



2017

Annual Report on the Colorado READ Act



COLORADO
Department of Education



Submitted to:

State Board of Education

Governor of Colorado

President of the Senate

Speaker of the House of Representatives

House of Representatives

Education Committee

Senate Education Committee

By:

Alisa Dorman

Executive Director of the Office of Literacy

Data Analyzed By:

Whitney Westgaard

Data Analyst of the Office of Literacy

Student Learning Division

Teaching and Learning Unit – Office of Literacy

201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203

303-866-6016

Dorman_A@cde.state.co.us

Content

Letter from the Commissioner of Education _____	2	READ Act Implementation Supports:	
Introduction _____	3	Available Resources for Colorado School Districts _	18
Prevalence of Significant Reading Deficiencies in Colorado _____	4	Statewide Professional Development _____	19
Trends Across Demographic Groups _____	7	Special Projects:	
Understanding SRD Rates in 2016 _____	10	Early Literacy Grant Program _____	20
READ Plans- Graphic Road Map _____	12	Early Literacy Assessment Tool Project _____	22
Advancement Decisions _____	15	Conclusion _____	24
Distribution of Funds _____	17	Appendices:	
		Appendix A- Districts, Students and Funding _____	26
		Appendix B- Early Literacy Grant _____	31
		Appendix C- Early Literacy Assessment Tool _____	32



Letter from the Commissioner of Education

The Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic Development Act (READ Act) focuses on early literacy development for all students with special attention for students at-risk for not achieving third grade reading proficiency. Importantly, the Act focuses on identifying students with significant reading deficiencies, engaging parents in the development of reading improvement plans, and providing funding to support intervention for those most at-risk.

Each year, the Colorado Department of Education reports to the General Assembly on the effectiveness of the Colorado READ Act. The purpose of this report is to inform all respective parties of the data and information collected through the spring 2016 READ Act data collection process and to provide an overview of the Colorado Department of Education's analysis and its determinations. The contents of this report are intended to assist in monitoring the implementation of and identifying the results achieved by the Colorado READ Act.

We know that early literacy is a key component of success in school and in life. By challenging our state to decrease the number of students identified as at-risk while also moving more students toward grade-level proficiency, we believe collectively we can drive student achievement here in Colorado while also serving as a national model for improving literacy and educational success for all children.

We wish to thank you for your continued support for the Colorado READ Act. Through this important literacy initiative, we continue to make long-lasting change possible for children who are at risk for academic challenges.

Sincerely,

Katy Anthes,
Commissioner of Education
for the State of Colorado



Introduction

Research shows that proficiency in reading by the end of third grade enables students to shift from learning to read to reading to learn in order to master the more complex subject matters they encounter in the fourth grade curriculum. The consequences of students not reaching reading proficiency are dire. According to The Annie. E. Casey Foundation, students who cannot read by the end of third grade are four times more likely to drop out of high school, and high school drop outs make up 75 percent of citizens receiving food stamps and 90 percent of the Americans on welfare. Nearly 85 percent of teenagers in the juvenile justice system cannot read to learn and seven out of 10 adult prisoners cannot read above a fourth grade level. This is a systemic reality that does not have to be true.



A strong reading initiative, like the Colorado READ Act, can help make the difference. It starts by making sure all students receive instruction in the foundational skills of reading. In kindergarten, students need to discriminate sounds in words and map them to the letters they represent. This focus continues, relying on research to guide our efforts, until each third grade student can read with ease, understand the materials and think critically. Effective early reading instruction and targeted intervention support have the greatest potential to change the trajectory of Colorado’s most at-risk readers – helping to ensure they meet the goal of reading by third grade.

The Colorado READ Act passed in 2012 with the purpose of ensuring every student in Colorado reaches reading proficiency by the end of third grade. The provisions of the Act promote early identification of reading difficulties and effective intervention to quickly close reading gaps and ensure all Colorado students can demonstrate a level of competency in reading skills necessary to achieve success in school. Pursuant to the READ Act, teachers in grades kindergarten through three administer an interim assessment to all children in order to determine whether children are making sufficient progress to grade level reading proficiency. When students are identified as significantly below grade level (called a “significant reading deficiency” or SRD), teachers administer a diagnostic assessment to determine specific areas of need for reading improvement. Teachers use this information to collaboratively develop an intervention plan (called a READ plan) with the child’s parents to bring the child up to grade level reading proficiency. Students continue to receive intervention supports until the teacher determines that the child has met reading skill competencies of their current grade level.


Prevalence of Significant Reading Deficiencies in Colorado

Pursuant to READ Act requirements, Colorado’s local education agencies (LEAs) provided end-of-year reading assessment data to CDE from the administration of the READ Act assessments in the spring of 2016. The vast majority of students (approximately 271,000) in kindergarten through third grade (K-3) were reported (98 percent). In spring of 2016, the assessment results for 262,878 K-3 students were reported through the READ Act data collection. Of those students, 39,014 (14.8 percent) were identified as having a significant reading deficiency. Two categories of students are designated as allowable exemptions as defined by reporting guidelines:

- English Language Learners who are designated as non-English proficient and in a school in the United States less than one year (428 students and 11 percent of exemptions); and
- Students not tested for reasons of attendance which may include part-time attendance, illness, discipline, late enrollment, etc. (3,349 students and 89 percent of exemptions).


