



Augenblick, Palaich
and Associates, Inc.

**Analysis of the Costs of
Colorado's Achievement Plan for Kids (CAP4K)
First Interim Report**

Prepared for
Colorado Department of Education

By
Augenblick, Palaich and Associates
and the
Colorado School Finance Project

March 1, 2010

Executive Summary

This report is the first of three prepared by Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA) for the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) to estimate the costs associated with Colorado’s Achievement Plan for Kids (SB 212 of 2008, commonly referred to as CAP4K). CAP4K is designed to “align the public education system from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness” [22-7-1002 (4)(a)] and to create a “seamless system of standards, expectations, and assessments from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness” [22-7-1002 (4)(c)]. This first report focuses on the planning phase for three components of CAP4K:

- (1) School Readiness;
- (2) New Content Standards; and
- (3) Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR).

For each component, APA attempted to determine the activities and costs needed to fulfill the requirements of four key impacted entities: (1) Colorado Department of Education (CDE); (2) Colorado Department of Higher Education (DHE); (3) K-12 school districts; and (4) institutions of higher education (IHEs). Some of the most critical information contained in this report is the lists of activities that each impacted entity is undertaking to s part of Phase I Cap4K planning activities. Each entity will have engaged in the following activities during this initial phase:

Colorado Department of Education- CDE co-convened regional tours and held meetings with stakeholders, conducted a review of relevant literature and best practice, developed the school readiness and PWR descriptions, developed new content standards, developed school readiness indicators, and developed strategic implementation and outreach plans.

Department of Higher Education- DHE held meetings with stakeholders, including representatives of higher education institutions, and participated in the development of the PWR description by co-convening regional tours, conducting a literature review, developing a database and conducting an analysis of pertinent data.

School Districts- School districts will translate new state requirements into local language and local expectations, design and implement staff development, adopt the new content standards

and align their existing curriculum, plan for new assessments, develop a PWR program, determine material and technology needs, and manage communications with students and families about new requirements.

Institutions of Higher Education- IHEs will plan for any needed changes to their teacher preparation programs, admissions policies, remediation policies and materials as a result of CAP4K. Community colleges also participated in the development of the school readiness, PWR and content standards.

It is important to note that CDE and DHE are further on the implementation timeline than school districts and IHEs. This had a significant impact on the ability of CDE and DHE to estimate the resources they need to comply with CAP4K. School districts, in particular, are only beginning to implement CAP4K and their understanding of what will be required for them is limited; as such, it is difficult to predict what their costs will be at this time. APA therefore only included costs to districts that could comfortably be estimated at this time; this means that the total cost estimates shown below do not include costs to districts for the PWR component and include a range of costs for the school readiness component. All figures in this report should be considered rough estimates at this stage and APA intends to review and refine these figures to produce a more complete and accurate cost picture in subsequent reports. With these caveats in mind, the total estimated costs by component for each entity are shown in the table below.

Entity	Component 1: School Readiness	Component 2: New Content Standards	Component 3: Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Total
Colorado Department of Education	\$250,339	\$929,716	\$341,117	\$1,521,172
Department of Higher Education	-	-	\$178,637.66	\$178,638
K-12 School Districts	\$2,596,988 to \$13,277,343	\$125,915,881	Cannot Estimate at this Time	\$128,512,869 to \$139,193,224
Higher Education Institutions	\$192,374	\$851,910	\$502,897	\$1,547,181
Total Estimated Cost for CAP4K Phase I (Incomplete)				\$131,547,181 to \$142,440,214

Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
Introduction	1
Overview of CAP4K	1
Components of CAP4K	2
Component One- School Readiness.....	3
Component Two- New Content Standards	4
Component Three- Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	6
Scheduled Implementation of CAP4K	7
The Procedure Used to Estimate Costs.....	8
Distinctions Made When Creating Cost Estimates	10
Compliance vs. Fulfilling Implied Intent.....	10
New Costs vs. Continued Costs	11
One-Time vs. Ongoing Costs	11
Tasks that Should be Undertaken vs. Those That Can be Undertaken Within Budget Constraints ...	12
Activities and Costs by Entity	12
Colorado Department of Education (CDE).....	12
General CAP4K Tasks Regarding All Components.....	13
Developing School Readiness and Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Descriptions.....	14
Creating New Content Standards	14
Total Costs by Component for CDE.....	15
Colorado Department of Higher Education (DHE).....	15
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) Tasks.....	15

Total Costs by Component for DHE.....	16
K-12 School Districts	16
School Readiness Tasks.....	18
Content Standards Tasks.....	19
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) Tasks.....	21
Total Costs by Component for School Districts.....	22
Total Costs for School Districts	25
Institutions of Higher Education	25
General Tasks Undertaken.....	25
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) Tasks.....	26
Total Costs by Component for Higher Education Institutions	26
Costs to All Entities during Phase I.....	27

Appendices

Appendix A- School District Collection Device

Appendix B- Institutions of Higher Education Collection Device

Introduction

This report is the first of three designed to estimate the costs associated with Colorado’s Achievement Plan for Kids (SB 212 of 2008, commonly referred to as CAP4K). SB212 required that a study of the “anticipated ...costs of implementing the provisions” of the law be undertaken and that the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), in consultation with the Colorado Department of Higher Education (DHE), contract with an independent entity to do this work (22-7-1018). Because CAP4K is implemented over several years, interim cost estimates are required to be completed by March 15, 2010 and by October 1, 2010; with a final cost estimate to be completed by October 1, 2011. The legislation also required that separate cost estimates be identified for: 1) CDE; 2) DHE; 3) 178 school districts in the aggregate (including Boards of Cooperative Education Services and the Charter School Institute); and 4) 27 postsecondary institutions in the aggregate (including 12 four-year public institutions and fifteen two-year public institutions, which includes the community college system).

Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc. (APA) was awarded the contract for this cost study in October of 2009. APA is a Denver-based education consulting firm that has worked with policymakers around the nation on issues related to education funding since 1983. APA has undertaken a variety of projects for CDE, numerous Colorado school districts, and several local foundations including ones focused on the use of pupil-weighted funding formulas, analyses of school district budgets, the development of alternative teacher compensation models, and the examination of school reorganization. For this project, the Colorado School Finance Project (CSFP) is a subcontractor to APA for the purpose of providing support and assistance. The CSFP was created in 1995 by the Colorado Association of School Boards, the Colorado Education Association, and the Colorado Association of School Executives and monitors school funding in the state.

