

**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 2005-2006**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006**  
**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**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 – *21<sup>st</sup> 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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

## PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 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:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, 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 SY 2005-06, 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 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 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: 07/31/2007

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, 2005-2006                       Part II, 2005-2006

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

Address:  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450  
Denver, CO 80020

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

Wednesday, February 28, 2007, 2:08:22

PM  
Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2005-2006**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 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 community is made up of teachers, administrators and businesses/coalitions in their respective expertise. The following is the new science frameworks created October/November 2004. These 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](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 were 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 were 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 were 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**

Colorado's content standards and assessments have met full approval from the USDE. There are no updates to the CSAP system.

CSAPA is currently going through revisions per the new contract with a focus of increasing the validity of the assessment. The revisions for this year were made in math grades three through ten and science grade 10. The cut scores and performance levels change this year at standard setting in late spring. The reading and writing assessments and science grades five and eight will undergo revisions next year and will also require change in the cut scores and performance levels in the spring of 2008.

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration****1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	463920	99.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	5598	100.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	14753	99.70
Black, non-Hispanic	28216	99.90
Hispanic	122771	99.80
White, non-Hispanic	292486	100.00
Students with Disabilities	49200	100.00
Limited English Proficient	55761	99.30
Economically Disadvantaged	159087	99.80
Migrant	4967	99.50
Male	237893	99.90
Female	225944	99.90

**Comments:**

- 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 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	463209	99.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	5598	100.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	14705	99.50
Black, non-Hispanic	28203	99.90
Hispanic	122189	99.30
White, non-Hispanic	292427	100.00
Students with Disabilities	49152	99.90
Limited English Proficient	55298	98.50
Economically Disadvantaged	158558	99.50
Migrant	4913	98.30
Male	237504	99.80
Female	225635	99.80

**Comments:** English Language Learner data is not complete, as Denver Public Schools did not code a significant number of their ELLs in data submitted to CDE. The number should be greater than what appears above.

- 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

##### 1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 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	44738	90.90
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4462	9.10

**Comments:**

##### 1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 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	44641	90.80
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4511	9.20

**Comments:**

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 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 Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	57035	92.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	633	89.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	2016	96.40
Black, non-Hispanic	3296	83.40
Hispanic	16697	86.20
White, non-Hispanic	34383	96.40
Students with Disabilities	6227	74.00
Limited English Proficient	9182	82.80
Economically Disadvantaged	22419	86.50
Migrant	749	82.20
Male	29068	92.30
Female	27959	92.80

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, inclusion of CSAPA, and inclusion of students in facilities.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	56995	88.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	642	82.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	2007	92.80
Black, non-Hispanic	3298	79.40
Hispanic	16676	79.70
White, non-Hispanic	34360	93.80
Students with Disabilities	6214	61.70
Limited English Proficient	9165	73.90
Economically Disadvantaged	22466	80.00
Migrant	764	72.90
Male	29043	86.80
Female	27948	90.70

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, and inclusion of students in facilities.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	57045	91.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	718	86.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1980	95.30
Black, non-Hispanic	3495	80.10
Hispanic	16071	83.80
White, non-Hispanic	34772	95.90
Students with Disabilities	6474	68.80
Limited English Proficient	8568	78.60
Economically Disadvantaged	21985	83.90
Migrant	708	77.80
Male	29236	91.50
Female	27801	91.20

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, inclusion of CSAPA, and inclusion of students in facilities.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	57043	89.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	717	86.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1978	92.30
Black, non-Hispanic	3492	80.60
Hispanic	16064	79.40
White, non-Hispanic	34781	94.50
Students with Disabilities	6477	60.10
Limited English Proficient	8569	71.40
Economically Disadvantaged	21973	80.20
Migrant	703	71.00
Male	29232	87.20
Female	27800	91.30

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, and inclusion of students in facilities.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	56973	90.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	637	86.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1961	95.80
Black, non-Hispanic	3492	79.70
Hispanic	15740	82.60
White, non-Hispanic	35129	95.00
Students with Disabilities	6657	64.90
Limited English Proficient	7839	78.20
Economically Disadvantaged	21399	82.80
Migrant	702	78.40
Male	29343	89.70
Female	27619	91.50