Overall data on the prevalence of significant reading deficiencies in the kindergarten through third-grade student population is depicted in the table below.

Figure1: Comparison of students identified as having an SRD by grade level as reported in the 2016 collection.



2016
Total Students Tested = 262,878
Total Number of Students Identified with SRD = 39,014 (14.8%)

Note: this chart does not include students who were exempt from taking a READ Act assessment




This data suggests that **17.2 percent of third graders cannot read *Charlotte's Web****. What seems like the most basic step in a child's education – the ability to read – is actually the foundation of a child's success. Therefore, a student who struggles to read must have every opportunity to strengthen and gain essential skills in reading before entering fourth grade – to better ensure a successful future.

Prevalence of Significant Reading Deficiencies by District

This map shows a geographical look at SRD identification rates across the state for 2016. The colors represent the variation of SRD identification by district compared to the (2016) state average of 14.8 percent. The greater the identification rate, the darker the district appears in purple. For more information visit <http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readdatapipeline>.


2016 Colorado SRD by Districts



Percent SRD
 0% 100%

*Charlotte's Web was written by E. B. White and is published by HarperCollins

What impact has the READ Act had on your students identified as having an SRD?



No one can fall through the cracks anymore!

Based on the READ plan goals, if students are not making progress, teachers are able to adjust instruction in order to ensure that students are making growth. It has quickened the process in knowing if a student has an SRD or if it is truly a learning disability because there is such a strong focus on data.

Dave Weiss, principal and Sarah Bardon and Roxanne Weaver, both first grade teachers at Westgate Elementary, Jefferson County Schools

Trends Across Demographic Groups

An analysis of the 2016 READ Act data reveals a number of trends across racial/ethnic groups. American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino students were more likely to be identified with an SRD than their Asian, White, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and multi-racial peers. These trends have remained consistent across all four years of READ Act implementation.

Figure 2: Percentage of K-3 SRD students as depicted across demographic groups from 2014, 2015 and 2016 data collections





Figure 3: Percentage of K-3 English Language Learners identified with SRD from 2014, 2015 and 2016 data collections

This graph shows the percentage of English Learners designated Non-English proficient and Limited English proficient who were also identified as having an SRD.



Trends Across Demographic Groups Cont.

Figure 4: Percentage of K-3 SRD students eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch (FRL) compared to their non-eligible peers from 2014, 2015 and 2016 data collections




Figure 5: Percentage of K-3 male and female students identified with SRD from 2014, 2015 and 2016 data collections





Figure 6: Percentage of K-3 SRD students eligible for special education services compared to their non-eligible peers from 2014, 2015 and 2016 data collections



How do you involve parents in the development of a READ Plan or in intervening support for at-risk readers?



We meet with each family to review the student's READ plan.

Within in the plan, there are Parent Support Strategies that we go encourage families to do at home with their child. There is also ongoing communication with families as needed.

*Kim Ash, principal and Marisa Burton, instructional coach,
at Littleton Preparatory Charter School, Littleton School District*

Understanding SRD Rates in 2016

The 2015-16 school year marked the fourth reporting period for the Colorado READ Act, and the data show an uptick in SRDs in Colorado’s students. This slight upward trend is likely due to three important factors.

First, the data reporting requirements changed between 2015 and 2016. Specifically, the 2016 collection includes students with disabilities who were exempt from taking a READ assessment in prior years because appropriate tests were not available. In 2016, for the first time, the LEAs were able to appropriately assess and identify significant reading deficiencies for students who were blind, deaf or had significant support needs. **Of the students with disabilities who were appropriately assessed (1,200), 91 percent were also identified as having an SRD.**

Secondly, cut score adjustments on three of the State Board of Education approved interim reading assessments between 2015 and 2016 resulted in increases of students identified with SRDs. As such, increases in identification rates ranged from as little as 4 percent to as much as 21 percent. Based on on-going analysis by publishers, READ Act assessments are re-normed regularly to ensure that cut scores are as accurate as possible. **These cut score changes contributed in part to the 1 percent increase in the state prevalence rate.**

Finally, each year since the beginning of the READ collection, more districts have been moving toward the use of a State Board approved interim assessment. Some of the assessments “grandfathered” from the Colorado Basic Literacy Act (CBLA) have been determined to be less sensitive to the identification of significant reading deficiencies. As such, **the more sensitive assessments have yielded higher numbers of students being identified as having an SRD each year.**

Early SRD Identification is Key to Reading Success

Early identification of an SRD is important. The table below illustrates that of the 3,268 kindergarten students identified with an SRD in 2013, about 39 percent still had an SRD three years later. In contrast, of the students identified with an SRD in second grade, 69 percent still had an SRD the following year as third graders. Students who are identified in early grades (K-1) have a greater chance of reducing their risk for reading difficulties and no longer being identified as having an SRD by third grade as compared to those who are not identified until later grades.