Overview of CAP4K

CAP4K is designed to “align the public education system from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness” [22-7-1002 (4)(a)] and to create a “seamless system of standards, expectations, and assessments from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness” [22-7-1002 (4)(c)]. The legislature recognized that in order to meet such goals it is necessary that “the State Board of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, with the departments of education and

higher education, work in close collaboration” [22-7-1002 (4)(b)] and that it is a “multi-faceted and complex project that will require multiple stages of planning, design, and implementation ... that will likely continue over years” [22-7-1002 (4)(c)]. Fulfilling these expectations “will likely require ...the allocation of new resources to meet increased needs at the state and local levels, including but not limited to significant investment in professional development for educators.” [22-7-1002 (4)(c)]. The CAP4K cost study was expected to address the costs associated with:

- (1) reviewing, adopting, and implementing standards and curricula;
- (2) implementing a new assessment system for CAP4K’s preschool through elementary and secondary standards;
- (3) implementing the school readiness description and assessments, including creating and implementing individualized school readiness plans;
- (4) incorporating career and technical education standards into the curricula;
- (5) aligning the preschool, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education curricula with the postsecondary and workforce readiness description and administering and reviewing the postsecondary and workforce planning, preparation, and readiness assessment;
- (6) making changes to the postsecondary admissions processes and publications; and
- (7) reviewing, adopting, and implementing standards in teacher preparation programs [22-7-1018 (1)(c)(I) - (VII)].
- (8) Probably need to add a piece around graduation/diploma requirements – this is last part of CAP4K in 3rd year.

Components of CAP4K

For the purposes of this first interim report, APA looked at three components of CAP4K:

- (1) School Readiness;
- (2) New Content Standards; and
- (3) Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

Included below are summaries of each of these components. Please note that much of the language is school district specific since they originally appeared in the materials provided to school districts.

Component One- School Readiness

In December 2008, the State Board of Education adopted the following description of school readiness as part of CAP4K:

School Readiness describes both the preparedness of a child to engage in and benefit from learning experiences, and the ability of a school to meet the needs of all students enrolled in publicly funded preschool or kindergarten. School Readiness is enhanced when schools, families, and community service providers work collaboratively to ensure that every child is ready for higher levels of learning in academic content.

Using this description, the State Board is adopting school readiness guidelines and assessments that are designed to measure a child's preparedness when entering school and identify areas of improvement.

Indicators of children's school readiness which are still in development include:

- **Social and Emotional Development** (e.g. ability to form human relationships, to get along in a group setting, self-confidence, sense of right and wrong, sense of empathy)
- **Communication and Language Development** (e.g. verbal and non-verbal skills, awareness of representation and meaning, ability to be understood and understand others)
- **Approaches to Learning** (e.g. participate and complete tasks, independently choose activities, age-appropriate level of concentration, problem-solving skills)
- **Content Knowledge** (e.g. basic knowledge of numbers, basic understanding of concepts, i.e., heat/cold, more/less)
- **Physical Well-Being and Motor Development** (e.g. rate of growth, motor skills, medical care)

Under SB 08-212, local education providers will create and implement individualized readiness plans (IRPs) for each child to address any areas where improvement is needed. The intent is that IRPs will inform teacher practice and help students progress towards school readiness.

In addition to evaluating the preparedness of children entering elementary school, the CAP4K School Readiness Component also addresses the ability of a school to meet the needs of kindergarten students by working collaboratively with families and community service providers. Examples of school capacity components include:

- **Professional Proficiency** (e.g. highly trained and qualified adults, knowledge of growth and social development of typically and atypically developing children, ability to translate knowledge into developmentally appropriate practices, application of knowledge of research proven practices to meet the developmental needs of all students)
- **Strategic Thinking in Leadership** (e.g. school leadership which works invitingly with young families, hospitals, child care providers and all P-3 educators to maximize the learning outcomes; leaders who analyze their success and communicate progress and needs in a way which compels parents and local citizens to get involved)
- **Community Services and Family Engagement** (e.g. provide an inventory of all available service providers in neighborhood range – [health, parent education, social service, family support; arrange regular meetings and executive director briefings to facilitate active participation and communication about on-going needs and services; measure outreach, enrollment, alignment of student attendance and satisfaction survey by internal and parent consumers])
- **Structures and Resources** (e.g. developmentally appropriate materials and resources, small class size, availability of full-day kindergarten, appropriate facilities)

Component Two- New Content Standards

As part of CAP4K, the state is conducting a standards review to update Colorado's state content standards. Currently, Colorado Model Content Standards exist in the areas of civics, dance, economics, foreign language, geography, history, mathematics, music, physical education, reading and writing, science, theater, and the visual arts for grades K-12. CAP4K requires CDE to revise the standards in three ways: (1) to expand the standards to preschool through grade twelve; (2) to align the standards

with the new descriptions of school readiness and postsecondary and workforce readiness; and (3) to meet the highest national and international standards that have been implemented successfully and that meet the legislation's other requirements. School districts must revise their standards to meet or exceed the new state standards, at a minimum, in those subject matter areas that are including in the state preschool through elementary and secondary education standards, including but not limited to English language competency.

The following are the changes that should be expected with the revised standards:

- **The inclusion of Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness and 21st Century Skills:** In an effort to align classroom learning with real world needs, content standards will be revised to include 21st Century Skills where appropriate. The skills identified as necessary for students to enter a globally competitive workforce are: (1) critical thinking and reasoning; (2) information literacy; (3) collaboration; (4) self-direction; (5) innovation; and (6) analysis and interpretation skills.
- **Fewer, clearer and higher standards:** A review of current content standards has determined that there are more standards and benchmarks than can be taught in depth in the school time frame. The new standards are written in broad terms to capture the volume, scope, and variability of the skills and information. Colorado has designed grade expectations to meet national and international tenets of "fewer" standards to reflect essential concepts that form intelligent building blocks grade-by-grade; simply stated "clearer" standards that convey knowledge and skill outcomes; and "higher" standards that allow each student to achieve at high levels and provide students with the skills needed to become Postsecondary and Workforce Ready.
- **Early childhood and higher education expectations:** As a fundamental part of the end-in-mind strategy, the revised Colorado standards focus on the entire system and each child from early learning to grade 12 mastery, incorporating the new definitions of school readiness and postsecondary/workforce readiness.

