

# 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 2007-08**

**COLORADO**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**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) 2007-08 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 EDFacts 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 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 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-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

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

Address:  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450  
Denver, CO 80202

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Patrick Chapman

Telephone: 303-866-6780

Fax: 303-866-6637

e-mail: chapman\_p@cde.state.co.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Patrick Chapman

Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:00:01 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB 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 taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 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 readiness, 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 Financial Literacy. CDE has determined that the Financial Literacy standards will exist within both Mathematics and Economics. The Financial Literacy standards that are determined to have assessable components will be embedded in Mathematics, the others will be embedded in Economics.

As a first step in enacting the standards review requirements of SB 08-212, Commissioner Dwight Jones appointed a Stakeholder group of 25 members to develop recommendations regarding the update of the Colorado State Standards. The group represents a diverse and inclusive set of K-12 educators, higher education experts, early childhood experts, business leaders, 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

In September 2008, more than 700 Colorado citizens applied to participate on one of the thirteen content review subcommittees. The Stakeholders group blindly vetted the applications and made 220 appointments to these subcommittees. The review subcommittees are geographically and ethnically diverse and represent all sectors of the community, to include ECE, K-12 educators and administrators, higher education, CTE, business, and parents.

The review is comprised in three phases. Phase I will take place between January 10 and March 28, 2009, and will include Mathematics, Science, Reading & Writing, Music, and Financial Literacy.

Drafts of the reviews and recommendations of the content subcommittees will be overseen by the Stakeholder group, CDE Content Specialist and the Office of Standards and Assessments. CRESST, a third-party review organization from UCLA will perform an independent study to ensure alignment and cohesion among and between content areas. The State Board of Education is required by SB 08-212 to adopt the revised Colorado Model Content Standards in December 2009.

Once adopted, the revised standards will be made available to local school districts for adoption and implementation beginning in January 2010.

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

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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 or reading/language arts 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 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.

CDE will build a state assessment system beginning in 2010, once the content standards are revised and adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education. Colorado School Districts will begin being held accountable for the revised assessment in the Spring of 2012.

The vision of the revised state assessment system is to closely align with the revised standards and create an assessment program that is relevant and has students both demonstrate content knowledge and apply that knowledge in a way that indicates mastery of 21st century skills.

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

### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below 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 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 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.

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."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado has new science CSAP and CSAPA Alternate tests which were first administered during the 07-08 school year. Information regarding the science assessments was submitted to the peer reviewers in 5/08. We will be sending in our augmented information per the requirements stated in our meeting with the peers in 3/09.

For comprehensive information regarding the review and revision of the Colorado Model Content Standards please visit this link: [http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/documents/OSA/stand\\_rev.html](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/documents/OSA/stand_rev.html) .

The standards review and revisions are to be finished and approved by 12/09.

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

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	468,177	464,230	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,631	5,561	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,180	16,086	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	28,524	28,179	98.8
Hispanic	129,369	128,091	99.0
White, non-Hispanic	288,465	286,305	99.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	48,608	47,756	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	43,053	42,662	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	164,464	162,883	99.0
Migratory students	3,471	3,448	99.3
Male	239,631	237,508	99.1
Female	228,515	226,691	99.2

**Comments: There are slight differences between the number of ELL and IEP students reported here and in section 1.3. The differences are a result of how students who were marked as taking the test, but actually received a "no score" were included in AYP calculations. This will be taken care of in the 2007-2008 calculations.**

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 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. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,070	35.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,052	54.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,634	9.7
Total	47,756	

**Comments: There are slight differences between the number of ELL and IEP students reported here and in section 1.3. The differences are a result of how students who were marked as taking the test, but actually received a "no score" were included in AYP calculations. This will be taken care of in the 2007-2008 calculations.**

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

### 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 NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	467,962	463,382	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,629	5,540	98.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,176	16,049	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	28,519	28,120	98.6
Hispanic	129,309	127,751	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	288,319	285,912	99.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	48,583	47,590	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	43,061	42,504	98.7
Economically disadvantaged students	164,470	162,530	98.8
Migratory students	3,463	3,424	98.9
Male	239,491	236,971	99.0
Female	228,432	226,375	99.1

**Comments: There are slight differences between the number of ELL and IEP students reported here and in section 1.3. The differences are a result of how students who were marked as taking the test, but actually received a "no score" were included in AYP calculations. This will be taken care of in the 2007-2008 calculations.**