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, and inclusion of students in facilities.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	56992	87.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	637	84.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1961	92.40
Black, non-Hispanic	3492	80.40
Hispanic	15752	75.70
White, non-Hispanic	35136	93.40
Students with Disabilities	6657	56.40
Limited English Proficient	7839	65.00
Economically Disadvantaged	21396	76.90
Migrant	701	63.90
Male	29356	85.40
Female	27623	89.80

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, and inclusion of students in facilities

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	57465	84.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	728	75.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1800	91.90
Black, non-Hispanic	3517	68.20
Hispanic	15695	71.00
White, non-Hispanic	35717	91.20
Students with Disabilities	6419	49.20
Limited English Proficient	7103	65.30
Economically Disadvantaged	21288	71.10
Migrant	665	62.90
Male	29504	83.40
Female	27957	84.70

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, and inclusion of students in facilities

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	57449	88.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	728	82.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1798	92.40
Black, non-Hispanic	3519	83.20
Hispanic	15690	78.10
White, non-Hispanic	35711	94.20
Students with Disabilities	6403	58.00
Limited English Proficient	7100	67.70
Economically Disadvantaged	21272	78.90
Migrant	664	63.60
Male	29489	86.40
Female	27956	91.60

**Comments:** Increase due to: increase in population in Colorado (destination state), inclusion of all ELLs in calculations, and inclusion of students in facilities

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	58711	78.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	745	67.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1714	88.90
Black, non-Hispanic	3641	58.00
Hispanic	15754	61.70
White, non-Hispanic	36847	87.30
Students with Disabilities	6171	39.30
Limited English Proficient	6743	55.10
Economically Disadvantaged	20876	61.70
Migrant	633	48.70
Male	30245	77.40
Female	28458	79.50

**Comments:** Increase is due to the fact that Colorado is a "destination" state and inclusion of all ELLs in calculations.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	58688	86.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	743	76.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1711	91.20
Black, non-Hispanic	3644	78.20
Hispanic	15738	73.40
White, non-Hispanic	36845	92.60
Students with Disabilities	6178	50.80
Limited English Proficient	6729	62.10
Economically Disadvantaged	20848	74.40
Migrant	636	53.10
Male	30235	83.00
Female	28447	89.80

**Comments:** Increase is due to the fact that Colorado is a "destination" state and inclusion of all ELLs in calculations,.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	59590	73.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	782	62.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1784	85.20
Black, non-Hispanic	3637	52.30
Hispanic	15277	53.70
White, non-Hispanic	38099	83.70
Students with Disabilities	6021	33.50
Limited English Proficient	6175	48.70
Economically Disadvantaged	19794	54.10
Migrant	583	42.20
Male	30492	73.20
Female	29085	74.50

**Comments:** Increase is due to the fact that Colorado is a "destination" state and inclusion of all ELLs in calculations.

- 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**

	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	59565	87.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	780	82.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1781	91.00
Black, non-Hispanic	3646	78.70
Hispanic	15269	74.60
White, non-Hispanic	38078	93.30
Students with Disabilities	6028	53.10
Limited English Proficient	6170	64.30
Economically Disadvantaged	19791	75.10
Migrant	579	55.30
Male	30479	84.60
Female	29074	90.30

**Comments:** Increase is due to the fact that Colorado is a "destination" state and inclusion of all ELLs in calculations.

- 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.

<b>1.3.13 High School - Mathematics</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	117512	66.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1355	51.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	3544	78.70
Black, non-Hispanic	7167	41.50
Hispanic	27847	42.80
White, non-Hispanic	77565	77.50
Students with Disabilities	11238	26.80
Limited English Proficient	10560	36.50
Economically Disadvantaged	31610	44.00
Migrant	952	32.80
Male	60231	66.60
Female	57249	67.00

**Comments:** Increases are due to the fact that Colorado is a "destination" state and inclusion of all ELLs in calculations.

- 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.

<b>1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts</b>		
	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006</b>
All Students	117451	87.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1351	81.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	3538	90.90
Black, non-Hispanic	7145	78.50
Hispanic	27820	74.50
White, non-Hispanic	77567	92.80
Students with Disabilities	11242	55.90
Limited English Proficient	10572	64.30
Economically Disadvantaged	31574	75.10
Migrant	951	57.00
Male	60196	84.30
Female	57234	90.70

**Comments:** Increases are due to the fact that Colorado is a "destination" state and inclusion of all ELLs in calculations.