Figure 7: SRD Matched Cohort of SRD designated students across years

Grade	2013	2014	2015	2016	% still SRD
Kindergarten	3,268	1,953	1,470	1,279	39.1%
First Grade	10,737	6,371	4,923	NA	45.9%
Second Grade	11,279	7,799	NA	NA	69.1%




Early identification of students with significant reading deficiencies in grades K-3 provides struggling readers the opportunity to receive early interventions essential for academic success, as well as the support for social and emotional stability.

*Sandra Vazquez, Elementary Literacy Coordinator,
St. Vrain Valley School District*

READ Plan Road Maps

With four years of READ data, it is now possible to identify trends in student progress. In an attempt to demonstrate the various trajectories students can take in any given year, we have created the following illustrations or “road maps” of student progress from one year to the next (Spring 2015 to Spring 2016). You will see five different journeys students took and the number of students traveling each “road.”

SPRING 2015 - 182,229 Students Tested



INTERVENTION SUPPORTS



Full-day Kindergarten



Summer School Literacy Program



Tutoring



Scientifically or Evidence-Based Intervention Program



General Instruction

SPRING 2016

SRD Designation remains in place.
READ Plan remains in place.

Students continue to be designated SRD.

15,810 Group A Students
 76.3%

SRD Designation removed.
READ Plan remains in place.

Students have gained enough skills to no longer have a SRD but have not yet made enough progress to be considered reading at grade level.

3,822 Group A Students
 18.5%

SRD Designation removed.
READ Plan removed.

Students demonstrate reading competency in Spring 2016 testing.

1,073 Group A Students
 5.2%

No SRD Designation.
No READ Plan.


Students continue to demonstrate reading competency and on track for meeting important reading outcomes.

148,289 Group B Students
 91.8%

New SRD Designation.
READ Plan established.

Students newly identified as having SRD in Spring 2016 testing suggesting they are now deficient in early reading skills.

13,235 Group B Students
 8.2%

A young boy with dark hair, wearing a light blue and white striped shirt, is looking intently at a book. He is holding the book with his right hand. The background is a library with bookshelves filled with books. The lighting is warm and focused on the boy and the book.

Can you tell us a story about one student in particular you believe has benefited from the READ Act supports?


A boy in our school was placed on a READ plan at the beginning of Kindergarten. Initially, he couldn't identify the sounds in his name. Through the READ Act supports, he was provided systematic explicit instruction from a highly trained reading specialist within the school day. He also attended after school tutoring and Summer School, funded via the READ Act, over the following three years, and is now a third grader who is reading at grade level.

The Assistant Principal and Reading Teachers, High Plains Elementary School, Academy 20 School District

Advancement Decisions

There are serious implications to a student's likelihood of graduating from high school when reading competency is not achieved by third grade. Therefore, under the READ Act when a child has an SRD, the parent, the student's teacher, and other personnel are required to meet and consider retention as an intervention strategy. The intention of the meeting is to determine whether the student, despite having an SRD, is able to maintain adequate academic progress at the next grade level. Retention is not the first strategy or option for support. The READ Act identifies students who are struggling to read as early as kindergarten, with frequent literacy screenings and parent notification/updates on progress over multiple school years. Students are given individual reading plans (READ Plans), home reading strategies and interventions support services through school and reading progress is monitored and shared at frequent intervals throughout the year.

Figure 8: Number of K-3 Grade Students Retained in 2015 and their trajectory in 2016



In 2015, 638 K-3 students reported as being retained. Of those 638 K-3 students, 68.5 percent were no longer identified as having an SRD at the end of the school year following retention (Spring 2016). However, not all of the 68.5 percent were found to be reading competent. Although a student may no longer be identified as having an SRD, they still may not have reached reading competency. Therefore, students who were once identified as having an SRD who are no longer at risk will remain on a READ Plan until they reach grade level competency which may extend in to fourth grade and beyond. Being reading competent is determined locally by the school district per statute. As a result, reading competency currently varies from district to district. Of the students no longer found to be SRD, 17.8 percent demonstrated grade level reading competency in Spring 2016.

It is important to stress the urgency of responding to our state's READ Act initiative since there are approximately 31,000 students beyond third grade with READ plans still in place as of the 2016 collection close. There are approximately 8,000 students who were identified with an SRD in third grade in 2013 and remain on a READ plan as seventh graders in 2016.

MYTH VS. FACT

Students can learn to read after third grade without challenge.

Students rarely catch up if they have not mastered reading by third grade. Students must learn to read in K-3 in order to read to learn in fourth grade and beyond. Reading to learn means comprehending facts in social studies and science, understanding word problems in math and interpreting complex materials in language arts.



MYTH VS. FACT

The ability to read by third grade does not have any correlation with the ability to graduate from school.

The ability to read by third grade is imperative for a student's ability to graduate from high school. This includes the years of high school and beyond, to career and/or college. Students who are not reading proficiently in third grade are four times more likely to not graduate high school.

Distribution of Funds


The READ Act provides per-pupil intervention funds to assist LEAs with interventions for students identified as having significant reading deficiencies. For the 2016-17 school year, the total amount of funds available for distribution to districts was approximately \$33 million. The state's investment in and commitment to early literacy serves to advance Colorado's collective goal of all children reading at grade level by the end of the third grade.