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

### 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 NCLB 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. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,757	37.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,179	52.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,654	9.8
Total	47,590	
<b>Comments: There are slight differences between the number of ELL and IEP students reported here and in section 1.3. The differences are a result of how students who were marked as taking the test, but actually received a "no score" were included in AYP calculations. This will be taken care of in the 2007-2008 calculations.</b>		

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

### 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 NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	172,870	170,775	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,109	2,068	98.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,895	5,847	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	10,472	10,295	98.3
Hispanic	45,886	45,241	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	108,504	107,320	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,232	16,852	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,274	13,072	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students	56,803	56,009	98.6
Migratory students	1,182	1,166	98.6
Male	88,167	87,070	98.8
Female	84,694	83,696	98.8

**Comments: There are slight differences between the number of ELL and IEP students reported here and in section 1.3. The differences are a result of how students who were marked as taking the test, but actually received a "no score" were included in AYP calculations. This will be taken care of in the 2007-2008 calculations.**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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 NCLB science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,800	40.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,449	50.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,603	9.5
Total	16,852	

**Comments: There are slight differences between the number of ELL and IEP students reported here and in section 1.3. The differences are a result of how students who were marked as taking the test, but actually received a "no score" were included in AYP calculations. This will be taken care of in the 2007-2008 calculations.**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB 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 in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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.

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

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

#### **1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (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.

### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	59,964	54,961	91.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	686	600	87.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,162	2,074	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,657	2,970	81.2
Hispanic	18,108	15,358	84.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,337	33,946	96.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,519	4,647	71.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,696	6,802	78.2
Economically disadvantaged students	24,045	20,433	85.0
Migratory students	500	414	82.8
Male	30,711	28,063	91.4
Female	29,235	26,882	92.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	59,920	53,080	88.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	683	564	82.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,159	1,997	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,655	2,912	79.7
Hispanic	18,035	14,452	80.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,355	33,123	93.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,483	3,807	58.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,689	6,131	70.6
Economically disadvantaged students	24,029	19,322	80.4
Migratory students	498	371	74.5
Male	30,643	26,468	86.4
Female	29,243	26,581	90.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not assessed in 3rd grade.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	58,970	53,520	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	683	572	83.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,150	2,050	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,614	2,874	79.5
Hispanic	17,337	14,432	83.2
White, non-Hispanic	35,175	33,583	95.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,670	4,375	65.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,389	5,362	72.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,242	19,336	83.2
Migratory students	498	378	75.9
Male	30,039	27,335	91.0
Female	28,917	26,173	90.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	58,953	52,614	89.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	685	568	82.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,141	2,016	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,610	2,948	81.7
Hispanic	17,355	13,815	79.6
White, non-Hispanic	35,149	33,255	94.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,651	3,894	58.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,362	4,775	64.9
Economically disadvantaged students	23,241	18,693	80.4
Migratory students	496	340	68.5
Male	30,022	26,282	87.5
Female	28,919	26,321	91.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4**

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
<b>Grade 4</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not assessed at the 4th grade level in Colorado.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	57,776	52,719	91.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	675	590	87.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,106	2,028	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,327	2,696	81.0
Hispanic	16,553	13,944	84.2
White, non-Hispanic	35,109	33,455	95.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,474	4,219	65.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,233	4,613	74.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,955	18,494	84.2
Migratory students	491	384	78.2
Male	29,512	26,745	90.6
Female	28,258	25,968	91.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	57,725	50,843	88.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	674	544	80.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,103	1,965	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,321	2,667	80.3
Hispanic	16,529	12,749	77.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,090	32,910	93.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,445	3,499	54.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,213	3,658	58.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,925	17,078	77.9
Migratory students	483	310	64.2
Male	29,479	25,421	86.2
Female	28,236	25,413	90.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5**