- 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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 School Year Data	1889	1422	75.30

**Comments:**

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 2005-2006 School Year Data	183	110	60.10

**Comments:**

**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 2005-2006 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 2005-2006 School Year Data	674	512	76.00

**Comments:**

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 2005-2006 School Year Data	175	105	60.00

**Comments:**

### **1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

**1.4.3.1** Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

**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 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; up to \$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. The web site also provides specific resources for reading and math. Schools are able to look at their data from the school profiles and then identify available electronic and print resources that can be used to assist them in their plan development or implementation.

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 participate in professional development that is designed to assist them in developing leadership skills for continuous improvement.

The department is planning a series of workshops based on the Standards and indicators for continuous improvement to assist schools in engaging in a self assessment process to determine factors that are impeding their ability to raise academic achievement.



**1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.**

**1.4.4.1** Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

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

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has a model of differentiated interventions based on a district's AYP performance. Districts are classified in the following categories: (a) low (less than 85% of AYP targets met, growth stable or decreasing) (b) fair (less than 85% of targets met, with growth increasing); (c) (good 85-95% of targets met, with growth either decreasing or increasing); (d) high (95-99% of targets met, with growth stable or increasing).

The interventions used are as follows:

- (a) Low districts-required to have a Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement (CADI) or hire a group of external consultants to conduct a systematic program review using a rigorous process;
- (b) Fair districts- Implement a self assessment process with assistance from an outside facilitator or receive a CADI visit ;
- (c) Good districts- use the assistance of an outside consultant with expertise in the areas in which the district did not make AYP in order to update, strengthen or amend the program improvement plan; and
- (d) High-submit a revised program improvement plan.

A district in the high, good, or fair category may forgo the CDE imposed corrective action by developing a plan for District Improvement and by implementing one or more of the following options:

1. implementing a new curriculum based on State and Local Content Standards in the areas of reading and math;
2. replacing LEA personnel who are relevant to the LEA's inability to make AYP; and
3. providing for alternative governance for individual schools.

Any district that selects one of these options must get prior approval from CDE.

CDE also plans to implement a series of workshops for districts on program improvement. The workshops will focus on research related to high performing/high poverty districts.

**1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

<b>1.4.5.1 Public School Choice</b>	
	Number
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 2005-2006 school year.	87
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 2005-2006 school year.	49
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 2005-2006 school year.	876
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 2005-2006 school year.	53001
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
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 2005-2006 school year.	876
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 2005-2006 school year.	876
<b>Comments:</b>	

<b>1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services</b>	
	<b>Number</b>
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 2005-2006 school year.	61
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	3068
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	26567
<b>Optional Information:</b>	
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 2005-2006 school year.	3068
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY**

**1.5.1** In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 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.

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Core Academic Classes</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</b>
<b>All Schools in State</b>	244525	226485	92.60
<b>Elementary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	39192	35126	89.60
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	38363	35599	92.80
<b>All Elementary Schools</b>	133813	123253	92.10
<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>High-Poverty Schools</b>	16171	14669	90.70
<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b>	52994	49440	93.30
<b>All Secondary Schools</b>	110712	103232	93.20
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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, 2006, 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 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 classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

<b>Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
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	24.76
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)	75.24
d) Other (please explain)	
<b>SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES</b>	
a) 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)	44.76
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	55.24
d) Other (please explain)	
<b>Comments:</b> Special Education teachers are included in the other categories.	



**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 (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
<b>Elementary Schools</b>	58.10	15.90
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Free or reduced lunch	
<b>Secondary Schools</b>	58.10	15.90
<b>Poverty Metric Used</b>	Free or reduced lunch.	

**Comments:** We used the same percentiles for elementary and secondary in our State Equity plan for the USDE. We wanted to be consistent with what we have reported, so we continued to use the same methodology.

### 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 2005-2006 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
2005-2006 School Year	88.50

**Comments:**

**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
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

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 conducted by the SEA on a regular basis. The SEA also monitors the use and knowledge of the ELD Standards through desk review and phone audits.