- **Concepts, not facts:** The new standards transform Colorado's academic requirements into crucial concepts and skills that provide the essential background, fluency, depth of knowledge, and problem solving abilities expected of all students in key content areas.
- **Standards by grade level:** The revision committee will also be unbundling grade span standards by grade level. This will create vertical alignment as students move from grade to grade as well as horizontal alignment across subjects.

In addition to the updated state academic standards, the Colorado Department of Education will also develop a new state assessment system that will be implemented during the 2011-2012 school year.

Component Three- Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The draft definition of postsecondary and workforce readiness (PWR) jointly adopted on June 30, 2009 by the Colorado State Board of Education and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is as follows:

“Postsecondary and workforce readiness” describes the knowledge, skills, and behaviors essential for high school graduates to be prepared to enter college and the workforce and to compete in the global economy. The description assumes students have developed consistent intellectual growth throughout their high school career as a result of academic work that is increasingly challenging, engaging, and coherent.

Postsecondary education and workforce readiness assumes that before graduating high school students are ready and able to demonstrate the following without the need for remediation:

1. **Content knowledge** in the areas of (1) literacy; (2) math; (3) science; (4) social sciences; and (5) the arts and humanities.
2. **Learning and life skills** in the areas of (1) critical thinking and problem-solving; (2) finding and using information/information technology; (3) creativity and innovation; (4) global and cultural awareness; (5) civic responsibility; (6) work ethic; (7) personal responsibility; (8) communication; and (9) collaboration.

Students will be evaluated using the following assessments: an 8th or 9th grade planning assessment, a 10th grade preparation assessment, and an 11th grade readiness assessment.

School districts will be expected to develop a Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Program based upon these guidelines and assessments. All high schools must offer at least one Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Program and all students must enroll in a program. Programs are designed to prepare a student to demonstrate Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness prior to or upon attaining a high school diploma. Districts may make graduation dependent on completion of the program. Based on criteria set by the State Board, high schools may offer an endorsement on diplomas indicating successful or outstanding completion of the program. Students receiving a postsecondary and workforce readiness endorsement shall be guaranteed eligibility for credit-bearing courses and are guaranteed to meet minimum academic qualifications for admission into Colorado's moderately selective institutions of higher education subject to additional review of other admission and placement qualification. By 2014, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education will be revising the minimum academic admission standards for first-time freshmen and transfer students to align with the postsecondary and workforce readiness description.

Beginning in the 2011-12 school year, schools will also need to provide additional services and supports for 11th and 12th grade English language learners if they are unable to meet English language competency standards or demonstrate Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.

Scheduled Implementation of CAP4K

The scheduled implementation of CAP4K required a number of benchmarks to be met by CDE, DHE, the State Board of Education, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and school districts in the years between 2009 and 2014, as follows:

In 2009, CDE was expected to submit implementation reports by February 15; CDE and DHE were expected to contract with the independent entity to conduct the cost study by September 15; the State Board of Education was expected to adopt preschool through secondary education course standards by December 15; and the State Board of Education and the Colorado

Commission on Higher Education was to have created the postsecondary and workforce readiness description by December 15 (these expectations were, in fact, met).

In 2010, the first cost study report is due by March 1; the second cost study report is due by October 1; the planning and preparation for postsecondary and workforce readiness (PWR) and the PWR assessments are expected to be available by December 15; and the State Board of Education is expected to adopt the preschool through secondary assessments by December 15.

In 2011, the State Board of Education is expected to adopt the criteria for high school diploma endorsements by July 1; the third cost study report is to be completed by October 1; local school boards are expected to adopt preschool through secondary education course standards by December 15; and local school boards are expected to revise their curricula by December 15.

In 2012, DHE is expected to develop annual reports on enrollment and education attainment at postsecondary institutions by February 15; local school districts are expected to develop individualized readiness plans for preschool and kindergarten for the fall semester; local school districts are expected to administer postsecondary and workforce readiness assessments by December 15; and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is expected to have reviewed basic skills assessment tests by December 15.

In 2013, CDE is expected to prepare progress and effectiveness reports by February 15 and local school districts are expected to administer kindergarten readiness assessments.

In 2014, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is expected to revise postsecondary admission policies.

Under Section 9 of SB212, the legislature allocated financial support in fiscal year 2009 (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009) of \$542,453 and 5.0 FTE staff to CDE, which included \$105,180 and 1.0 FTE for DHE. In addition, \$250,000 was allocated in support of a specific task (the postsecondary and workforce readiness assessment pilot program).

The Procedure Used to Estimate Costs

Developing cost estimates for any piece of legislation can be difficult for a variety of reasons: (1) legislation may be so broad that it is difficult to define it clearly; (2) there may be numerous ways to

accomplish the goals of the legislation; and (3) complying with the requirements of the legislation may be different from achieving the outcomes or goals of the legislation. Preparing cost estimates for CAP4K is particularly tricky because: (1) in part, the legislation defines a completely new undertaking; (2) costs need to be estimated not only for the state but also for education institutions; (3) different institutions were at different places in terms of legislative requirements – that is, some had already been working on components of the legislation before it was enacted; (4) the timing of the reports required is not related in any systematic way to the implementation of the legislation; (5) the national economic recession hit Colorado just as the legislation was beginning to be implemented, which resulted in agencies and institutions focusing a great deal of their attention on reducing costs; and (6) CAP4K is one of several statutory requirements that school districts and post secondary institutions face that interact with each other in some way, including alternative teacher preparation programs (SB 160), new accreditation and accountability systems (SB 163), concurrent enrollment (HB 1319), individual career and academic plans (included in SB 256), and ongoing requirements of the federal Elementary and Secondary School Act (commonly referred to as No Child Left Behind), and development of the “Higher Education Plan”..

As part of the contract between CDE and APA, an initial meeting was held to define the scope of the first report (as required by the legislation). At that meeting, it was agreed that the first report would focus on three components of CAP4K, reflecting work that had been completed and adopted by CDE and DHE:

- (1) the school readiness description and planning for its implementation in school districts and potential impact on post secondary institutions;
- (2) elementary and secondary grade level standards and planning for their implementation in school districts and potential impact on postsecondary institutions; and
- (3) the postsecondary and workforce readiness description and planning for its implementation and potential impact on postsecondary institutions.