The department allocates the per-pupil intervention funds to LEAs by dividing the amount of funds available by the total number of students enrolled in kindergarten through third grade in public schools identified as having a significant reading deficiency. LEAs may use the per-pupil intervention funds to provide full-day kindergarten, operate a summer school literacy program, purchase tutoring services, and/or provide other targeted, scientifically or evidence-based intervention services as allowed in statute.



In the spring of 2016, districts reported 39,014 students as having a significant reading deficiency. The appropriated funds were distributed to 181 LEAs at a per-pupil amount of \$847.07. Intervention services and summer school were reported as the most frequent use of these funds. An analysis of the data submitted to the department indicated that use of per-pupil intervention funds were not reported for all students. As a result, the department will continue to refine the collection process to ensure all students receiving services are included in this data. A list of districts and distribution amounts is included in the appendix beginning on page 26.

Figure 9: Usage of Per-Pupil Intervention Funds as reported in the 2016 Data Collection



Available Resources for Colorado School Districts

In addition to the per-pupil intervention funds, the READ Act appropriates additional funds for field support services statewide through regionally based Literacy Specialists out of the Office of Literacy at CDE.

Literacy Specialists are available to support schools and districts upon request through onsite technical assistance and professional development. Districts report that the technical assistance is a valuable resource. Onsite visits were generally focused on interpretation of reading data, professional development through coaching and modeling, and alignment of goals for improving reading outcomes.

After analyzing three years of data, the Office of Literacy took the opportunity to reframe technical support for the 2015-16 school year. Literacy Specialists were able to target the schools most in need of assistance, based on their percentage of students identified with significant reading deficiencies, and deploy technical assistance there first.

Also, in support of effective implementation of the READ Act, the Office of Literacy continues to create resources that are easily accessible through the READ Act website managed by the CDE (see <http://cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/ReadAct/index.asp>). Examples include checklist for developing quality READ plans, READ Act assessment timelines, supports for diverse populations, data driven decision making, and other resources for implementing key components of the law.



Thanks to the READ Act, I was able to take this awesome and important class facilitated by our regional Literacy Specialist from the Office of Literacy. I appreciate these staff development opportunities because they give me effective strategies to immediately implement in my classroom.

*Holley Norris, 1st Grade Teacher, Pioneer Elementary,
Fort Morgan School District*

Statewide Professional Development

Through READ Act administrative funds, the Office of Literacy was able continue support for a statewide, no-cost professional development opportunity for K-3 teachers to support early literacy knowledge and skills.

The focus of the Academy is on explicit and systematic instruction in reading with an emphasis on the foundational reading skills. The foundational skills include the five essential reading components identified within the READ Act (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary including oral language, and comprehension). Academy participants are supported in applying new learning to classroom practice. Over 530 teachers participated in the 2015-16 Academy offered across the state.

Also, in October 2016, the Office of Literacy hosted a READING Conference at no cost. This event was open for any Colorado educator or administrator. The focus of the conference was K-3 literacy with an emphasis on research based practices in early reading. Over 550 educators attended the two-day conference. Feedback on the event was positive and plans are underway for another conference next fall. The Office of Literacy will partner with the Exceptional Student Services Unit at CDE to continue to provide this event.



The K-3 READING Foundations Academy has been extremely beneficial for our staff. It has been a tremendous boost to staff and administration to review the essentials of how students learn to read and what we can do to support those who struggle.

*Larry Brady, Director of Curriculum and Instruction,
Garfield Re-2 School District*

The Early Literacy Grant is a competitive grant program designed to distribute funds to local education agencies to ensure the implementation of Scientifically Based Reading Research in all aspects of K-3 literacy instruction, including universal, targeted and intensive instructional interventions.

Requirements of participation in the Early Literacy Grant include:


- A selection of materials (both comprehensive core and intervention programming) from the Colorado Department of Education Advisory List.
- Use of DIBELS Next or PALS for an interim assessment and progress monitoring tool.
- Monthly consulting with an approved professional development provider.

The first cohort of the Early Literacy Grant ran from 2013 to 2016 and included participants from 30 schools representing 15 districts in seven regions of the state. Twenty-four of these schools were awarded small awards in 2016 to help with sustainability of grant processes.




In 2013, ELG schools had a much higher SRD rate than the state. While need is not a condition for receiving the Early Literacy Grant, schools that apply tend to be schools with higher needs. Across the three years of implementation, these schools have decreased their SRD percentages below the state average. Even with the addition of students with disabilities in 2016, the SRD rate in ELG schools only increased by 0.2 percent and stayed below the state average.

Figure 10: Reduction of SRD in ELG Schools Compared to the State




When matched cohort data are examined, ELG schools were able to significantly decrease the rate of significant reading deficiency from kindergarten through second grade for students who remained in the same school across the three years of the grant. Of the 7 percent of students who were identified with an SRD in kindergarten only three percent still had an SRD at the end of second grade. This indicates that with early identification and consistent, research-based intervention, there is a high likelihood of remediating reading difficulties.

