

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

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

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10

COLORADO



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2009-10 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:		
Address:		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name:		
Telephone:		
Fax:		
e-mail:		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):		
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

In November, 2007, the Colorado State Board of Education called for a comprehensive review of Colorado Model Content Standards. Subsequent legislation was drafted and resulted in the passage of Senate Bill 212 (SB 08-212) in May 2008. SB 08-212 requires:

1. Alignment of Early Childhood Education, K-12, and Higher Education standards;
2. Moving Colorado's education system into the 21st century;
3. Adoption of descriptions for school readiness, postsecondary and workforce readiness and 21st century skills, and;
4. Assuring that more students are ready for postsecondary options.

In addition, House Bill 08-1168 was also passed that required standards to be developed specifically for Personal Financial Literacy. CDE has determined that the Personal Financial Literacy expectations will exist within both Mathematics and Economics. The Personal Financial Literacy expectations that are determined to have assessable components will be embedded in Mathematics, the others will be embedded in Economics.

254 Coloradans participated in the revision process. The group represents a diverse and inclusive set of K-12 educators, higher education experts, Career and Technical Education professionals, early childhood experts, business leaders, military personnel and public policy leaders. The review process is designed to be:

1. Research based --WestEd and the Colorado Department of Education collaborated to gather research both nationally and internationally. WestEd is producing a review and gap analysis for each content area.
2. Inclusive --Educators, citizens, higher education, business and industry members have been invited to participate in the review process
3. Transparent --All updates, notes, and deliberations are posted on the CDE website on a page dedicated to the standards review

December 2009, the Colorado State Board of Education unanimously adopted the new Colorado Academic Standards in mathematics, reading, writing and communicating, Science, and seven other content areas and English language proficiency standards.

On August 2, 2010, the Colorado State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards in mathematics and English language arts. Per the adoption guidelines, the Colorado Department of Education is currently working to enhance the Common Core State Standards with aspects of the Colorado Academic Standards which are required by state law and will ensure a vertical and horizontal alignment within and among the content standards. Colorado anticipates release of the updated standards in early 2011.

The Colorado Department of Education is currently involved in a comprehensive implementation plan for the new standards. Districts are expected to adopt standards which meet or exceed the state standards by December 2012.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Also included in Senate Bill 212 (SB 08-212), the Colorado Department of Education was required to revise its statewide assessment system to align to the P-12 Colorado Academic Standards.

The timeline below is in reference to both the new regular summative assessments and the new alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards.

Fall of 2009 -Fall 2010: Conducted stakeholder meetings to develop the attributes of the new assessment system, including the summative assessments required under ESEA. 135 Coloradans participated in the process. The group represented a diverse and inclusive set of K-12 educators, higher education experts, Career and Technical Education professionals, early childhood experts, business leaders, military personnel and public policy leaders. Like the standards review process, the assessment process was also designed to be research-based, inclusive and transparent.

Fall 2009 - Fall 2010: Colorado Department of Education and the Colorado Board of Higher Ed met regularly regarding the new assessment system's attributes

November 2010: Present initial recommendations for the attributes of the new assessment system to the Board.

December 2010: Board expected to adopt the attributes of the new assessment system.

Spring 2011: Writing and release of RFSP

Summer 2011: Review of proposals and negotiating of contract(s)

Fall of 2011: Award of new contract(s)

2011-2012: Item development

Spring 2012: New item type exposure to the field

Summer and fall 2012: Pilot materials development and production

Spring 2013: Piloting of full forms

Summer and fall 2013: Materials development and production, including accommodated materials

Spring 2014: Operational administration, scoring, standard setting, adoption of performance level descriptors and cutscores, and establishment of scales