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	57,732	48,636	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	673	515	76.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,107	1,896	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3,320	2,343	70.6
Hispanic	16,532	11,223	67.9
White, non-Hispanic	35,092	32,652	93.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,459	3,715	57.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,229	2,802	45.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,958	15,390	70.1
Migratory students	492	254	51.6
Male	29,496	25,048	84.9
Female	28,231	23,584	83.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	57,682	50,081	86.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	716	579	80.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,040	1,919	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,510	2,534	72.2
Hispanic	15,973	12,255	76.7
White, non-Hispanic	35,431	32,784	92.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,312	3,302	52.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,191	3,087	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,304	16,233	76.2
Migratory students	447	312	69.8
Male	29,532	25,312	85.7
Female	28,137	24,759	88.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	57,617	52,072	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	712	627	88.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,036	1,895	93.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,517	2,944	83.7
Hispanic	15,942	12,889	80.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,395	33,705	95.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,301	3,706	58.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,167	2,983	57.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21,262	17,263	81.2
Migratory students	440	306	69.5
Male	29,489	25,951	88.0
Female	28,112	26,110	92.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6**

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not assessed in 6th grade in Colorado.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	57,646	46,804	81.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	658	475	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,050	1,867	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3,463	2,278	65.8
Hispanic	15,596	10,404	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	35,862	31,768	88.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,136	2,575	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,513	2,018	44.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,342	13,625	67.0
Migratory students	436	241	55.3
Male	29,744	23,723	79.8
Female	27,885	23,069	82.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	57,605	50,396	87.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	658	540	82.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,050	1,878	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,461	2,771	80.1
Hispanic	15,587	11,902	76.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,834	33,294	92.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,127	3,148	51.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,507	2,202	48.9
Economically disadvantaged students	20,330	15,593	76.7
Migratory students	436	255	58.5
Male	29,713	25,015	84.2
Female	27,876	25,371	91.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7**

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science is not assessed in the 7th grade in Colorado.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	57,563	44,064	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	758	487	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,899	1,675	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,566	2,064	57.9
Hispanic	15,397	9,054	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,930	30,775	85.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,777	2,021	35.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,818	1,336	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19,865	11,745	59.1
Migratory students	391	189	48.3
Male	29,510	22,588	76.5
Female	28,038	21,466	76.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	57,501	50,752	88.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	756	636	84.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,899	1,755	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,558	2,853	80.2
Hispanic	15,364	11,946	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,909	33,549	93.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,780	2,974	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,801	1,861	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19,835	15,344	77.4
Migratory students	389	242	62.2
Male	29,461	25,207	85.6
Female	28,024	25,530	91.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8**

	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
<b>Grade 8</b>			
All students	57,544	42,850	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	757	486	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,900	1,581	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,556	1,901	53.5
Hispanic	15,401	8,136	52.8
White, non-Hispanic	35,922	30,741	85.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,775	2,211	38.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,804	862	22.7
Economically disadvantaged students	19,869	10,785	54.3
Migratory students	389	142	36.5
Male	29,495	22,219	75.3
Female	28,043	20,627	73.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,883	78,889	67.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,427	762	53.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,693	2,904	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	7,265	3,202	44.1
Hispanic	29,711	13,351	44.9
White, non-Hispanic	74,763	58,663	78.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,069	2,746	27.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,841	1,489	21.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33,686	15,321	45.5
Migratory students	697	209	30.0
Male	59,855	40,519	67.7
Female	57,003	38,363	67.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,445	104,409	89.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,409	1,205	85.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,676	3,403	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	7,229	5,856	81.0
Hispanic	29,540	23,746	80.4
White, non-Hispanic	74,563	70,178	94.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,605	6,072	57.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,781	3,748	55.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,494	26,791	80.0
Migratory students	689	459	66.6
Male	59,582	51,392	86.3
Female	56,822	52,983	93.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	56,541	40,591	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	659	400	60.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,850	1,394	75.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,516	1,769	50.3
Hispanic	13,595	6,474	47.6
White, non-Hispanic	36,908	30,546	82.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,995	1,533	30.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,046	543	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	14,885	7,283	48.9
Migratory students	287	68	23.7
Male	28,711	20,590	71.7
Female	27,812	19,994	71.9
<b>Comments: Science is assessed at the 10th grade level in Colorado.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

#### 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 schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,687	963	57.1
Districts	184	78	42.4
<b>Comments: Decreases in the number of schools making AYP is a result of increases in the performance targets.</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 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 2007-08 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 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	604	361	59.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	368	174	47.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	236	187	79.2
<b>Comments: Decreases in the number of schools making AYP is a result of increases in the performance targets.</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 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 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
170	71	41.8
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

## 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 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and 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 2008-09 (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))
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> 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 NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	1
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	5
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 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 NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 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)	8
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	19
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

Districts 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;

Districts closed the school and reopen it as a focus or theme school with new staff or staff skilled in the focus area (e.g., math and science, dual language, communication arts);

Reconstitute the school into smaller autonomous learning communities (e.g., school-within-a-school model, learning academies, etc.)