Other components, such as the costs associated with development of assessments (for school readiness, for elementary and secondary content areas, and for postsecondary and workforce readiness) or gathering, compiling, and evaluating data will be addressed in subsequent reports.

APA used a methodology to develop cost estimates that is commonly referred to as the “professional judgment” approach among school finance policy makers and practitioners. This approach, which has

been used effectively in multiple K-12 school finance studies conducted across the country, typically utilizes panels of experts to identify programs, staffing and materials that can be translated into costs for hypothetical school districts of specific sizes and with specific student enrollment characteristics. Using this approach in the CAP4K setting, APA asked affected parties to develop lists of the tasks and activities they felt were necessary to undertake in order to implement each CAP4K component. They were also asked to estimate both the amount of time different people would need to complete those activities and any other costs for supplies, materials, technology, meetings and contracts with specialists.

For this report, APA met on several occasions with CDE and DHE to develop the lists of tasks and activities they had undertaken and planned to undertake and to obtain time estimates for different staff. For school districts, it was determined that it would be difficult to gather needed information from all districts in the state through a survey. Therefore, APA staff met individually with a sample of large districts and met with several groups of mid-size and small districts, where participants discussed the cost impacts on hypothetical districts of specified sizes. APA also held webinars with several districts prior to their completing individual district CAP4K cost surveys. For postsecondary institutions, APA determined that a survey would be the best way to collect data after meeting with DHE; all postsecondary institutions were therefore asked to complete individual surveys, which were compiled by DHE with totals forwarded to APA.

Distinctions Made When Creating Cost Estimates

APA made several important distinctions when capturing what activities and resource costs could be attributed to CAP4K. These included: (1) activities, tasks and resources needed for compliance vs. fulfilling the implied academic goals and intent of the legislation, (2) new vs. continued activities, which were translated to costs, (3) one time vs. ongoing activities that were translated to costs; and (4) defining efforts that should be made to effectively and efficiently comply with CAP4K vs. those that could be undertaken in an environment of budget reductions. Each of these distinctions is described in greater detail below.

Compliance vs. Fulfilling Implied Intent

APA differentiated between the costs of complying with CAP4K and the costs of fulfilling the intended objectives of the legislation. Compliance costs refer to those incurred by affected entities to meet the

stated requirements of the legislation. For example, CAP4K requires that school districts assess incoming kindergarten students and, on the basis of the results, create an individualized plan so that each student is prepared academically and socially for school. In this example, compliance costs are those associated with developing the assessment procedure, actually conducting the assessment, reviewing results, and preparing plans for individual students on the basis of those results. However, what would not be included in this example are any resources needed to ensure that the student, once assessed, becomes school ready. While the implied intent of the legislation is that all students become school ready, the resources needed to do so go beyond compliance with the legislation and are as a result, outside of this study's scope of work. For this first report, the focus is on planning for the three CAP4K components, which excludes most activities that go beyond compliance in any case.

New Costs vs. Continued Costs

APA also focused on new costs. Because CAP4K is, in some cases, replacing components of the education system that had been in place previously, some costs are not new costs – they simply continue activities that may have been taking place already or involve redirecting personnel that were already available. We felt that it was inappropriate to attribute such continued costs to CAP4K although it should be noted that some activities may need to be accomplished more quickly under CAP4K than they had been completed previously (as an example, school districts may have updated one or two curricular areas annually while CAP4K both adds new standards and requires that new district curricula will be implemented in a couple of years). In the long run, it is possible that CAP4K may allow school districts and postsecondary institutions to reduce costs; while such savings are not identified in this report, they may appear in subsequent reports.

One-Time vs. Ongoing Costs

APA also attempted to distinguish between “one-time” costs and costs that recur year after year. It is useful to understand when any of the four entities for which costs need to be estimated expect to undertake activities only once, even if it takes a year or two to complete such activities, and to distinguish such activities, and their associated costs, from those that are expected to be undertaken on a regular basis. For example, the cost of creating assessments may be largely at the front end, but require only periodic modifications in the future at a much lower expenditure. APA noted that some one-time costs extended over a period of time longer than a year. APA found, however, that at this

juncture it is difficult for entities to accurately differentiate the one time from ongoing costs given this is the planning stage for implementation. This will need to be assessed in future reports.

Tasks that Should be Undertaken vs. Those That Can be Undertaken Within Budget

Constraints

Finally, APA wanted to estimate the costs of those activities that each of the four affected entities believed needed to be done in order to comply with CAP4K, not just those activities that the entities could afford to do given the budget constraints and reductions that went into effect as CAP4K was being implemented. (The costs ascertained are reflective of 2008-09 budgets – which recognize minimal reductions) This is something of a fine point that is very difficult to discuss with the target entities for which costs are to be estimated. Given this difficulty, the costs that were calculated, and the activities that underlie them, are conservative.

Activities and Costs by Entity

Colorado Department of Education (CDE)

APA met with CDE on a number of occasions to determine what activities it was undertaking to fulfill CAP4K. While CDE has previously reported their efforts to the legislature and calculated a fiscal note to cover the costs of their efforts, APA still felt it was still important to meet with CDE to examine whether those previous estimates were sufficient. What APA often heard during its meetings is that while the fiscal note may have provided for a full time person to fulfill a certain role, that in actuality that person's efforts amounted to more than a 1.0 FTE and instead should have been a 1.5 FTE for all of the work to have been done during an average work week. Further, prior documents recorded only activities already completed and were not forward-looking and APA needed to capture these additional activities.

Many of the activities that CDE undertook were designed to address more than one component. APA worked with CDE to determine what amount of the noted resources for each activity could be attributed to each component so that a cost by component could still be developed.

During Phase I CDE engaged in the following activities:

General CAP4K Tasks Regarding All Components

Contracting with Various Consultants (Components 1, 2, and 3): CDE contracted with several individuals and firms to do work on implementing each of the CAP4K components. CDE's efforts included the hiring of consultants, collaborating with them on various tasks and more generally managing and overseeing each consultant's work. This contracting included work done by a contractor for which there was no charge; without this service CDE would have incurred additional costs.