Summer 2014: Reporting

It is important to note that the new assessment development work is being conducted while Colorado also participates in and follows the work of the national consortia. The timeline of activities, above, could be altered based on the consortia's progress or altered due to state funding issues.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	20.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	80.0
Comments:	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments:	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (*LEP*) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	483,871	477,196	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,798	5,670	97.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,265	18,069	98.9
Black, non-Hispanic	29,376	28,883	98.3
Hispanic	137,482	135,998	98.9
White, non-Hispanic	292,931	288,560	98.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	48,795	47,461	97.3
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	50,657	50,166	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	189,677	187,239	98.7
Migratory students	2,020	2,005	99.3
Male	247,595	244,033	98.6
Female	236,241	233,131	98.7
Comments:			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,522	32.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,329	57.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,610	9.7
Total	47,461	
Comments:		

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	483,753	476,652	98.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,793	5,656	97.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	18,250	18,032	98.8
Black, non-Hispanic	29,355	28,830	98.2
Hispanic	137,498	135,777	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	292,817	288,319	98.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	48,801	47,355	97.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	50,636	49,970	98.7
Economically disadvantaged students	189,603	186,813	98.5
Migratory students	2,030	2,009	99.0
Male	247,535	243,677	98.4
Female	236,161	232,923	98.6
Comments:			

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	16,880	35.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,813	54.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,662	9.8
Total	47,355	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	177,214	174,702	98.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,158	2,110	97.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,504	6,439	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	10,804	10,582	97.9
Hispanic	48,913	48,220	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	108,826	107,344	98.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,302	16,791	97.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,903	14,702	98.7
Economically disadvantaged students	65,891	64,818	98.4
Migratory students	690	684	99.1
Male	90,513	89,211	98.6
Female	86,683	85,475	98.6
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,172	36.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,997	53.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,593	9.5
Total	16,762	
Comments: Some students with disabilities were counted twice as non-participants because they did not receive a valid score on either CSAP or CSAP-Alternate, but these two data sets cannot be cross-referenced at this time.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (*LEP*) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,715	57,638	91.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	725	652	89.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,462	2,332	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,676	3,000	81.6
Hispanic	19,055	16,371	85.9
White, non-Hispanic	36,796	35,282	95.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,136	4,303	70.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,930	8,952	81.9
Economically disadvantaged students	27,138	23,460	86.4
Migratory students	281	221	78.6
Male	31,926	29,226	91.5
Female	30,785	28,409	92.3
Comments:			

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,776	55,358	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	727	623	85.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,459	2,236	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,667	2,934	80.0
Hispanic	19,019	15,068	79.2
White, non-Hispanic	36,903	34,497	93.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,153	3,365	54.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,868	7,859	72.3
Economically disadvantaged students	27,078	21,740	80.3
Migratory students	286	204	71.3
Male	31,956	27,472	86.0
Female	30,816	27,884	90.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,941	56,572	91.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	702	593	84.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,380	2,247	94.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,781	3,111	82.3
Hispanic	18,829	15,969	84.8
White, non-Hispanic	36,248	34,651	95.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,409	4,184	65.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,323	7,256	77.8
Economically disadvantaged students	26,772	22,837	85.3
Migratory students	300	248	82.7
Male	31,684	28,834	91.0
Female	30,256	27,737	91.7
Comments:			

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,903	55,453	89.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	695	588	84.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,373	2,200	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,776	3,118	82.6
Hispanic	18,832	15,272	81.1
White, non-Hispanic	36,223	34,271	94.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,392	3,597	56.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,306	6,495	69.8
Economically disadvantaged students	26,746	22,004	82.3
Migratory students	300	215	71.7
Male	31,666	27,661	87.4
Female	30,234	27,789	91.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,524	55,024	90.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	693	577	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,263	2,128	94.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,721	2,991	80.4
Hispanic	18,006	15,302	85.0
White, non-Hispanic	35,838	34,025	94.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,613	4,106	62.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,266	5,499	75.7
Economically disadvantaged students	25,551	21,604	84.6
Migratory students	272	206	75.7
Male	30,943	27,834	90.0
Female	29,577	27,188	91.9
Comments:			