Districts expanded or narrowed the grades served, for example, narrowing a K-8 school to a K-5 elementary school.

## 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 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and 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 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action )
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup>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.

If CDE identifies an LEA for improvement, the LEA must develop or revise an improvement plan, no later than three months after the identification. In developing or revising this plan, the LEA must consult with parents, school staff, and others. The purpose of the LEA improvement plan is to address the deficiencies in the LEA that prevent students in its schools from achieving proficiency in the core academic subjects of reading and mathematics. The improvement plan must analyze and address LEA insufficiencies as they relate to leadership for schools, governance and fiscal infrastructures, and curriculum and instruction. The plan-writing process should result in a determination of why the LEA's previous efforts to improve were ineffective and a framework of detailed action steps to improve on those efforts. LEA improvement plans are collected in January of each year and undergo a peer review process to check for likelihood of success and to ensure the inclusion of the NCLB required elements.

##### Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement

An independent, comprehensive, research-based appraisal to support districts in continuous improvement that becomes the foundation for districts to engage in a systemic assessment and strategic planning for implementation of the change process.

The Standards and Indicators for Continuous District Improvement from the basis of the appraisal process used in the district review. The standards are derived from the research on highly effective school districts. Each standard has a set of indicators that allows the appraisal team to assess the degree to which each standard is in place.

The Standards are organized in three major areas: (1) Academic Performance; (2) Learning Environment; (3) Organizational Effectiveness.

Districts use the detailed report of the appraisal as the basis for developing their District Improvement Plan.

##### Closing the Achievement Gap

This is a program to assist school districts in their efforts to close achievement gaps associated with race and/or income.

The Colorado Department of Education provided funding and services to districts whose data showed an achievement gap for minority students and/or students of poverty. Each of the six districts selected is being provided with:

- An on-site achievement gap manager
- Assistance in developing formative assessments
- Intervention services and professional development

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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 NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 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 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	46
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	46
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 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	41	38
Schools		86
<b>Comments: Districts and schools can appeal a single target. They do not need to appeal the entire determination. 41 districts appealed at least one target, and 38 of those had at least one target change. As the LEAs are responsible for school determinations and appeals, we only receive information about successful appeals. 86 schools were noted by districts as having appealed determinations. We do not have information about the number of appeals that were submitted, but not approved.</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	9/29/08
---	---------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 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 2007-08.

##### 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 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
  - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	9,935	10,816
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	6,329	6,473
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	63.7	59.8
Total number 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 2007-08	6,920	6,903
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 2007-08	69.7	63.8
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	40	
<b>Comments: The enrollment counts include students just in the tested grades, and they also include students who were not tested or did not receive a valid score. Like stated in the directions, the 06-07 column only includes data for schools funded during the 07-08 school year.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	9
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	31
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy (s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1	CDE uses its grant dollars to provide technical assistance through the use of school support team reviews and school improvement grants.	40	1	9	D	Data show that over several years, there has been a positive improvement in schools that have received both the school improvement grant and the school support team review process. See description of progress in "Title I School Improvement Grant booklet from Analysis to Achievement."
1	Six districts were identified as Closing the Achievement Gap pilot districts. As part of the pilot they received Comprehensive Appraisals for District Improvement (CADI) reviews. These reviews are similar to School Support Team reviews but are districtwide. CADI reviews support the implementation of research-based practices in districts.	46	0	1	C	Increased focus on the use of data to drive decision-making and inform instruction.
1	Comprehensive Appraisal of District Improvement (CADI) reviews. Districts were provided with the opportunity to have a CADI review to analyze how the district as a whole is functioning and where improvements could be made.	168	1	0	D	Districts received an in-depth analysis of their strengths and areas for improvement.