Internal Meetings (Components 1, 2, and 3): The team of staff members at CDE responsible for CAP4K met on a regular basis to ensure tasks were being completed in a timely manner and that the implementation process was aligned and focused.

Regular Meetings with Stakeholders (Components 1, 2, and 3): CDE regularly met with the Department of Higher Education, State Board of Education, Colorado Association of School Boards, Colorado Association of School Executives, and Colorado Educators Association, P-3 Subcommittee, P-20 Council and the Standards Review Stakeholders Committee to address each of the components. These meetings were key in helping to create the descriptions of the components and in ensuring that stakeholders were aware of the process and understood the direction CDE was moving towards.

Progress Reporting to House and Senate Ed Committees (Components 1, 2, and 3): CDE staff reported to both legislative education committees on a bi-annual basis about the progress of CAP4K implementation. The efforts to complete this task include presentation preparation and the presentations themselves.

Developing Website (Components 1, 2, and 3): CDE staff developed content for their website to address CAP4K legislation and the changes that the legislation would entail to communicate with and educate stakeholders.

Building Outreach Plan (Components 1, 2, and 3): CDE is currently developing an outreach plan that would outline the Department's response strategy. The plan will provide guidance to CDE staff to help them better respond to incoming questions regarding CAP4K.

Creating Implementation Plan (Components 1, 2, and 3): CDE is developing an overarching implementation plan to help guide their work in the next phase.

Developing Implementation Materials Bank (Components 1, 2, and 3): CDE is working to develop a bank of resources to help schools implement the new CAP4K standards.

Developing School Readiness and Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Descriptions

Online Survey of Colorado Citizens to Create Descriptions (Components 1 and 3): CDE created an online survey that over the course of a month asked Colorado citizens what they thought was most important to ensure that students were school ready and post secondary and workforce ready. CDE then used this feedback during the creation of the descriptions for each of the components.

Literature Review for Creation of Descriptions (Components 1 and 3): CDE conducted a literature review of existing best practices and research on school readiness and postsecondary readiness at the onset of the process. This information was used to inform the initial drafts of the two descriptions.

Creation of School Readiness Indicators (Component 1): Early childhood specialists at CDE determined indicators of school readiness in the five areas identified.

Joint Regional Tour with DHE about PWR (Component 3): CDE co-convened twelve regional meetings across the state to gather feedback from the public to inform the development of the PWR description. This included developing and producing materials, prepping for the meetings, and travel for CDE staff.

Creating New Content Standards

Teacher Tour with CEA (Component 2): CDE co-convened a teacher tour with CEA to gather teacher feedback on creating and implementing new content standards. This included developing and producing materials, prepping for the meetings, and travel for CDE staff.

Review of Content Areas and Drafting of new standards by CDE Content Specialists (Component 2): CDE content specialists reviewed each of the existing content areas to determine what existing standards were still important. From this review, the content specialists determined what standards could be eliminated in an effort to decrease the total number and make them clearer and better. CDE content specialists then drafted new content standards in 13 areas. These standards were then reviewed by national experts

Developing Map between New Standards and Previous Standards (Component 2): CDE content specialists further compared the newly created standards to the previous ones to identify any

differences and similarities between them. They then created a map to crosswalk between the two sets of standards.

Total Costs by Component for CDE

APA recorded resources needed to fulfill these activities in terms of personnel time, materials and travel costs, and contractor fees. APA used actual salaries and benefits provided by CDE to determine the cost of the personnel time. As mentioned previously, the costs of any activities that were applicable to more than one component were divided proportionately for each component involved. During the eighteen-month Phase I of CAP4K the preliminary estimated total cost to CDE was as follows:

Component 1: School Readiness	Component 2: New Content Standards	Component 3: Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Total
\$250,339	\$929,716	\$341,117	\$1,521,172

According to CDE, in fall of 2009 there were 832,368 K-12 students in Colorado; therefore \$1,521,172 represents about \$1.83 per student.

Colorado Department of Higher Education (DHE)

APA met with DHE to determine costs associated with the first phase of CAP4K implementation. DHE staff determined that the bulk of the agency’s efforts thus far have been focused around the third component, Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness. During Phase I, DHE engaged in the following PWR activities:

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) Tasks

Literature Review for Creation of PWR Description: DHE conducted a literature review of existing best practices and research on postsecondary and workforce readiness at the onset of the process. This information was used to inform the initial draft of the PWR description.

Joint Regional Tour with CDE: DHE partnered with CDE to convene twelve regional meetings to gather feedback in order to develop the PWR description, as described in the previous section. Their efforts

included preparation in advance of the meetings, development of materials, staff attending meetings, and associated travel costs.

Meetings with Stakeholders: DHE regularly held meetings with key stakeholder groups, including representatives from the higher education institutions and their faculty in the state both to educate them about upcoming changes and to keep them apprised of progress in the implementation of CAP4K.

Internal Meetings: DHE staff members responsible for CAP4K met on a regular basis to ensure tasks were being completed in a timely manner and that everyone was focused on required steps in the implementation process.

Creation of Database and Data Analysis: DHE created a database of relevant data, some of which consisted of graduation and remediation rates, where students attended high school, and input from businesses which regarding PWR. DHE also conducted some initial analysis of this data.

Contracting with a Consultant: DHE hired a consultant to assist with work on CAP4K. DHE collaborated with the consultant on various tasks and managed and oversaw the consultant’s work.

Total Costs by Component for DHE

Based upon the activities described above, the total costs to DHE during this phase are shown below:

Component 1: School Readiness	Component 2: New Content Standards	Component 3: Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Total
No Costs at this Phase of the Study	No Costs at this Phase of the Study	\$141,473	\$141,473

According to DHE’s head count enrollment for 2008, there are 218,571 students in Colorado public higher education; therefore \$141,473 would be about \$0.65 per student.

K-12 School Districts

In preparing to collect the cost information for school districts across the state APA designed a process that would allow it to determine if the size of a school district had an impact on the costs associated with CAP4K. In order to accomplish this, APA collected information and broke the 178 school districts in the state into six groups: 1) Above 40,000 students; 2) 20,000 to 40,000 students; 3) 10,000 to 20,000

students; 4) 3,000 to 10,000 students; 5) 1,000 to 3,000 students; and 6) below 1,000 students. APA used three different communication methods to collect the costs for school districts: 1) One-on-one meetings with districts above 10,000 students; 2) Webinars with districts between 10,000 and 3,000 students; and 3) Focus groups with multiple districts for districts below 3,000 students.