Figure 11: SRD Status of ELG Cohort Students



Results from interim assessments can be used to examine how ELG schools increased the percentage of students reaching benchmark (students who are on track to meet grade level reading outcomes) across each year of the grant from the beginning of the year (BOY) to the end of the year (EOY). Each year, schools slightly increased the number of students who remained at benchmark at the beginning of the year. Additionally more students achieved benchmark by the end of the year across the three years of the grant.

Figure 12: Moving Students to Benchmarks



The 2012 School Finance Act enabled CDE to select a contractor to supply an early literacy assessment tool that Colorado teachers could use to obtain real-time assessments of the reading skill levels of students in kindergarten through third grade.


The project supports state purchase of software licenses that allow teachers to give a READ Act approved assessment on a mobile platform (i-Pad, touch screen computer, etc.). The platform provides immediate assessment results with the ability to store the results, provides reports that help in analysis of the results, and has a feature that recommends activities based on the results.

Through a competitive bid process, the contract was awarded to Amplify for its DIBELS Next assessment system in January 2013. The first year of the project was in the 2013-2014 school year.

Over each of the four years of the project, participation has increased. Total K-3 enrollment in the state for the 2015-16 school year was approximately 271,000 students. Students in the ELAT Project represent 47% percent of the total K-3 population.




Figure 13: ELAT School and Student Participation



In the 2015-16 school year, progress was measured based on program participants' ability to move students to a score range that indicates K-3 students are on track to meet grade level reading outcomes. Of the 517 schools in the project, 61 percent had above to well above typical progress compared to a national data set where only 40 percent of schools performed above to well above typical progress.


Figure 14: ELAT Schools : School Progress in moving students from risk to benchmark



The state pays a portion of the ELAT contract to the awarded vendor based on two deliverables: a 15 percent reduction in students identified with an SRD from beginning to end of year and a 75 percent customer satisfaction rate. The ELAT project has met the deliverables each year of the project.

In the graph below the green bar indicates those students identified as having a significant reading deficiency at the beginning of the year and the blue bar indicates the number of students identified as having a significant reading deficiency at the end of the year by grade level for the 2015-16 school year. Thus, within the school year participants in the ELAT project are reducing the number of students who score in the range of having a SRD.

Figure 15: ELAT: Reduction of Students Scoring in the Significant Reading Deficiency Range



Educator Satisfaction with ELAT Project

To gauge participant satisfaction, a survey is sent to every teacher in the ELAT project at the end of the school year. In the 2015-16 school year, the satisfaction survey was completed by 919 participants. On average, 91 percent of respondents were satisfied (or very satisfied) with the ELAT program.

Domain Measured	Satisfied or Very Satisfied
Using the mCLASS software to collect DIBELS Next student data	95%
Student and classroom data reports on www.mclasshome.com	91%
Accessing aggregated data through the reporting and analysis suite	90%

Can you tell us a story about one student in particular you believe has benefited from the READ Act supports?

It is hard to choose just one story, as I feel ALL students have benefited from the READ Act supports. There was a little girl in my first grade classroom the first year the READ Act was implemented in schools. Within the first month of school she was placed on a READ Plan. She was surrounded by a team that was able to grow her academically, but was also able get to know her, and this truly allowed her to feel smart, loved and valued. She left first grade as a confident fluent reader.

*Dave Weiss, principal and Sarah Bardon and Roxanne Weaver,
both first grade teachers at Westgate Elementary, Jefferson County School District*



Conclusion

Research shows reading proficiency by the end of third grade is critical for future educational success. The Colorado READ Act focuses on early literacy development for all students and especially for students at-risk of not achieving third grade reading competency. While this year's data showed a slight increase in the number of students having a significant reading deficiency, it is important to keep in mind the three factors that contributed to this increase. We will continue to monitor the year-over-year data as the data collection becomes cleaner, more accurate, and more robust in order to make interpretations on trends. The Office of Literacy provides guidance and direct support to schools and districts through onsite technical assistance, professional development and resource development. Through these various supports, teachers and leaders are deepening their knowledge, skills and instructional practices to strengthen reading outcomes for all K-3 students.



Appendix A:

Read Act per-pupil intervention funds distribution based on the 2016 collection. Per-pupil intervention funds are distributed to districts based on the number of students reported as having significant reading deficiency. These students are eligible for intervention services and are supported through individual READ Plans.

Districts	Number of Eligible Students	% of Eligible Students Based on Total N of Students Assessed	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
ACADEMY 20	561	9%	\$475,204
ADAMS 12 FIVE STAR SCHOOLS	2081	17%	\$1,762,745
ADAMS COUNTY 14	818	37%	\$692,900
ADAMS-ARAPAHOE 28J	3665	28%	\$3,104,497
AGATE 300	N<16	N<16	N<16
AGUILAR REORGANIZED 6	N<16	N<16	N<16
AKRON R-1	18	15%	\$15,247
ALAMOSA RE-11J	93	12%	\$78,777
ARCHULETA COUNTY 50 JT	34	8%	\$28,800
ARICKAREE R-2	N<16	N<16	N<16
ARRIBA-FLAGLER C-20	N<16	N<16	N<16
ASPEN 1	22	100%	\$18,635
AULT-HIGHLAND RE-9	60	24%	\$50,824
BAYFIELD 10 JT-R	52	11%	\$44,047
BENNETT 29J	39	13%	\$33,036
BETHUNE R-5	N<16	N<16	N<16
BIG SANDY 100J	N<16	N<16	N<16
BOULDER VALLEY RE 2	766	9%	\$648,853
BRANSON REORGANIZED 82	N<16	N<16	N<16
BRIGGS DALE RE-10	N<16	N<16	N<16
BRUSH RE-2(J)	68	16%	\$57,601
BUENA VISTA R-31	44	19%	\$37,271
BUFFALO RE-4J	N<16	N<16	N<16
BURLINGTON RE-6J	35	15%	\$29,647
BYERS 32J	285	40%	\$241,414
CALHAN RJ-1	16	16%	\$13,553
CAMPO RE-6	N<16	N<16	N<16
CANON CITY RE-1	176	16%	\$149,084
CENTENNIAL R-1	N<16	N<16	N<16