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,486	53,481	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	691	550	79.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,252	2,054	91.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,728	3,003	80.6
Hispanic	17,999	14,368	79.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,794	33,486	93.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,614	3,450	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,244	4,673	64.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,514	20,466	80.2
Migratory students	271	196	72.3
Male	30,913	26,610	86.1
Female	29,552	26,852	90.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,650	52,329	86.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	694	545	78.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,260	2,019	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,706	2,699	72.8
Hispanic	18,015	13,382	74.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,973	33,683	93.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,574	3,811	58.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,265	4,078	56.1
Economically disadvantaged students	25,509	19,332	75.8
Migratory students	271	170	62.7
Male	30,979	26,669	86.1
Female	29,667	25,657	86.5
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,569	51,972	87.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	721	571	79.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,279	2,120	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,700	2,799	75.6
Hispanic	17,169	13,467	78.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,699	33,014	92.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,290	3,283	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,112	3,817	62.5
Economically disadvantaged students	24,362	19,037	78.1
Migratory students	253	167	66.0
Male	30,321	25,990	85.7
Female	29,246	25,980	88.8
Comments:			

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,479	53,894	90.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	719	621	86.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,276	2,118	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,689	3,112	84.4
Hispanic	17,131	14,198	82.9
White, non-Hispanic	35,664	33,845	94.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,278	3,629	57.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,086	3,924	64.5
Economically disadvantaged students	24,295	20,237	83.3
Migratory students	250	185	74.0
Male	30,280	26,690	88.1
Female	29,196	27,201	93.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,470	47,914	81.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	701	490	69.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,258	2,046	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,392	2,320	68.4
Hispanic	16,442	11,353	69.0
White, non-Hispanic	35,676	31,704	88.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,944	2,472	41.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,049	2,388	47.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,815	15,822	69.3
Migratory students	248	139	56.0
Male	29,936	24,143	80.6
Female	28,531	23,769	83.3
Comments:			

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,416	51,874	88.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	700	587	83.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,255	2,061	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,393	2,761	81.4
Hispanic	16,426	13,025	79.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,640	33,438	93.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,948	3,100	52.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,032	2,748	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,795	18,236	80.0
Migratory students	248	160	64.5
Male	29,889	25,642	85.8
Female	28,523	26,229	92.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,880	46,290	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	725	516	71.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,127	1,901	89.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,512	2,247	64.0
Hispanic	15,876	10,471	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	35,638	31,153	87.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,530	2,108	38.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,288	1,780	41.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,965	14,620	66.6
Migratory students	226	124	54.9
Male	29,599	23,453	79.2
Female	28,274	22,831	80.7
Comments:			

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,805	51,555	89.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	727	619	85.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,121	1,929	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,498	2,892	82.7
Hispanic	15,838	12,679	80.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,620	33,436	93.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,505	2,896	52.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,267	2,225	52.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,923	17,710	80.8
Migratory students	228	146	64.0
Male	29,552	25,501	86.3
Female	28,245	26,049	92.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,006	44,348	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	724	492	68.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,133	1,795	84.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,487	2,070	59.4
Hispanic	15,833	9,094	57.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,827	30,896	86.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,453	2,001	36.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,274	1,004	23.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,850	13,060	59.8
Migratory students	227	89	39.2
Male	29,625	22,509	76.0
Female	28,374	21,834	77.0
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,097	79,912	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,403	764	54.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,300	3,423	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	7,101	3,365	47.4
Hispanic	30,621	15,058	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	72,665	57,296	78.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,539	2,785	26.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,198	1,556	21.6
Economically disadvantaged students	38,636	19,503	50.5
Migratory students	425	151	35.5
Male	59,624	40,925	68.6
Female	56,462	38,981	69.0
Comments:			