Regardless of the communication method, APA used the same collection device for all districts. This device can be seen in Appendix A and was developed by first meeting with one district's staff to discuss what types of tasks districts might be undertaking in order to comply with the components in Phase I of the cost study. It was important to have this initial discussion that focused on tasks only, with no discussion of costs, since it was apparent that many districts had not begun to undertake the work necessary to comply with the Phase I components.

APA's meeting with this initial district allowed us to generate a basic list of tasks that would serve as a starting point for our later discussions with other districts. By generating such a list in advance, districts could better focus on system design instead of developing new lists of tasks each time from scratch. However, all districts were able to add, delete and alter tasks as they saw fit so they were in no way limited to or constrained by the initial list of tasks. Districts then described the processes they would implement, the time allocated, and the materials needed to accomplish these tasks.

After several meetings it became apparent that many of the smaller districts rely heavily on Boards of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) to implement the three main CAP4K components. In order to understand the potential BOCES role, APA therefore also held meetings with members of various BOCES from around the state.

For this report APA gathered data from the following 19 districts and several BOCES:

- Greeley Public Schools in a one on one meeting;
- Jefferson County Public Schools in a one on one meeting;
- Adams 12 Public Schools in a one on one meeting;
- Littleton Public Schools in a one on one meeting;
- Mesa Public Schools in a one on one meeting;
- El Paso County District 11 in a one on one meeting;
- Montrose Public Schools through a webinar;

- Garfield 12 Public Schools through a webinar;
- A meeting with district representatives at the annual CASB conference: Bayfield, Branson, Brush, Byers, Center, Idalia, Lake City, Meeker, Platte Valley 50, Silverton, and Strasburg.

The list and description of tasks that districts will undertake in complying with CAP4K represents some of the most important information to come forward as a result of this first reporting phase. Districts are currently in different stages with implementation of the descriptions of the three components in Phase I. While all districts have done at least some work planning for the implementation of the new content standards; they have done less work, in some cases nearly no work, to plan for implementation of the other two components. This level of completion is in line with the timeline set out in CAP4K. For many districts it was difficult to predict the effort and costs associated with work that will be done in the future. However, the discussion of what tasks would have to be undertaken was an important first step. It is important to note that there is uncertainty on the level of support that will be provided by CDE in the implementation of the three components in Phase I. As such, APA noted where districts mentioned that the amount of work necessary at the district level is viewed as being dependent on the level of state support provided.

School districts will engage in the following tasks during Phase I:

School Readiness Tasks

Translate the state requirements into local language and local expectations: Districts will take time to understand how the new readiness standards and assessment tool fit into their current kindergarten induction process. It was clear that districts had different levels of induction processes but all districts believed that the new readiness standard would be above their current level. The level of existing kindergarten service varies and it is unclear if the state will be able to move forward with full financial support for all day kindergarten.

Staff Development: The bulk of the resources associated with the implementation of the School Readiness standards will fall into staff training. The majority of the district costs associated with staff training will be one time, up-front costs with quarterly/annual updates. After the district has a full understanding of the readiness standard and assessment district staff will need to create, or contract for the creation of, training materials for both kindergarten and first grade staff. Then the kindergarten and first grade staff members will have to be trained on the new school readiness standard and assessment

tool. This staff development will most likely be done over the summer months because of the amount of time required, and because of a desire to not pull teachers from classroom teaching. Districts' costs will be reduced in this area if the state creates and provides training materials for the readiness standard.

Develop plans to raise all students not ready for kindergarten up to standard by the end of first grade:

Though no student will have to meet the new readiness standards during the first phase, districts will have to begin to design the tools that will be used to create the plans to get students "school ready." It is thought that these plans might look very similar to current Individual Learning Plans. It is unclear how this information has to be reported to CDE, and this may have an added impact on cost. The costs associated with this task could be reduced if the state provides a working template for this area.

Manage communications (including with parents, community, and staff): With the implementation of the new readiness standard a number of different groups will need to be informed beyond the kindergarten and first grade staff. One important group will be the parents of incoming kindergarten students. Most districts assume this will require increased contact time prior to the beginning of the school year with incoming students and their parents. Much of this effort can be handled within the current communications going out to parents but some time will have to be spent on creating the new information materials that will need to be distributed.

Plan for and acquire appropriate materials: Again, no student will need to reach the school readiness standard during Phase I of this work. Still, districts may begin to identify any new materials that will be necessary to align with the new requirements.

Translate and interpret materials as needed: Materials for students, staff and parents will be translated into different languages as needed.

Coordinate with families and local agencies: As part of CAP4K districts may need to build relationships with outside agencies to connect families with necessary resources – such as health and social service resources – to ensure that their children are school ready.

Content Standards Tasks

During APA's meetings with districts it was often mentioned that the tasks associated with the new content standards are not unique to CAP4K. What is unique is the very compressed timeline associated

with implementing 13 new content standards at the same time. This abbreviated timeline is taxing for all districts, but particularly for smaller districts. For smaller districts it is extremely difficult to undertake the level of work for each task listed below for each content standard in the timeline dictated by CAP4K. In fact, for smaller districts the implementation of a curricular change can take six to twelve months as the revisions and staff development are done all at once in addition to maintaining regular teaching duties. Many districts report it would be nearly impossible to implement 13 new content standards in the given time allotment as there is no capacity or available time in a typical school day to do so.

Create a set of standards in 13 course areas that is consistent with those of the state, aligning curriculum, and mapping curriculum/developing pacing guides: In the past, as new state level content standards have been adopted districts have taken the option of creating their own standards that are consistent with those put forth by the state. APA presented this as an option for those districts we met with during the Phase I work. Districts report however that, given the short timeline and recent budget cuts, they would not endeavor to create their own standards for CAP4K. Instead, every district APA met with indicated they would adopt the state content standards as is. Once these standards are adopted, districts will have to get staff to work on curriculum mapping and the development of pacing guides. Again, any support that can be provided by the state in these areas will help lessen district cost.