Districts	Number of Eligible Students	% of Eligible Students Based on Total N of Students Assessed	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
CENTER 26 JT	20	10%	\$16,941
CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE	766	18%	\$648,853
CHERAW 31	N<16	N<16	N<16
CHERRY CREEK 5	1689	11%	\$1,430,695
CHEYENNE COUNTY RE-5	N<16	N<16	N<16
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN 12	61	4%	\$51,671
CLEAR CREEK RE-1	29	11%	\$24,565
COLORADO DIGITAL BOCES	36	13%	\$30,494
COLORADO SPRINGS 11	1560	18%	\$1,321,423
COTOPAXI RE-3	N<16	N<16	N<16
CREEDE SCHOOL DISTRICT	N<16	N<16	N<16
CRIPPLE CREEK-VICTOR RE-1	29	94%	\$24,565
CROWLEY COUNTY RE-1-J	N<16	N<16	N<16
CUSTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT C-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
DE BEQUE 49JT	N<16	N<16	N<16
DEER TRAIL 26J	N<16	N<16	N<16
DEL NORTE C-7	34	25%	\$28,800
DELTA COUNTY 50(J)	189	14%	\$160,096
DENVER COUNTY 1	5663	19%	\$4,796,935
DOLORES COUNTY RE NO.2	17	21%	\$14,400
DOLORES RE-4A	42	18%	\$35,577
DOUGLAS COUNTY RE 1	2055	13%	\$1,740,721
DURANGO 9-R	168	11%	\$142,307
EADS RE-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
EAGLE COUNTY RE 50	383	19%	\$324,426
EAST GRAND 2	41	11%	\$34,730
EAST OTERO R-1	84	20%	\$71,154
EATON RE-2	58	10%	\$49,130
EDISON 54 JT	N<16	N<16	N<16
ELBERT 200	N<16	N<16	N<16
ELIZABETH C-1	56	9%	\$47,436
ELLICOTT 22	57	17%	\$48,283
ENGLEWOOD 1	165	20%	\$139,766
ESTES PARK R-3	47	15%	\$39,812
EXPEDITIONARY BOCES	N<16	N<16	N<16
FALCON 49	474	10%	\$401,509
FORT MORGAN RE-3	108	12%	\$91,483
FOUNTAIN 8	499	17%	\$422,686
FOWLER R-4J	N<16	N<16	N<16
FREMONT RE-2	68	16%	\$57,601

Districts	Number of Eligible Students	% of Eligible Students Based on Total N of Students Assessed	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
FRENCHMAN RE-3	N<16	N<16	N<16
GARFIELD 16	53	17%	\$44,895
GARFIELD RE-2	243	16%	\$205,837
GENOA-HUGO C113	N<16	N<16	N<16
GILPIN COUNTY RE-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
GRANADA RE-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
GREELEY 6	1340	19%	\$1,135,069
GUNNISON WATERSHED RE1J	92	15%	\$77,930
HANOVER 28	N<16	N<16	N<16
HARRISON 2	763	18%	\$646,311
HAXTUN RE-2J	N<16	N<16	N<16
HAYDEN RE-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
HINSDALE COUNTY RE 1	N<16	N<16	N<16
HI-PLAINS R-23	N<16	N<16	N<16
HOEHNE REORGANIZED 3	N<16	N<16	N<16
HOLLY RE-3	N<16	N<16	N<16
HOLYOKE RE-1J	N<16	N<16	N<16
HUERFANO RE-1	29	16%	\$24,565
IDALIA RJ-3	N<16	N<16	N<16
IGNACIO 11 JT	47	21%	\$39,812
JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	2488	10%	\$2,107,501
JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN RE-5J	257	21%	\$217,696
JULESBURG RE-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
KARVAL RE-23	N<16	N<16	N<16
KIM REORGANIZED 88	N<16	N<16	N<16
KIOWA C-2	N<16	N<16	N<16
KIT CARSON R-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
LA VETA RE-2	N<16	N<16	N<16
LAKE COUNTY R-1	87	30%	\$73,695
LAMAR RE-2	32	7%	\$27,106
LAS ANIMAS RE-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
LEWIS-PALMER 38	118	8%	\$99,954
LIBERTY J-4	N<16	N<16	N<16
LIMON RE-4J	17	12%	\$14,400
LITTLETON 6	425	10%	\$360,003
LONE STAR 101	N<16	N<16	N<16
MANCOS RE-6	25	17%	\$21,177
MANITOU SPRINGS 14	53	15%	\$44,895
MANZANOLA 3J	N<16	N<16	N<16
MAPLETON 1	388	18%	\$328,662