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	115,787	105,515	91.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,397	1,219	87.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,296	3,904	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	7,079	5,988	84.6
Hispanic	30,532	25,688	84.1
White, non-Hispanic	72,475	68,710	94.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	10,465	6,348	60.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,167	4,146	57.8
Economically disadvantaged students	38,462	32,327	84.0
Migratory students	426	305	71.6
Male	59,421	52,607	88.5
Female	56,357	52,902	93.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	56,046	39,745	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	692	409	59.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,046	1,561	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,389	1,747	51.5
Hispanic	14,372	6,951	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,544	29,074	81.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,764	1,428	30.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,163	451	14.3
Economically disadvantaged students	17,459	8,845	50.7
Migratory students	186	50	26.9
Male	28,607	20,268	70.8
Female	27,434	19,472	71.0
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,708	994	58.2
Districts	183	88	48.1
Comments:			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	662	378	57.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	430	203	47.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	232	175	75.4
Comments:			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
174	81	46.6
Comments:		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	9
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	9
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	4
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	10
Comments:	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- 1 school was closed
- 8 Changed the governance structure of the school in a significant manner that either diminishes school-based management and decision making or increases control, monitoring, and oversight of the school's operations and educational program by the LEA
- 1 Closed the school and reopened it as a focus or theme school with new staff or staff skilled in the focus area
- 1 Narrowed the grades served

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts placed on Program Improvement submit a Unified Improvement plan. The districts have received technical assistance in the development of the plan. Unified improvement planning provides a common approach for districts to prepare improvement plans required by state and federal law. More information regarding the Unified Improvement Plan process can be found here: <http://www.schoolview.org/UnifiedImprovementPlanning.asp>

Districts moving on to Corrective Action are offered the Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement to assist them in the identification of barriers that are impeding academic achievement.

CDE provides grants for district improvement processes. The District Improvement Grant can be used for a comprehensive appraisal of district programs (CADI), a self assessment process, or implementation of the findings from either of the previous processes. Both the district appraisal process and the self assessment process use rubrics based on the characteristics of high performing districts. The rubrics are used to assess performance in the following areas:

Curriculum;
Assessment;
Instruction;
District Culture;
Parent Community engagement;
Professional Development and Evaluation;
Leadership;
Organizational Effectiveness; and
Comprehensive Planning

Depending on the size of the district, the CADI process may take 2-3 weeks with teams that vary in size from 7-13. The CADI process is also a rubric based process and evidence is collected through document analysis, interviews and observations/walkthroughs. Once the report is complete, the CADI team leader works with district staff to plan a "roll out" of the findings to a variety of stakeholders in the district (i.e. School Board members, administrative staff, teaching staffs and parents and community members). Following the formal roll out, district central office staff convene meetings to develop the district's Unified Improvement Plan. Funding is available to assist with the implementation of the districts' plan.