Design and implement staff development as necessary (training in best practices, training in new materials, etc.): The task of staff development on the new content standards was divided into three categories:

- a. *Creation of training materials on new standards:* District staff will develop materials, which could include printed materials or online modules, for each of the new content standards by grade level.
- b. *Training on new standards:* Once the training materials are created district staff, mainly teachers, will have to be trained on the new content standards. With the tight timeline and the redo of all the content standards, the amount of training required is predicted to be significant. All districts also indicated that to accomplish this task properly, evaluations and revisions would be needed over multiple years.
- c. *Coaching teachers on 21st Century skills:* Many districts felt that training around 21st Century skills will need to be ongoing to ensure that it is properly integrated into all instruction.

Districts therefore plan to coach teachers on an ongoing basis throughout the year in addition to providing training on the new content standards.

Determine and integrate technology as needed: Many districts mentioned that, as the new content standards are implemented, particularly those that are brand new, additional technology will be needed to expand connectivity as well as hardware and software capacity. The desire to utilize technology was critical as it was more timely and efficient. Staff will begin to evaluate these needs in Phase I.

Manage communications about new standards: The implementation of the new standards will require communication to staff, parents and the community. Staff will therefore need to be provided information on the new standards as well as the process their district will be utilizing for implementation.

Align to formative assessments: Districts use various formative assessments throughout the year. Districts will need to take the time to review their current formative assessments and ensure they align well with the new standards. This includes changes needed in data bases, and associated support materials.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) Tasks

PWR is the area where the least number of districts indicated having a strong understanding of the tasks they would undertake. In general, however, the tasks listed below were identified as important to help many districts begin to frame their approaches.

Develop Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Program: Though districts know they will need to implement a Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness program, what districts believe this should look like varies widely across the state. More clarity in state expectations would therefore be helpful. It is, for instance, unclear what type of additional reporting will be expected of districts and to whom such reporting will be made. Some districts believe that the PWR requirements simply trigger a need to provide a class or set of courses that every student takes during their high school career. Other districts view it as a comprehensive overhaul of the current high school design requiring the development of comprehensive guidance services and a redesign of high school course schedules. Districts are in various stages of implementing a PWR program. Though this component does not need to be in place in the

next few years, some districts are already creating similar approaches in their schools. These districts may serve as good models to help determine what PWR should like across the state.

Determine and integrate technology as needed (student needs, instructional and accountability/data reporting needs): Most districts believe, regardless of the PWR model discussed, that a large amount of technology, both software and hardware, will be needed to implement the PWR programs. One common theme is that the new monitoring of students in their progress towards graduation will require districts to have more sophisticated technologic capacity.

Staff Development: Like the other two components, districts will need to design materials and then train staff on the PWR requirements. Depending on the type of program being implemented, staff development or redesign could be very time consuming and costly. The state could lessen district costs by providing a framework, template or materials for this work.

Manage communications: The implementation of the new PWR standard will require communication to staff, students, parents and the community to ensure all constituents understand the purpose and structure of new programs..

Develop plan to provide additional support and services to ELL students: The PWR component specifically addresses getting ELL students proficient in English in a “timely manner.” In Phase I, districts will need to design the plans associated with making this a reality.

Total Costs by Component for School Districts

When working with the districts APA attempted to identify costs for all three components in Phase I. To do this APA asked districts to identify the resources, such as staff time, they would need in order to fulfill the requirements of each component. APA provided the districts with a collection device that allowed them to identify the effort needed to accomplish each task, but did not ask them to translate or calculate this into total costs. This meant that the districts did not know what the cost of each component would be and instead were only focused on the resources and time needed to complete each task.

As was mentioned above, the timeline for the three components varies and many districts did not have a full understanding of what resources would be needed for one or more of the components. In the end, APA felt most comfortable with the data associated with school readiness and implementation of

the new content standards. APA will not be reporting any cost data for the PWR component in this first interim report, but will do so in subsequent reports. For the other two components we have cost figures that vary due to the size of the district. Much like the state funding system, smaller districts reflected costs for the two components that are higher on a per pupil level than it was for larger districts.

It is important to note that APA was unable to collect enough information to translate into cost estimates for districts below about 1,500 students. This is because these districts are likely to develop different service delivery models that they explore with one another and with BOCES. In APA's meeting with representatives from the BOCES, they indicated that they would be exploring what role they could serve for districts in the implementation of CAP4K, but no specific activities or costs could be estimated at this time. Therefore, APA will work to include a more accurate estimate of the costs incurred by the smallest districts in future reports when better information will be available.

School Readiness

The school readiness component costs ranged from \$1.33 per pupil up to \$21.68 per pupil. The per pupil cost is based on all students in the district, not just those affected or receiving services for this component. Interestingly, the costs identified by districts seemed to be split into two groups: A high cost group and a low cost group. It seems that the ambiguity around what exactly the new assessment will entail lead to districts approaching the new potential costs differently. Once the assessment is finalized it will be easier to determine the true cost per pupil.

For the current report, APA provides two cost estimates. The range is from \$3.12 to \$12.58 per pupil. In establishing the low cost estimate APA did not have enough information to estimate any difference in cost due to size. For lower cost districts the estimates will simply use the state size adjustment used as part of the state funding formula. The high cost estimate did have information from different size districts and an adjustment was applied to create a cost for every district. The additional cost for different sizes is in displayed in the following table; it ranges from 1.0 at the largest districts to 2.33 for a district with 50 students. Since there was no cost information for districts with less than 1,500 students APA extrapolated out estimates for this size category. These estimates may change in later reports as more accurate information is received.

Content Standards

The content standard component costs range from \$87.99 per pupil up to \$280.61 per pupil. The costs per pupil generally increase as districts get smaller. The costs seem to be flat or constant from around 40,000 students and up. This knowledge allowed APA to establish a base cost for content standards of \$94 per student for any district with 40,000 or more students. The size adjustment for this component is included in the table that follows.

Adjusting Costs for the Size of Districts

As was discussed in both of the paragraphs above, the district-level costs increase at a per pupil level as districts get smaller. This is consistent with how the state currently allocates funds to districts under the School Finance Act. Still, the relative differences by component differed from one another and from the state’s current size adjustment. The table below shows the different size adjustments APA applied for this study compared to the state’s current adjustment. APA took the state’s current adjustment which gives every district at least some level of size adjustment and set the lowest adjustment to 1.0.