The State observes classroom level implementation when providing technical assistance to School Districts or when conducting onsite monitoring reviews/audits.

Please review attached letter from the Deputy Commissioner at the Colorado Department of Education announcing the State's adoption and implementation of the State ELD Standards.

**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**

Please see 1.6.1.1. The Colorado Department of Education will partner once again with McRel to link/align the State's Math Content Standards to the State's English Language Development Standards. This will be initiated in the year of 2007 and the State anticipates that the linking/aligning process will also be completed in the year 2007.

Please see McREI attachment describing the linking/aligning of State Language Arts Standards to the State's English Language Development Standards. A document similar to this one will be developed to show the linkage/alignment between Colorado Math content standards and the ELD Standards.

**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 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:**

- An independent alignment study Yes
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

**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:**

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

**STATE RESPONSE**

The Colorado Department of Education is in the process of developing a plan for an independent alignment study for the Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA).

CTB McGraw-Hill has documented that the CELA alignment to ELP standards is 85% complete.

1. Limited English proficient students were assessed for the first time in 2006 on the Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA). This English language proficiency assessment is given at all grade levels from kindergarten to grade 12. The data from the CELA are compared against enrollment records to assure that all appropriate students are assessed.

2. The CELA addresses the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension. This is documented in the 2006 Performance Summary and Technical Addendum.

3. The CELA currently is 85% aligned to the Colorado ELP standards. We anticipate that 100% alignment will occur incrementally and be complete by 2011.

4. The reliability and validity statistics for the 2006 Colorado English Language Assessment are provided in the 2006 Performance Summary and Technical Addendum accompanying this document. The evidence provided includes item statistics, internal consistency reliability, standard errors of measurement, and coefficients of agreement.

Please review attached documentation on the CELA assessment.

**1.6.3 English Language Proficiency Data**

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2005-2006** 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													
2005-2006 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 (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 (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)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (8)	
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA)	84049	84049	100.00	11600	13.80	13319	15.80	23418	27.90	29575	35.20	6137	7.30

**Comments:** Note: There were 89,174 students assessed on the CELA 2006 in the final student data file. Of these, 355 records were missing the state student ID numbers or were for students who were tested more than once. In addition, there were 4,770 students who had no test score because of invalidations, exemptions, absences, or failure to answer enough items to receive a score. There were a total of 5,125 records that were not counted and 84,049 that were included in the reporting.

- (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).
- (4-8) In columns four-eight, 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 4-8 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 3.

<b>1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State</b>		
<b>2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs</b>		
<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>	<b>Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State</b>
1. Spanish	84019	94.00
2. Vietnamese	1925	2.10
3. Russian	1081	1.20
4. Korean	1012	1.10
5. Hmong	770	0.10
6. Chinese, Mandarin	637	0.10
7. Arabic	628	0.10
8. Navajo	437	0.10
9. Chinese, Cantonese	369	0.00
10. Amahric	334	0.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

- 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 1.6.3.2.



<b>1.6.3.3 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment Data</b>																
<b>2005-2006 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III</b>																
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 (8)			
			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)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 5 (7)					
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA)	83709	100.00	11568	13.80	13284	15.90	23335	27.90	29449	35.20			6073	7.30	7081	8.50
<b>Comments:</b>																

- (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 2005-2006 school year.
- (3-7) In columns three-seven, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2005-2006 school year. The number (#) and percentage (%) of columns 3-7 should equate to the number (#) and percentage (%) of all students identified as limited English proficient in column 2.
- (8) In column eight, provide the total number and percentage of LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2005-2006 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**

**Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth**

**Definitions:**

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrant subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students  
2005-2006**

<b># Immigrants enrolled in the State</b>	<b># Immigrants served by Title III</b>	<b># Immigrant subgrants</b>
14587	3988	47

**Comments:**

**STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)**

Colorado has witnessed increased immigration from Mexico, Somalia, former Russian states, Chinese territories and Latin America. Because Colorado is close to border states and boasts a healthy tourism business, plentiful agricultural work and a generally steady job market, the state has become a destination state for many immigrant groups. The largest population of immigrants lives in the Denver metro area where jobs are plentiful and wages are competitive.

**1.6.5 Definition of Proficient**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), 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 (CELA) 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.

The following outlines the Scale Scores of CELA as they pertain to Colorado Definitions of Proficiency.