Closing the Achievement Gap Revised

- In the fall of 2009, CDE asked the state to obligated funds to extend the CTAG project.
- The CTAG rules were revised In December 2009, to include 8 strategies that must be used as part of the grant.
- The RFP that listed eligible districts was released 2010, January.
- CDE presented a webinar February 2010, to explain the CTAG proposal process and program expectations.
- After the proposals were reviewed in early March 2010, applicants received the award and denial letters before the end of the March.
- In April 2010, CDE announced that eleven additional districts agreed to join the initial 8 pilot districts in the CTAG project.
- The 11 districts are: Adams-Arapahoe School District 28J (Aurora Public Schools), Ault-Highland School District RE-9, Boulder Valley School District, Cherry Creek Schools, Colorado Springs School District 11, Douglas County Schools, East Grand School District 2, Holly School District RE-3, Littleton Public Schools, Poudre School District and Thompson School District R-2J.
- The 11 districts were selected based on persistent gaps in achievement and growth associated with race, income and low student achievement.
- The funding for the 11 districts is for one year and must be spent by June 30, 2011. Funding is limited to a maximum of \$150,000 per site. The new grantees attended a spring meeting to learn from the six school districts currently involved with the Closing the Achievement Gap pilot.
- The districts began implementation and professional development after they receive funding in spring 2010.
- They also participated in plc meetings and achievement calls with CDE staff and if appropriate, their provider, to discuss progress and challenges.
- These 11 districts were not required to partner with a provider, only to align their improvement plan with at least one of the strategies approved by CDE.
- In November 2010, CDE conducted a Fall PLC in Denver, CO to allow an opportunity for the districts to share successes and challenges.
- A Request for Documented Quotation for a formal program evaluation will be posted in 2011, January.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	6
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	8	7
Schools	23	23
Comments: Districts and schools can appeal a single target; they do not need to appeal the entire determination. 8 districts appealed at least one target, 7 of which had at least one target change. These resulted in changed overall AYP determination for 3 districts. As the LEAs are responsible for school determinations and appeals, we only receive information about successful appeals. 23 schools were noted by districts as having appealed determinations. 6 appeals were for AYP reading only, 4 were for AYP math only, and 7 were for both reading and math. We do not have information about the number of appeals that were submitted, but not approved.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	09/22/10
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	16,862	84,308
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	11,740	68,121
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	69.6	80.8
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	16,841	84,116
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	13,100	73,819
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	77.8	87.8
Comments:		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	16
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	0

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	44
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<p>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)</p> <p>If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</p> <p>(See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</p> <p>This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
1		19	0	0	B	
6 = Combo 1	1 and 2	19	0	0	D	B and C
7 = Combo 2	1, 2, and 3	19	0	0	D	B and C
5	One of four intervention models: Closure, Restart, Turnaround or Transformation	19			D	Planning year- no data. A process was developed for vetting vendors. CD supported districts and schools in selecting vendors.
5	The CDE provided technical assistance through the use of school support team (SST) reviews.	25	0	0	D	School Support Team: this was a planning year without data. There was positive improvement in schools that received both the school improvement grant school support team review process. See description of progress in "Title I School Improvement Grant booklet from Analysis to Achievement. A process was developed for vetting vendors. CD supported districts and schools in selecting vendors.
	6 districts were identified as CDE partners to Close the Achievement					Districts implemented plans that identified research based strategies to CTAG. Evaluation determined by the success of diminishing gaps compared when compared to state

5	Gap	20			D	gaps.

Comments:

Column 1 Response Options Box	
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.	
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.	
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.	
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.	
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.	
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.	
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.	
8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.	

Column 6 Response Options Box	
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells	
B = Increased teacher retention	
C = Improved parental involvement	
D = Other	

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools and districts that have received school and district level grants participated in numerous informational meetings and in a facilitated review debriefing process that provided staffs with an understanding about the recommend practices. Recommended practices are those based in research (e.g. the need to have a standards based instruction program) and have shown the most effectiveness with struggling schools. Schools and districts then prioritized the recommended strategies for implementation so that the school or district improvement plan included the most relevant strategies for effective improvements. The CDE website provides information about effective strategies on the Professional Development and School Support Program website. This website provides information aligned to the standards used to analyze performance in the district and school reviews.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1003(g) Tiered Intervention Grant: Technical assistance for schools and districts in writing their Unified Improvement Plans and Tiered Intervention Grant applications using results from the school reviews to determine the appropriate intervention model. Support was also provided to schools and districts in communications with staff, parents, community, boards, and other stakeholders.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	62,341
Applied to transfer	1,099
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,099
Comments:	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 682,258

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	12

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	41,231
Applied for supplemental educational services	8,839
Received supplemental educational services	8,007
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 7,209,950
Comments: This data (and also 1.4.9.1.3) are not yet final as CDE is still reviewing the Annual Financial Reports from districts. Final data will be submitted during the re-open process.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	257,785	255,281	99.0	2,504	1.0
All elementary classes	159,142	157,938	99.2	1,204	0.8
All secondary classes	98,643	97,343	98.7	1,300	1.3