Districts	Number of Eligible Students	% of Eligible Students Based on Total N of Students Assessed	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
MC CLAVE RE-2	N<16	N<16	N<16
MEEKER RE1	38	19%	\$32,189
MESA COUNTY VALLEY 51	866	13%	\$733,559
MIAMI/YODER 60 JT	16	21%	\$13,553
MOFFAT 2	N<16	N<16	N<16
MOFFAT COUNTY RE:NO 1	131	21%	\$110,966
MONTE VISTA C-8	81	25%	\$68,612
MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1	217	24%	\$183,813
MONTROSE COUNTY RE-1J	245	15%	\$207,531
MOUNTAIN VALLEY RE 1	N<16	N<16	N<16
NORTH CONEJOS RE-1J	18	6%	\$15,247
NORTH PARK R-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
NORWOOD R-2J	N<16	N<16	N<16
OTIS R-3	16	21%	\$13,553
OURAY R-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
PARK COUNTY RE-2	24	12%	\$20,330
PAWNEE RE-12	N<16	N<16	N<16
PEYTON 23 JT	N<16	N<16	N<16
PLAINVIEW RE-2	N<16	N<16	N<16
PLATEAU RE-5	N<16	N<16	N<16
PLATEAU VALLEY 50	N<16	N<16	N<16
PLATTE CANYON 1	33	12%	\$27,953
PLATTE VALLEY RE-7	37	12%	\$31,341
POUDRE R-1	974	11%	\$825,042
PRAIRIE RE-11	N<16	N<16	N<16
PRIMERO REORGANIZED 2	N<16	N<16	N<16
PRITCHETT RE-3	N<16	N<16	N<16
PUEBLO CITY 60	882	15%	\$747,112
PUEBLO COUNTY 70	301	11%	\$254,967
RANGELY RE-4	46	22%	\$38,965
REVERE SCHOOL DISTRICT	N<16	N<16	N<16
RIDGWAY R-2	N<16	N<16	N<16
ROARING FORK RE-1	297	18%	\$251,579
ROCKY FORD R-2	56	24%	\$47,436
SALIDA R-32	40	12%	\$33,883
SANFORD 6J	N<16	N<16	N<16
SANGRE DE CRISTO RE-22J	N<16	N<16	N<16
SARGENT RE-33J	16	15%	\$13,553
SCHOOL DISTRICT 27J	713	13%	\$603,958
SHERIDAN 2	79	20%	\$66,918

Districts	Number of Eligible Students	% of Eligible Students Based on Total N of Students Assessed	Per-Pupil Intervention Funds
SIERRA GRANDE R-30	N<16	N<16	N<16
SILVERTON 1	N<16	N<16	N<16
SOUTH CONEJOS RE-10	N<16	N<16	N<16
SOUTH ROUTT RE 3	N<16	N<16	N<16
SPRINGFIELD RE-4	18	17%	\$15,247
ST VRAIN VALLEY RE 1J	1009	11%	\$854,690
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS RE-2	94	12%	\$79,624
STRASBURG 31J	34	12%	\$28,800
STRATTON R-4	N<16	N<16	N<16
SUMMIT RE-1	113	10%	\$95,718
SWINK 33	N<16	N<16	N<16
TELLURIDE R-1	31	11%	\$26,259
THOMPSON R2-J	459	10%	\$388,803
TRINIDAD 1	42	12%	\$35,577
VALLEY RE-1	57	8%	\$48,283
VILAS RE-5	N<16	N<16	N<16
WALSH RE-1	N<16	N<16	N<16
WELD COUNTY RE-1	97	18%	\$82,165
WELD COUNTY S/D RE-8	141	20%	\$119,436
WELD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-3J	85	12%	\$72,001
WELDON VALLEY RE-20(J)	N<16	N<16	N<16
WEST END RE-2	24	31%	\$20,330
WEST GRAND 1-JT	22	17%	\$18,635
WESTMINSTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS	883	31%	\$747,959
WIDEFIELD 3	242	8%	\$204,990
WIGGINS RE-50(J)	20	12%	\$16,941
WILEY RE-13 JT	N<16	N<16	N<16
WINDSOR RE-4	190	11%	\$160,943
WOODLAND PARK RE-2	83	13%	\$70,306
WOODLIN R-104	N<16	N<16	N<16
WRAY RD-2	22	10%	\$18,635
YUMA 1	35	15%	\$29,647
STATE TOTAL	39,014	15%	\$33,047,438

Appendix B:

Early Literacy Grant (ELG) Districts, Schools and Awards for 2015-16.