Colorado English Language Fluency Level: Non-English Proficient

CELA Proficiency Level: Beginning and Early Intermediate levels (CELA Levels 1 and 2)

Definition of Fluency for Colorado: This level includes students who are just beginning to understand and respond to simple routine communication through those who can respond with more ease to a variety of social communication tasks.

Colorado English Language Fluency Level: Limited English Proficient

CELA Proficiency Level: Covers the CELA Intermediate through mid-Proficient (CELA Level 3 and lower portion of LAS Links Level 4)

Definition of Fluency for Colorado: Students at this level are able to understand and be understood in many to most social communication situations. They are gaining increasing competence in the more cognitively demanding requirements of content areas; however, they are not yet ready to fully participate in academic content areas without linguistic support.

Colorado English Language Fluency Level: Fluent English Proficient

CELA Proficiency Level: Covers from mid-Proficient to Above Proficient (Upper portion of CELA Level 4 and CELA Level 5)

Definition of Fluency for Colorado: Students at this level are able to understand and communicate effectively with various audiences on a wide range of familiar and new topics to meet social and academic demands. They are able to achieve in content areas comparable to native speakers, but may still need limited linguistic support.

Grade CELA FEP

Cut Score

K 503

1 508

2 534

3 539

4 564

5 566

6 573

7 574

8 575

9 588

10 589

11 590

12 592

---

**1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress**

**If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), 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: A student that speaks a language other than English and does not comprehend or speak English

LEP - Limited English Proficient: A student who comprehends or speaks some English; but whose predominant comprehension or speech is in a language other than English

FEP - Fluent English Proficient,

Redesignated: Monitored year 1 and year 2: Students in a language acquisition program may be ready to be redesignated into a two-year monitoring period (Monitored Year 1 and Monitored Year 2) as outlined by Office of Civil Rights criteria and Title III, Section 3121(a)4

Students can be redesignated when they have achieved a "fluent" category on a reliable or valid language proficiency assessment or has achieved grade and age level academic achievement standards and proficiencies commensurate to the achievement of mainstream students at a partially proficient level.

\*After one year of monitoring, it is the district's decision to place the student back into a language acquisition program or to monitor for a second year.

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.

**1.6.7 Definition of Cohort**

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), 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.

â€ There are three cohorts established each year: NEP, LEP and FEP.

â€ The cohorts contain all students K-12 who fit the above requirements.

â€ Each year the cohorts are adjusted for students graduating or moving out of the district.

â€ Students who move from NEP to LEP, or LEP to FEP, become part of a new cohort the next year.

â€ A cohort must contain (and maintain over time) a minimum of 16 students.

The State will use data from the new Colorado English Language Assessment (CELA) after the second year of administration. The State will convene a work/task force to determine the validity of the data as it pertains to present AMAO targets. The State will evaluate if the targets should be rewritten to justify current data and the new CELA assessment. This taskforce will meet in December 2006 to examine new options for AMAO targets, then look at the second year's Data from CELA to determine the appropriate measure of AMAOs.

**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

**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	
2005-2006 School Year	% 42.00	# 11972	% 58.00	# 16609	% 25.00	# 8319	% 38.00	# 12609

**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.

Please note: These numbers reflect only those students who were continuously enrolled in one district from one data point to the next. Students that have moved from district to district are not reflected in these targets, as they do not meet the definition of being a part of a cohort.

### 1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

#### Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

#### TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

#### Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.



<b>1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants</b>			
	<b>2005-2006</b>		
	<b>AMAO TARGET</b>	<b>ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS</b>	
	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>MAKING PROGRESS</b>	42.00	29218	47.00
<b>DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS</b>		32567	
<b>ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY</b>	25.00	12609	38.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		74394	

**Explanation of data for Table**

**Check the answer to the following question.**

Are monitored\* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"?  Yes  No

\* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

**1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards**

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

**Title III Subgrantee Information**

	<b>2005-2006</b>
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	112
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>making progress</b>	110
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>attaining</b> English proficiency	76
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for <b>AYP</b>	80
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	79
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	103
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	112
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet <b>any</b> AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	29
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the <b>State</b> meet <b>all</b> three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

**Comments:** Note: 112 districts accepted Title III dollars, or signed over to a LEA or BOCES if they did not meet the \$10,000 threshold amount.