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado uses a departmentalized approach where an elementary classroom is counted multiple times so that the data is comparable from the elementary to secondary level.
--

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	19.5
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	16.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	33.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	30.5
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes both regular ed and special education teachers who do not have subject-matter competency and are not fully certified.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	15.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	12.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	66.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	6.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes both regular ed and special education teachers who do not have subject-matter competency and are not fully certified.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	40,937	40,658	99.3
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	44,014	43,817	99.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	19,637	19,309	98.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	37,325	37,047	99.3

1.5.4 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	70.8	20.7
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced price lunch.	
Secondary schools	58.4	20.8
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced price lunch.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other programs include: Push-in, After school tutoring, Spanish Language Arts, Co-Teaching: content-based and ELD instruction, One-on-one classroom instruction - English in a Flash computer software, ECELL, Immersion, individual tutoring based on specific student need and developmental level, Literacy based ESL, Newcomer Program, Sheltered Content Instruction, Daily ELD Blocks, and Inclusion with pull out available.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	106,566
Comments:	

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	106,381
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	91,405
Vietnamese	1,834
Arabic	1,216
Chinese	1,160
Russian	1,014

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	94,525
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	388
Total	94,913
Comments: The total LEP population (106566) reported in question 1.6.2.1 counts any student (non-duplicated) who was coded as NEP or LEP in Colorado either in January at the CELAPro count and/or in the End of Year data file (which looks at students' status for the entire school year). Students who have left the state before January or entered school in the state in February after CELApro are in the Student EOY but not in the CELApro file. There is tremendous mobility of LEP students in Colorado.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	7,193
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	7.6
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	94,372
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	386
Total	94,758
Comments: The Title III LEP population (106381) reported in question 1.6.2.1 counts any student (non-duplicated) who was coded as NEP or LEP in Colorado either in January at the CELAPro count and/or in the End of Year data file (which looks at students' status for the entire school year). Students who have left the state before January or entered school in the state in February after CELAPro are in the Student EOY but not in the CELAPro file. There is tremendous mobility of LEP students in Colorado.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	19,393

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	36,251	48.3		48.00
Attained proficiency	7,186	7.6		5.00

Comments:

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>Yes</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,299	6,225	11,524
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
11,488	9,739	84.8	1,749
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
11,469	10,945	95.4	524
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,140	3,087	74.6	1,053
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	63
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	17
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	51
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	60
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	17
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	41
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	41
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	27

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years reflects the number who have not met AMAOs for 2 or 3 consecutive years.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The state did not make AYP for ELLs.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
10,719	4,132	22

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) ð The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course ð (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	3,518
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,000

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	135	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	105	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	80	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	51	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	74	
Other (Explain in comment box)	29	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	126	19,011
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	94	4,157
PD provided to principals	100	1,098
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	72	467
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	60	2,505
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	1,338
Total	475	28,576