1	Districts that received a CADI review in 06-07 were eligible for an implementation grant in 07-08 to assist them with moving forward with the recommendations in the CADI report.	278	6	0	D	Districts were able to implement recommendations from the prior year CADI report.
5	Support for Family Literacy programs	10	0	1	C	Improved student achievement
	Recruitment and Retention Grant. This grant was offered to provide assistance in teacher recruitment and					
5	retention, for conducting needs assessments, for the equitable distribution of teachers, and for professional development for the reasons the district was not making AYP.	403	4	1	B	Districts were provided with the opportunity to analyze teacher needs and to begin implementation around those areas.
1	Schoolwide Planning Grant. Three targeted assistance schools that were planning to go schoolwide in 08-09, received a Schoolwide Planning Grant in 07-08. The schools participated in a SST review (paid for from a different source). But then received an implementation grant to use the data from the report as a comprehensive needs assessment for the basis of their SW plan.	3	0	0	D	These schools received important information and time to process that information in order to create a truly meaningful school wide plan.
<b>Comments:</b>						

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

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 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 are required to use a facilitated debriefing process to provide staffs with understand about the recommend practices. These practices are based in research (e.g. the need to have a standards based instruction program. Schools and districts prioritize the recommended strategies for implementation so that a school or district improvement plan can be developed.

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

#### 1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### 1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) 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:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

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

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

##### 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 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g) funds were used by the SEA to provide technical assistance to schools/districts eligible for School Improvement Funding. Each eligible school received an orientation visit and a informational brochure explaining the School Improvement Grant process and requirements.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### **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 2007-08 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.

Schools on Improvement in 2007-2008 were supported by funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds. The 21st CCLC grant supported 41 schools on Improvement. This grant provides opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students (particularly students in high-poverty areas and those who attend low-performing schools) meet state and local student performance standards in core academic subjects such as reading and mathematics.

A Colorado grant, Read to Achieve, supported 23 schools on Improvement with funds for programming designed to support the Colorado Basic Literacy Act (CBLA) that called for all Colorado students to be proficient readers by the end of third grade. The Read To Achieve grant program was created to fund research-based, intensive reading programs including reading academies, after-school literacy programs, summer school clinics, tutoring, and extended-day reading programs.

CDE entered into a partnership with the Front Range BOCES for teacher leadership. The BOCES provided on site coaching and support for several low performing schools and also facilitated the implementation of a model science program that closed achievement gaps.

School and district reviews indicated that there was little implementation of standards based educational practice. CDE developed a guide on the standards based teaching and learning cycle. Several workshops were held on the standards based teaching and learning cycle. All of the feedback was positive. More workshops are planned for further dissemination of the guide.

The Standards Based Teaching and Learning Cycle has been continuously revised based on feedback from awareness sessions. The tool was used in exit debriefing sessions of schools and districts whose reports indicated that lack of implementation of a standards-based educational program was an issue. Further, school support team members were given training on the guide so that they could use it in their work with schools.

The guide was disseminated through awareness sessions conducted by the Colorado Association of School Executives, the Colorado Association of School Boards, and the Colorado Education Association.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### **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 for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	55,488
Applied to transfer	955
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	955

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 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 in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,102,302
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 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 options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

- 1 All schools at a grade level 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	7
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 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?*

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a 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.<sup>3</sup>

- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

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	35,435
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,685
Received supplemental educational services	3,685
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 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	\$ 4,692,120
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 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 each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) 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. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	239,719	234,041	97.6	5,678	2.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	36,987	36,149	97.7	838	2.3
Low-poverty schools	42,010	41,099	97.8	911	2.2
All elementary schools	149,667	146,534	97.9	3,133	2.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	18,256	17,424	95.4	832	4.6
Low-poverty schools	30,511	29,987	98.3	524	1.7
All secondary schools	90,052	87,506	97.2	2,546	2.8

**Comments: Classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction in core content areas are included in the table. After the 2007-2008 collection closed, it came to our attention that two districts mis-reported their secondary level core content special education teachers. One of the districts over-reported and one district under-reported the number of teachers. There are corrective action plans with both districts for the 08-09 submission. The Colorado Department of Education is monitoring their progress. We have verified their initial submissions and they are reporting accurately for 08-09.**

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.

Yes

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.