67 School Districts sign over their T3 monies to 8 Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) or a Lead Consortium Agent.

45 School Districts accept T3 monies on their own.

\* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

**1.6.11** On the following tables for 2005-2006, 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 2005-2006 school year.

<b>1.6.11.1</b> 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		
<b>Grade/Grade Span</b>	<b>Students Proficient &amp; Advanced</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
3	1198	96.40
4	1389	97.10
5	1301	93.80
6	1226	93.30
7	1099	88.80
8	937	88.60
H.S.	1348	89.40

**Comments:**

**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

<b>Grade/Grade Span</b>	<b>Students Proficient &amp; Advanced</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
3	1202	98.00
4	1364	95.70
5	1314	94.70
6	1137	86.50
7	952	76.80
8	708	66.90
H.S.	784	52.20

**Comments:**

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

**1.7.1** 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 2006-2007 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
2006-2007 School Year	0

**Comments:**

**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 2004-2005 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.

<b>1.8.1 Graduation Rates</b>	
<b>High School Graduates</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
<b>Student Group</b>	<b>2004-2005 School Year</b>
All Students	80.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	62.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.10
Black, non-Hispanic	74.00
Hispanic	63.70
White, non-Hispanic	85.50
Students with Disabilities	76.50
Limited English Proficient	79.70
Economically Disadvantaged	81.60
Migrant	82.70
Male	77.50
Female	82.70
<b>Comments:</b>	
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 2004-2005 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.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	4.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.90
Black, non-Hispanic	5.40
Hispanic	7.50
White, non-Hispanic	2.90
Students with Disabilities	4.40
Limited English Proficient	7.00
Economically Disadvantaged	4.40
Migrant	4.80
Male	4.60
Female	3.80
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado is better able to calculate an accurate drop out rate with the insitutionalization of student identifiers.	
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.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

**1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM**

**1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").**

**STATE RESPONSE**

"The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June."

Colorado School Laws, Title 22 C.R.S. 22-1-112

**1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:**

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	152	151
LEAs with Subgrants	26	26

**Comments:**

**1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	257	1120
1	264	1061
2	232	926
3	226	803
4	228	829
5	198	718
6	190	802
7	193	766
8	189	728
9	194	678
10	141	548
11	166	489
12	164	579

**Comments:**

**1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth**

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>without</b> subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs <b>with</b> subgrants
Shelters	177	1552
Doubled-up	1288	7533
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	30	211
Hotels/Motels	142	307
Unknown	1005	444

**Comments:**

\* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.



**1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**

**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	1120
1	1061
2	926
3	803
4	829
5	718
6	802
7	766
8	728
9	678
10	548
11	489
12	579

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children**

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

**Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006**

314

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths**

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

**Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006**

513

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served**

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

**Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)**

518

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	1396
English Language Learners (ELL)	2398
Gifted and Talented	152
Vocational Education	84

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services**

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

<b>Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program</b>	<b>Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	13
Expedited evaluations	3
Staff professional development and awareness	14
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	14
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	14
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	10
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	13
Coordination between schools and agencies	15
Counseling	6
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	10
School supplies	13
Referral to other programs and services	13
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
Other (optional)	4

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

<b>Barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	5
School selection	4
Transportation	4
School records	6
Immunizations or other medical records	5
Other enrollment issues	4

**Comments:**

**1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)**

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

<b>List other barriers</b>	<b>List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier</b>
Lack of options for high school students mid-semester or with less than a quarter left	2
Difficulty enrolling students during CSAP (week when standardized assessments are given)	5

**Comments:**



**1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

**Reading Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	550	416
Grade 4	Yes	559	434
Grade 5	Yes	528	402
Grade 6	Yes	499	376
Grade 7	Yes	569	393
Grade 8	Yes	472	336
Grade 9	Yes	419	314
Grade 10	Yes	295	210
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

**Comments:****Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	601	505
Grade 4	Yes	586	487
Grade 5	Yes	530	437
Grade 6	Yes	500	327
Grade 7	Yes	571	330
Grade 8	Yes	474	229
Grade 9	Yes	420	188
Grade 10	Yes	295	107
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

**Comments:**

\* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.