Enrollment	School Finance Act Current Adjustment	School Readiness Adjustment	New Content Standards Adjustment
50	2.33	2.33	4.99
100	2.14	2.20	4.59
500	1.19	1.92	3.66
1000	1.09	1.80	3.27
2500	1.02	1.63	2.74
5000	1.00	1.51	2.34
7500	1.00	1.44	2.11
10000	1.00	1.39	1.94
15000	1.00	1.32	1.71
20000	1.00	1.27	1.54
30000	1.00	1.19	1.31
40000	1.00	1.14	1.14
60000	1.00	1.07	1.00
80000	1.00	1.02	1.00

It is important to remember that APA had no data for districts under 1,500 students so the size adjustments may change as better information becomes available in later phases of the study.

Total Costs for School Districts

All the costs reflect an 18 month period for implementation as examined in this study. The School Readiness component shows the range of costs from a low of about \$2.6 million up to about \$13.3 million. Again, these figures reflect differences associated with districts' varying expectations on how much new work will have to be done to prepare for the new assessment. Once the assessment is available a more final estimate can be created. The per pupil average costs range from \$3.12 per pupil up to \$15.95 per pupil. The Content Standards component has an estimated total cost of about \$126 million dollars. This is an average of \$151.27 per pupil. Again, once better information is gathered for districts with less than 1,500 students a more precise estimate will be made. No costs have been estimated at the current time for the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness component. This decision is based upon too many unknown variables on expectations, definitions and assessments.

Component 1: School Readiness	Component 2: New Content Standards	Component 3: Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Total
\$2,596,988 to \$13,277,343	\$125,915,881	Could Not Estimate at this Time	\$128,512,869 to \$139,193,224

This would be an average of \$154.39 to \$167.22 per student for Components 1 and 2.

Institutions of Higher Education

APA, at the advice DHE, determined that the most appropriate way to reach out to institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) would be to survey them individually. APA created a similar collection device to the one used with school districts that gave a starting list of tasks, previously reviewed by DHE, that IHEs may be undertaking as a result of CAP4K. The device then asked the IHEs to identify what resources were needed to accomplish these tasks. IHEs were allowed to modify the list of tasks as they saw fit. This collection device is available in Appendix B.

General Tasks Undertaken

Planning to incorporate any needed changes to Teacher Preparation Program (Components 1, 2, and 3): As a result of CAP4K, IHEs will likely need to modify their Teacher Preparation Programs to properly

educate students on the new expectations of school readiness and postsecondary and workforce readiness, as well as on the new content standards.

Determining any needed changes to course descriptions and materials (Components 1, 2, and 3): IHEs will need to update course descriptions and materials, such as course catalogs and website content, to reflect possible changes to their Teacher Preparation Programs, admissions requirements, or remediation classes.

Participating in the Development of the School Readiness, Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness, or New Content Standards (Components 1, 2, and 3): Unique to community colleges, some instructors from these institutions participated in the development of the new standards.

Participating in Stakeholder Meetings (Components 1, 2, and 3): IHEs participated in stakeholder meetings through DHE and CDE.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) Tasks

Planning for any needed changes to admissions requirements (Component 3): Changes to graduation requirements that occur as a result of CAP4K could impact IHE admissions policies if students that meet a certain set of requirements are guaranteed IHE admission. The amount of cost would ultimately depend on the degree to which new graduation requirements mirror existing admissions requirements.

Planning for any changes to how remediation needs will be assessed or for how remediation will be provided (Component 3): If students graduate high school ready for postsecondary success this would likely lower the burden on IHEs to provide remediation.

Total Costs by Component for Higher Education Institutions

Ultimately, two institutions returned APA's collection device in the time provided. Other IHEs indicated to DHE that they would be unable to do so. At that time, DHE determined that it would be best if DHE created estimates for the remaining institutions collectively. These estimates were created by type of institution (such as research versus moderately selective) to reflect the differences in costs that would occur for each group. DHE applied a previously created cost estimate formula to estimate costs by institution.

The table below displays the total costs by component for each type of institution. Please note that totals reflect costs to all institutions (number indicated in parentheses) of a certain type.

Type of Institution	Component 1: School Readiness	Component 2: New Content Standards	Component 3: Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Total
4 Year Institutions				
Research (6)	\$72,000	\$442,080	\$302,400	\$816,480
Moderately Selective (5)	\$36,000	\$230,000	\$175,000	\$441,000
Modified Open (1)	\$1,280	\$8,400	\$7,000	\$16,680
2 Year Institutions				
Community College (15)	\$83,094	\$171,430	\$18,497	\$273,021
All Institutions	\$192,374	\$851,910	\$502,897	\$1,547,181

This would be \$7.08 per student using DHE’s 2008 head count enrollment figures.

Costs to All Entities during Phase I

In each of the previous sections APA attempted to assign a cost to the activities each entity was undertaking; this was easier to do in the cases of CDE and DHE, but more difficult for school districts and higher education institutions. School districts, in particular, are only beginning to implement CAP4K and their understanding of what will be required is limited; as such, it is difficult to predict what their full costs will be. APA therefore only included costs to districts that it felt it could comfortably estimate at this time; this means that the total cost estimates shown below do not include costs to districts for the PWR component and include a range for the school readiness component. All figures in this report should be considered rough estimates only and APA intends to review and refine these figures to produce a more complete and accurate cost picture in subsequent reports. APA believes that the most important information coming out of this report are the lists of activities that each entity is undertaking which demonstrates the scope and impact of CAP4K during Phase I.

With these caveats in mind, the total preliminary estimated costs by component for each entity are shown in the table on the following page.

Entity	Component 1: School Readiness	Component 2: New Content Standards	Component 3: Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Total
Colorado Department of Education	\$250,339	\$929,716	\$341,117	\$1,521,172
Department of Higher Education	-	-	\$178,637.66	\$178,638
K-12 School Districts	\$2,596,988 to \$13,277,343	\$125,915,881	Cannot Estimate at this Time	\$128,512,869 to \$139,193,224
Higher Education Institutions	\$192,374	\$851,910	\$502,897	\$1,547,181
Total Estimated Cost for CAP4K Phase I (Incomplete)			\$131,547,181 to \$142,440,214	