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Subgrantees in the tables above include district Grantees (LEAs) and districts signing over dollars to Consortium LEAs. Other includes: Quality Standards for Online Education, Six Pillars of Quality Online Education, Components of High Quality Online Classes, Alpine Rtl Training, Enhancing online classes with video, Podcasting, developing cultural proficiency, Technology - use of SMART Boards, Differentiation, SIOP Model 1, Development of an ELL resource handbook, research based strategies for poverty and minority students, Co-teaching Approaches and Structures, Math recovery/number sense, equity trainings, Community Leadership Forum, Reading First, Technology/21st Century Skills, & Reading Plus, Instructional strategies for ELL students in the general education classroom, Professional Learning Communities for ELL teachers, and District ELA Policies and Procedures for Administrators.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/09	7/1/09	30
<p>Comments: Preliminary allocations, based on USDE's preliminary allocations, are available to districts in the Spring of each year for budgeting and application process purposes. These are provided with anticipation that LEAs applying for funds will have Substantial Approval by July 1st. Applications and budgets are due by June 30th of each year. However, application extensions are granted to LEAs that request them.</p> <p>Each LEA application is reviewed on a case-by-case basis within 30 days of receipt. After review, each LEA is notified that its application has been given final approval, substantial approval, or no approval. If the Department is unable to give an application final approval, the LEA is notified of the changes that must be made in order to give the application final approval. Substantial approval means that an LEA may obligate funds but may not draw down funds. Once an LEA has received final approval of its application, funds are available for drawdown. However, any carryover funds continue to be made available to districts prior to final approval of its current application.</p> <p>Also, Colorado does not allow any LEA to drawdown funds until Colorado receives grant award notification from USDE, which typically occurs in mid-July. However, funds are available for LEA draw down as soon as Colorado receives its award notification from USDE and the Department has established that the LEA has met federal and state NCLB requirements for release of the funds.</p>		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: There were no persistently dangerous schools in Colorado last year. The EDEN system does not populate "0" in this report for some reason.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	55.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.7
Black, non-Hispanic	64.4
Hispanic	57.8
White, non-Hispanic	82.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	66.5
Limited English proficient	54.4
Economically disadvantaged	62.5
Migratory students	58.9
Male	71.4
Female	78.0
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5.0
Hispanic	6.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	2.4
Limited English proficient	6.7
Economically disadvantaged	4.1
Migratory students	5.2
Male	3.8
Female	3.4
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	131	131
LEAs with subgrants	49	49
Total	180	180
Comments: LEAs with subgrants includes 2 BOCES (Board of Cooperative Education Services).		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	119	1,088
K	266	1,442
1	268	1,380
2	276	1,368
3	258	1,257
4	235	1,221
5	207	1,105
6	218	979
7	191	901
8	191	870
9	187	987
10	171	747
11	197	833
12	335	903
Ungraded	1	207
Total	3,120	15,288
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	380	1,926
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,411	12,083
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	50	634
Hotels/Motels	279	645
Total	3,120	15,288
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,088
K	1,442
1	1,380
2	1,368
3	1,257
4	1,221
5	1,105
6	979
7	901
8	870
9	987
10	747
11	833
12	903
Ungraded	207
Total	15,288
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	953
Migratory children/youth	684
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,301
Limited English proficient students	2,510
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	18
Expedited evaluations	10
Staff professional development and awareness	27
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	21
Transportation	19
Early childhood programs	12
Assistance with participation in school programs	23
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	13
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	17
Coordination between schools and agencies	27
Counseling	17
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	13
Clothing to meet a school requirement	20
School supplies	29
Referral to other programs and services	24
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	24
Other (optional – in comment box below)	18
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	8
School Selection	6
Transportation	10
School records	7
Immunizations	6
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	4

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- 1) Financial barriers- there are not enough resources to serve the significant need.
 - 2) School staff and principals still do not understand McKinney-Vento
 - 3) Costs sharing for transportation with other districts
 - 4) Guiding families through social services, legal services and other processes with outside agencies

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	817	623
4	798	628
5	745	556
6	609	470
7	543	396
8	587	450
High School	989	759
Comments:		

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *ESEA* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	833	689
4	797	639
5	747	606
6	615	441
7	549	329
8	588	339
High School	998	411
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

b. How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	602
K	306
1	353
2	364
3	342
4	370
5	312
6	295
7	282
8	274
9	282
10	236
11	200
12	171
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	497
Total	4,886

Comments: Ungraded count is being submitted as zero. The increase in counts by grade level increased from what was previously submitted in December 2010. When the data was pulled to populate this category the enrollments used were from the 2010 period (summer) and should have been from the 2009 period. Therefore, resulting in the fluctuation of numbers by grade levels. We have since rectified the issue and updated our information.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Colorado MEP Category 1 count decrease is attributed to several factors:

1. Migrant families who have ended their 3 year eligibility and elected to remain permanent residents and discontinue migration.
2. A decline in the number of available temporary agricultural employment opportunities, based on the current OME ID&R policy.
3. State immigration has substantially influenced mobility particularly for our men and youth who have been disproportionately hit by the changing economic conditions and the dwindling budgets for public services. (e.g. Health care, housing and educational opportunities)

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9
K	16
1	14
2	18
3	20
4	12
5	16
6	9
7	7
8	9
9	16
10	16
11	11
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	183
Comments: Ungraded count is being submitted as zero.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Colorado MEP Category 2 count decrease is attributed to several factors:

1. Migrant families who have ended their 3 year eligibility and elected to remain permanent residents and discontinue migration.
2. A decline in the number of available temporary agricultural employment opportunities, based on the current OME ID&R policy.
3. State immigration has substantially influenced mobility particularly for our men and youth who have been disproportionately hit by the changing economic conditions and the dwindling budgets for public services. (e.g. Health care, housing and educational opportunities)
4. State and local budget deficits have negatively impacted district summer schools.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The States migrant COMEP database system along with the MEP program local databases were used to compile and generate the Category 1 and 2 child counts for the 2009-10 reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child data was collected for attending, non-attending (residency only), and for two year olds turning three students.

1. Category 1 and 2 attending data counts were verified by district attendance and validated against the Departments Student End of Year Reporting.
2. Category 1 non-attending data counts were verified by MEP programs completing a home visit to report the identification residency only student's present during the reporting period.
3. Category 1 and 2 students who were two years old turning three data counts were verified by MEP programs completing a home visit to report the identification of the students present during the reporting period.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The enrollments for attending and non-attending are entered by MEP program personnel. MEP program personnel input data which is reviewed, approved, or denied by the SEA migrant data specialist before being added to the migrant student count.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All enrollments for the Category 2 count were entered by the MEP program personnel into the COMEP database if the student was enrolled in a district held summer program and received services. The Category 2 enrollments are monitored by the SEA prior to being included in the migrant summer counts.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21;
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2009-10 unduplicated migrant student count is based upon qualified migrant students who meet the federal eligibility requirements for that reporting period.

The regular, summer/intersession and residency only enrollments include an enrollment date if the student was enrolled for at least one day during the reporting period.

If the student is between the ages of 3-21 years old for at least one day during the reporting period.

The student's qualifying arrival date for any enrollment within the state or district must be within three years of the reporting period.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count is an unduplicated count of MEP students who received either instructional or support supplemental services funded by MEP funds during the summer/intersession term.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's Quality Control System facilitates multiple reviews of every certificate of eligibility, first by MEP program data specialist and ID&R coordinators, second by SEA data specialist, auditors and validation committee members. The SEA conducts MEP program ID&R trainings, as well as, bi-annual and quarterly SEA ID&R trainings with technical assistance visits as needed to support best practices that comply with federal regulations.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA auditor and validation committee randomly reviews certificate of eligibility submissions. Students who do not meet the federal requirements are denied before they become part of the State's migrant student counts. The SEA auditor and validation committee reviewed randomly 100 COE's.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA reviews each submission and either approves/denies it on a case by case basis. The SEA verifies that no duplicate students are reported in the State's migrant counts by annually running reports to verify eligibility and accuracy.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEP Program Personnel review migrant student enrollments against the district attendance rosters for the current reporting period. A final validation is run against the Department's Student End of Year report to reaffirm accuracy. Any inaccuracies are removed and not reported on the State's migrant student counts.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA conducts statewide ID&R training through teleconferencing, program site visits, program director meetings, and at the Statewide Migrant Conference. The SEA publishes an annually-updated ID&R manual based upon the current guidance of the Office of Migrant Education. The State provides weekly correspondence to the field regarding Migrant ID&R policy, procedure and guidance.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Training on OME's eligibility determination changes and federal requirements and the national COE was conducted throughout the State. Additional Training will be held to address the 2010 Chapter 2 Eligibility Requirements published by OME.