District	School	Award
Academy School District 20	Pioneer	\$171,297.00
Adams County School District #50	Harris Park, Sherrellwood	\$455,524.00
Bennett	Bennett	\$126,592.00
Bethune	Bethune	\$96,978.00
Burlington School District RE-6J	Burlington	\$196,075.00
Delta County Joint School District No. 50	Lincoln	\$207,312.00
Denver Public Schools	Cesar Chavez	\$91,990.00
Denver Public Schools	Cole	\$264,345.00
Fort Morgan RE3	Sherman, Columbine	\$335,981.00
Harrison School District Two	Bricker, Giberson, Stratmoor Hills	\$414,438.00
Jefferson County	Westgage	\$240,484.00
Lamar School District Re-2	Alta Vista, Parkview, Washington	\$31,609.00
Mesa County Valley School District #51	Rocky Mountain	\$245,518.00
Park County School District RE 2	Edith Teeter	\$107,936.00
Roaring Fork School District	Basalt, Crystal River, Glenwood Springs, Sopris	\$593,239.00

Appendix C:

Early Literacy Assessment Tool (ELAT) Participating Local Education Agencies (LEAs) for 2015-16.

Academy School District 20 (2 schools)	Eads RE1
Aguilar School District RE-6	Eagle County School District RE-50
Alamosa School District RE-11J	East Grand School District 2
Archuleta School District 50-J	East Otero School District R-1
Arickaree School District R-2	Eaton School District RE-2
Aspen School District 1	Edison School District 54JT
Bayfield School District 10JTR	Elbert School District 200
Bennett School District 29J	Elizabeth School District C-1
Branson Reorganized School District 82	Ellicott School District 22
Briggsdale RE-10	Englewood School District 1
Brush School District RE-2J	Falcon School District 49
Burlington School District RE-6J	Fountain-Fort Carson School District 8
Calhan School District RJ-1	Fowler School District R-4J
Campo School District RE-6	Fremont School District RE-2
Canon City School District RE-1	Frenchman School District RE-3 (Fleming)
Centennial School District R-1	Garfield School District RE-2
Center Consolidated School District 26 JT	Genoa-Hugo School District C113
Cesar Chavez Academy- Pueblo	Gloval Village Academy Charter Collaborative
Charter School Institute	Granada School District RE-1
Cheraw School District 31	Greeley-Evans Weld County School District 6
Cheyenne County School District RE-5	Gunnison Watershed School District RE-1J
Cheyenne Mountain School District 12	Hanover School District 28
Clear Creek School District RE-1	Harrison School District 2
Colorado Springs School District 11	Haxtun School District RE-2J
Cotopaxi Consolidated School District RE-3	Hayden School District RE-1
Crowley County School District RE-1J	Hoehne School District RE-3
Custer County School District C-1	Holly School District RE-3
De Beque School District 49JT	Holyoke School District RE-1J
Del Norte School District C-7	Huerfano School District RE1
Delta County School District 50J	Idalia School District RJ-3
Denver Public Schools (2 schools)	Ignacio Public School District 11JT
Dolores County School District RE-2	Jefferson County Public Schools
Dolores School District RE-4A	Julesburg School District RE-1
Douglas County School District RE-1	Karval School District RE-23
Durango School District 9R	Kim Reorganized School District 88

Kiowa School District C2 (Elbert Co SD)
Kit Carson School District R1
Lake County School District R-1
Lamar School District RE-2
Las Animas School District RE-1
Lewis-Palmer School District 38
Limon School District RE-4J
Littleton School District 6
Lone Star School District 101
Mancos School District RE-6
Manzanola School District 3J
McClave School District RE-2
Meeker School District RE1
Mesa County Valley School District 51
Miami-Yoder School District 60JT
Moffat Consolidated School District 2
Moffat County School District RE-1
Montezuma-Cortez School District RE-1
Montrose County School District RE-1J
Morgan County School District RE-3
Mountain Valley School District RE-1
North Conejos School District RE-1J
North Park School District R-1
Norwood School District R-2J
Otis School District R-3
Ouray School District R-1
Park County School District RE-2
Pawnee School District RE-12
Plainview School District RE-2
Plateau Valley School District 50
Platte Canyon School District 1
Platte Valley School District RE-7
Poudre School District R-1
Pritchett School District RE-3
Pueblo City Schools District 60
Pueblo School District 70
Rangely School District RE-4
Roaring Fork School District RE-1
Salida School District R-32
Sanford School District 6J
Sangre de Cristo School District RE-22J
Sargent School District RE-33J
School District 27J
Sierra Grande School District R-30
South Conejos School District RE-10
South Routt School District RE-3
Springfield School District RE-4
Steamboat Springs School District RE-2
Stratton School District R-4
Swink School District 33
Trinidad School District 1
Vilas School District RE-5
Walsh School District RE-1
Weld County School District RE-1
Weld county School District RE-3J (Keenesburg)
Weld County School District RE-4 (Windsor)
Weld County School District RE-5 (Johnstown-Milliken)
Weld County School District RE-9 (Ault/Highland)
Weldon Valley School District RE-20J
West End Public Schools RE-2
West Grand School District 1JT
Westminster Public Schools (Adams 50)
Wiggins School District RE-50J
Wiley School District RE-13JT
Woodland Park School District RE-2
Wray School District RD-2
Yuma School District 1



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado Department of Education
201 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203
www.cde.state.co.us
303-866-6600