The State uses a departmentalized approach.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**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 were 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 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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *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. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

In the table 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	35.4
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	21.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	21.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	22.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" is the percent of elementary classes-both regular and special ed-taught by teachers who are both not fully certified and do not have the necessary content knowledge.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	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)	19.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	28.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	46.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	7.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" is the percent of secondary classes-both regular and special ed-taught by teachers who are both not fully certified and do not have the necessary content knowledge.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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	66.7	16.4
Poverty metric used	Percent of student eligible for free or reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	53.5	16.1
Poverty metric used	Percent of student eligible for free or reduced lunch.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *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.*
- b. *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/expert/glossary.html>.**
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
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Literacy Based ESL, Push-In ESL model, Needs Based Literacy Grouping, Co-teaching model, Differentiated Instruction, One-on-One Tutoring, Spanish Language Arts, Newcomer Program, and Bilingual Saturday school aligned with Language Arts standards.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 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. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in 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 in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	82,347
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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 the 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.	82,127
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 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	107,968
Vietnamese	2,816
Russian	1,414
Korean	1,324
Hmong	960

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because Colorado law requires district to monitor students before exiting, these numbers reflect numbers that are English Language learners as defined by Colorado law.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	84,288
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	84,288
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	30,948
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	36.7
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	84,283
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	84,283
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, 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.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	<b>Results</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	34,805	41.3
ELP attainment	8,388	10.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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).	Yes
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments: The State of Colorado only offers Spanish native language assessments in 3rd and 4th grade Reading and Writing only.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 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 NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Spanish
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP 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 (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- 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
956	6,922	7,878
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12,911	10,719	83.0	2,192
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 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
12,878	11,908	92.5	970
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students 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 number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,470	3,041	68.0	1,429
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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	57
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	13
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	54
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	57
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	13
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 2006-07 and 2007-08)	34
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	34
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 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>
<b>Comments:</b> The State did not meet AMAO 1 and AMAO 3.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 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 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 in 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 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
12,940	4,776	33

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.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

## 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 in 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) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (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 and a second language.**

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	8,370
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	6,000

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.

Colorado has only 1,272 licensed professionals that are endorsed in Linguistically Diverse Education working in Language Instruction Education Programs. Colorado has a need for high quality professionals that are licensed, as well as endorsed in this area to meet the unique needs of Colorado's English Language Learners.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

\* 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 (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets 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 (PD) activities reported.**
4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	57	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	57	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	57	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	57	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	57	
Other (Explain in comment box)	40	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	57	14,926
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	57	5,137
PD provided to principals	57	1,959
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	57	911
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	57	2,740
PD provided to community based organization personnel	14	1,188
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>26,861</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Cultural Competency, SIOP, Laws and Regulations regarding ELL students, Ruby Payne poverty training, ELL strategies in the general education classroom, ELLEN = English Language Learners with Exceptional Needs, RTI and ELLs, Differentiating Instruction, Differentiating Curriculum, Differentiating Assessment, Family Literacy, Implementing Professional Learning Communities, Brain Research and Colorado Reading First.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	07/01/08	30
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 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.

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.

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.

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.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 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 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.5
Black, non-Hispanic	65.4
Hispanic	57.1
White, non-Hispanic	82.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	63.7
Limited English proficient	55.4
Economically disadvantaged	63.2
Migratory students	61.1
Male	71.5
Female	78.6

**Comments: WARNING -The graduation rate for Limited English proficient students (55.4%) increased or decreased by 10 percentage points or more from the previous year (65.9%). Check data carefully.**

Source – Initially populated from EDfacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDfacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### 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 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	4.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	8.0
White, non-Hispanic	2.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.5
Limited English proficient	9.3
Economically disadvantaged	5.2
Migratory students	8.5
Male	4.7
Female	4.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### **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	145	131
LEAs with subgrants	33	33
Total	178	164
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	117	753
K	279	1,071
1	256	922
2	246	823
3	217	835
4	192	734
5	168	672
6	160	644
7	138	585
8	140	598
9	121	621
10	135	541
11	119	425
12	155	522
Ungraded	N<16	112
Total	2,444	9,858
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	218	1,628
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,774	7,478
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	250	162
Hotels/Motels	202	590
Total	2,444	9,858
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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)	753
K	1,071
1	922
2	823
3	835
4	734
5	672
6	644
7	585
8	598
9	631
10	551
11	435
12	531
Ungraded	112
Total	9,897
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations 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	670
Migratory children/youth	599
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,279
Limited English proficient students	1,550
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 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	19
Expedited evaluations	11
Staff professional development and awareness	24
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	23
Transportation	24
Early childhood programs	16
Assistance with participation in school programs	20
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	17
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	16
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	17
Coordination between schools and agencies	24
Counseling	14
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
Clothing to meet a school requirement	18
School supplies	25
Referral to other programs and services	21
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	18
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1 response for tuition for on-line classes 5 responses for emergency assistance through outside funding sources 1 response for moving and storage of household items

