency**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed Yes No

Approved, adopted, sanctioned Yes No

Operationalized Yes No (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

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 five domains, which include 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.

The ELD Standards are being utilized by districts and are currently available for view or download on the Colorado Department of Education website. The knowledge and use of the ELD Standards is questioned during Monitoring On-Site visits which are currently being conducted by the SEA.

The ELD Standards are being utilized by districts and are currently available for view or download on the Colorado Department of Education website. The knowledge and use of the ELD Standards is questioned during Monitoring On-Site visits which are currently being conducted by the SEA.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The ELD Standards are designed for K-12 students and target five domains, which include 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.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. **The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113(b)(2) is spring 2006 . Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**
 - An independent alignment study Yes
 - Other evidence of alignment _____
2. **Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:**
 - The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
 - The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
 - ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
 - Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

1. The Colorado Department of Education (CDE), English Language Acquisition Unit (ELAU) has recently implemented the Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA) which was created by CTB McGraw Hill. An alignment study has been performed by CTB McGraw Hill and the CELA is approximately 80% to 85% aligned with the Colorado ELD Standards.

Under the Colorado Validity and Alignment Study (CVAS), CDE will be conducting an alignment study when the first administration of the CELA has been completed.

2. Testing for Non-English Proficient (NEP), Limited English Proficient (LEP) and Monitored Year 1 students in grades K-12 will take place between March and April 2006 in all districts that have identified English Language Learners (ELLs). Identification of ELL students was done through our October 1st count which is submitted to CDE in late fall by districts that request federal and state funds.

Districts are currently being provided with a training model which will help to ensure that testing is done appropriately and in a timely manner. Results will be returned to districts by July 2006. Results are to be analyzed by each district which in turn will assist in identifying any needs and provide assistance with direct instruction for ELLs. Considering that this is the first year for implementation of the CELA; a screener will not be provided until later summer or early fall 2006 for districts to utilize. Testing with the CELA will take place each spring, with a screener administered in the fall for new/incoming students.

The CELA addresses the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing and is currently aligned at approximately 80% to 85% with our ELD Standards. Our goal is to have the CELA aligned to our ELD Standards by approximately 90% to 95% by spring 2007. The CDE has been working closely with CTB McGraw Hill in order to ensure that the CELA meets the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act as well as our own State legislation requirements.

Districts will be utilizing the CELA this spring. The CELA is an off the shelf-assessment a pilot of this assessment has been completed. As we give our first administration of the CELA in spring 2006; we will utilize the same accommodations, prompting structures, invalidation of test, and exemptions that were used in the original norming study. This ensures that we have created validity and reliability to the "original" pilot norming study.

1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2004-2005** school year test administration. The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information. The information following the chart is meant to explain what is being requested under each column.

1.6.3.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State											
Name of ELP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number of ALL Students assessed for ELP (2)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		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 (4)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (5)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (6)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (7)						
Woodcock Munoz	21610	21610	23.7	5595	6.1	9039	9.9	6976	7.7		
LAS	38288	38288	42.0	12159	13.3	23254	25.5	2875	3.2		
IPT	31206	31206	34.3	10673	11.7	7639	8.4	12894	14.2		

In Colorado we determine proficiency by NEP, LEP and FEP categories, not level 1, 2, 3, and 4. In the chart above Level 1= NEP, Level 2= LEP, and Level 3= FEP.

- (1) In column one, provide the name(s) of the English Language Proficiency Assessment(s) used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students evaluated using State-selected ELP assessment(s)).
- (3) In column three, provide the 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).
- (4-7) In columns four-seven, provide the 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). The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 4-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of **all** students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State

2004-2005 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number and Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State	
1. Spanish	82866	82.0
2. Vietnamese	2265	2.2
3. Korean	1751	1.7
4. Russian	1679	1.7
5. Chinese	1307	1.3
6. Hmong	1101	1.1
7. Arabic	869	0.1
8. German	517	0.1
9. French	464	0
10. Navajo	430	0

This data includes students who are not included in ELL proficiency level data (1.6.3.1) due to how the information is collected during October count.

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.4.1.

1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data

2004-2005 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III						
Name of ELP 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 students identified at each level of English language proficiency				Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (7)
		Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1 (3)	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2 (4)	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3 (5)	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4 (6)	

Data is same as chart in 1.6.3.1

- (1) In column one, provide the name of the English Language Proficiency Assessment used by the State.
- (2) In column two, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year.
- (3-6) In columns three-six, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2004-2005 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-6 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (7) In column seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2004-2005 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111©:

1.6.4.1	Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2004-2005	<u>13255</u>
1.6.4.2	Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2004-2005	<u>13255</u>
1.6.4.3	Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2004-2005	<u>36</u>

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. 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;
3. 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

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. 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).

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

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2003-2004), 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.

1.6.8 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.

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 Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2004-2005 School Year	40.0	9162	41.0	9491	25.0	1378	87.0	4804

Colorado also holds a target for LEP students moving to FEP status. The projected target was 10% (2965 students), the actual was 18.7% (5531 students).

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.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) 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.

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

English Language Proficiency	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 AMAO Target	Actual	Projected AMAO Target	Actual
2004-2005 School Year				

Data is same as in 1.6.8

1.6.10 Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2004-2005 School Year

	Number:
Number of Title III subgrantees	50
Number of Title III subgrantees that met all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attainment, and AYP)	76
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet all three components of Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	70

CDE holds all districts accountable for the academic and linguistic achievement of ELLs, and thus AMAO targets. The numbers that are reported for numbers of grantees also include 74 districts that have signed their monies over to a lead Consortium or BOCES. The remaining 22 districts that are accounted for in the AMAO numbers, are those districts that serve a significant number of ELLs but decline their NCLB Title III allocations.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2004-2005, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2004-2005 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1839	95.0
4	2382	93.1
5	2869	91.9
6	3137	87.1
7	3040	84.5
8	2798	84.0
H.S.	4882	86.0

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	1904	96.7
4	2414	94.3
5	2852	91.4
6	3047	84.5
7	2824	78.4
8	2245	67.5
H.S.	2817	49.6

1.7 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 2005 - 2006 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2005-2006 School Year	0

1.8 Graduation and Dropout Rates

1.8.1 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 2003-2004 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.

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	82.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	66.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	76.2
Hispanic	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	86.4
Students with Disabilities	84.9
Limited English Proficient	88.1
Economically Disadvantaged	86.6
Migrant	92.4
Male	79.1
Female	85.6

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 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 2003-2004 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.

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	03-04 School Year
All Students	3.8
American Indian/Alaska Native	6.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4.3
Hispanic	6.3
White, non-Hispanic	2.9
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	4.2
Female	3.4

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.