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

### 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	9
Transportation	15
School records	7
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	7

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1 response-basic needs, shelter and food 2 responses-registered students but students did not attend class 1 response-no housing for unaccompanied youth under 18 years of age 2 responses-verification and eligibility particularly for unaccompanied youth 1 response-getting the neighborhood district to respond quickly

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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 NCLB 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 NCLB.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	513	391
4	511	401
5	476	329
6	429	336
7	399	284
8	413	291
High School	734	505
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 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 NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	566	489
4	521	412
5	476	377
6	429	291
7	401	233
8	414	194
High School	734	250
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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 in 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:

*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.*

*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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,057
K	531
1	664
2	618
3	603
4	521
5	530
6	508
7	453
8	489
9	457
10	413
11	287
12	250
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,674
Total	9,055
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 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.

This past year, Colorado has experienced a decrease in identification. This decrease can be attributed to the following factors:

1. State Legislation on immigration reform which affects the employers hiring undocumented workers, and required identification for specific states services. The legislation has made a significant impact on family mobility.
2. Families seeking employment in areas other than agriculture.
3. Families settling in their current residence.
4. Agricultural employment opportunities are decreasing.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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)	289
K	66
1	81
2	73
3	68
4	41
5	50
6	43
7	42
8	31
9	29
10	24
11	20
12	N<16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,873
Total	2,733
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 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.

This past year, Colorado has experienced a decrease in identification. This decrease can be attributed to the following factors:

1. State Legislation on immigration reform which affects the employers hiring undocumented workers, and required identification for specific states services. The legislation has made a significant impact on family mobility.
2. Families seeking employment in areas other than agriculture.
3. Families settling in their current residence.
4. Agricultural employment opportunities are decreasing.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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.

New Generation System

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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 count was collected for attending, non-attending (residency only) and students who were two (2) turning three (3).

1. Attending data counts were verified by districts. Each district verified each migrant students enrollment within their district for the 07-08.
2. Non-Attending data counts were verified on a re-enrollment form by verifying the student's residence in the State during 07-08 SY.
3. Students who were two and turned three within the funding period were verified with a signature from the parent/guardian on or after their date of birth.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

All enrollments are entered by regional MEP personnel by utilizing the NGS Approver Component. The NGS Approver Component allows the SEA to check for accuracy prior to allowing regional entries to be downloaded into the SEA's database. This allows the State to produce accurate child counts.

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 are entered by regional MEP personnel by utilizing the NGS Approver Component. The NGS Approver Component allows the SEA to check for accuracy prior to allowing regional entries to be downloaded into the SEA's database. This allows the State to produce accurate child counts. Enrollments for Category 2 are entered and approved if the student was enrolled in a summer program and received services.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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; and  
children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Eligible Student Count Report calculates an unduplicated count of students by district or State. NGS selects students based upon the enrollment period and federal eligibility criteria.  
Intersession, regular and summer enrollments containing an enrollment and withdrawal date are included if the student was enrolled for at least one day during the reporting period.  
Each student has a residency verification date within the reporting period.  
The student is between 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.

A category 2 count shows an unduplicated count of migrant children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds during the summer or intersession term.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 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.

A random review of certificates of eligibility through phone and home audits is completed by the SEA and the Regional MEP. These audits are done in order to ensure accuracy of information that is provided on behalf of the families. An eligibility questionnaire is completed with interviewee's response. Periodically ID&R training of staff is provided on the processes for ensuring accuracy. Annually we evaluate the effectiveness of our quality control processes.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

A combination of Quality Control eligibility determinations re-interviews and randomly selected re-interviews of families was based on a total 85 combined re-interviews; 34 of which were deemed eligible.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

Monthly auditing is done by running reports from NGS which verifies that each child's eligibility is unduplicated. A second stage SEA reviewing process of all COE's is completed to ensure accuracy of data and eligibility.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

Discrepancies found by the SEA are reported immediately to the Regional Director who researches the discrepancy and provides feedback to the SEA. After verification of accuracy. The enrollment is then approved by the SEA to be included in the States child counts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 has created and implemented a new ID&R Guidebook with Statewide training of new regulations. The new SEA MEP database is constructed with edit checks to aid in eligibility determinations. A weekly written communication with regional ID&R coordinators has been implemented

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

Additional recruiter training on temporary employment and intent only moves is planned for the 2008-2009 SEA regional ID&R activity calendar.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.