

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 2008-09

COLORADO



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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 12, 2010, 10:41:23 AM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The state board recommended a comprehensive revision to the Colorado Model Content Standards and Senate Bill 08-212 (also known as CAP4K -the Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids) affirmed the revision process. SB 08-212 mandated the revision of all thirteen content areas be adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education by December 15, 2009.

Colorado's new academic standards create a seamless pathway from preschool into postsecondary education or the workforce. Historically, these standards have been organized by grade spans but have now evolved to more articulated grade level expectations in P-8 in all content areas. High school standards are organized by standards to support local controls around curriculum and course designs with the exception of Reading, Writing, and Communicating which continues with grade level articulation through 12th grade. Additionally, Colorado Academic Standards reflect workforce readiness and 21st century skills such as problem-solving, information literacy and innovation. The ability to take responsibility for additional learning, self direction and interaction with others to learn new information quickly and more naturally is the new emerging direction of our work.

The revision of the old Colorado Model Content Standards has been research-based, inclusive and transparent. WestEd has been an integral partner in the revision process. Following a WestEd gap analysis of our old standards, which compared our standards to the best nationally and internationally, 254 Colorado citizens participated on 15 subcommittees in the revision. Subcommittee recommendations were vetted by national experts and feedback opportunities were available for all Coloradans.

Final recommendations, which represented standards that were fewer, clearer, and higher, were approved by the Colorado State Board of Education on December 10, 2009.

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.

Colorado signed into law Senate Bill 212 (CRS 22-7-1007), which calls for the creation of "a seamless system of standards, expectations, and assessments from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness."

A group of assessment stakeholders started meeting in October 2009, to begin the work surrounding the development of the new assessment system. This new system will include school readiness, summative (will include assessments for Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts), and postsecondary workforce readiness assessments. Alternate assessments and English language proficiency assessments will also be in place. In addition, discussions around formative assessments are being held.

The timeline for development and implementation of the new assessment system is tentatively as follows:

Aug 2009-Enlist a committee of representative stakeholders

Sept 2009-Build awareness and understanding with a survey of needs and wants; launch a public inquiry

Oct 2009-Locate purpose in the context of a defined vision & purpose

Nov 2009-Develop preliminary set of design features cost aside, identify what features are preferred & in what order

Dec 2009-Consider cost and rank order design features Summarize (for SBE) the results from research & public outreach

Jan 2010-Modify design based on new information Review discrepancy analysis (identify best-of-breed features)

Feb 2010-Use features to draft more fine-grained specs Draft beginning specs; tailor for special populations (ELL, IEP, etc)

Mar 2010-Confirm specifications Lock in SBE support for specs (Complete and disseminate RFT)

Dec 2010-Adopt provider(s) for the whole or parts of the assessment system, including, but not limited to summative, school readiness, postsecondary/workforce assessment & award contract, English language proficiency, and expanded benchmarks. Jan 2011-Develop assessments Initiate development Mar 2012-Next generation state assessments are in use; Complete development and commence implementation

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 4,000 characters.

In 2007, the Colorado State Board of Education recommended a comprehensive revision of the Colorado Model Content Standards, which included Science. In 2008, the state's legislature affirmed and further articulated the nature of these changes. Additionally, Colorado signed into law Senate Bill 212 (CRS 22-7-1007), which calls for the creation of "a seamless system of standards, expectations, and assessments from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness."

The revised Colorado Academic Standards were adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education on December 10, 2009. WIDA standards were also adopted as Colorado's new English Language Development standards. Alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities are currently in development with a goal in mind for state adoption in March 2010. School districts are required by state statute to adopt standards that meet or exceed the revised standards document by December 2011.

A group of assessment stakeholders started meeting in October 2009, to begin the work surrounding the development of the new assessment system. This new system will include school readiness, summative (will include assessments for Science), and postsecondary workforce readiness assessments. Alternate assessments and English language proficiency assessments will also be in place. In addition, discussions around formative assessments are being held.

The assessment stakeholders will meet through February 2010. The state's goal is to have an RFP for the new assessment system out no later than April 2010. Adoption of an assessment provider(s) will be in December 2010, so that development of the assessments can start in January 2011. The new assessments for Science will be implemented during the 2011-2012 school year.

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 assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	477,594		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,681		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,128		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	29,308		>97%
Hispanic	134,349		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	291,061		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	49,553		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46,121		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	178,282		>97%
Migratory students	2,578		>97%
Male	244,802		>97%
Female	232,702		>97%
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. 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(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	16,969	35.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,838	55.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,520	9.4
Total	48,327	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	477,575		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,681		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,116		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	29,302		>97%
Hispanic	134,356		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	291,032		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	49,582		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	46,127		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	178,303		>97%
Migratory students	2,576		>97%
Male	244,787		>97%
Female	232,691		>97%
Comments:			

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 reading/language arts assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,524	36.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,001	54.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,591	9.5
Total	48,116	
Comments:		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	175,833		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,023		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,237		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	10,809		>97%
Hispanic	47,634		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	109,118		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,610		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,084		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	61,691		>97%
Migratory students	925		>97%
Male	90,011		>97%
Female	85,803		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	6,754	39.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,681	50.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,677	9.8
Total	17,112	
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,015	57,352	92.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	707	614	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,309	2,207	95.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,758	3,132	83.3
Hispanic	18,916	16,394	86.7
White, non-Hispanic	36,317	34,999	96.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,280	4,562	72.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,097	8,255	81.8
Economically disadvantaged students	26,112	22,642	86.7
Migratory students	386	319	82.6
Male	31,761	29,315	92.3
Female	30,246	28,031	92.7
Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,487	55,798	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	707	617	87.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,302	2,162	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,743	3,143	84.0
Hispanic	18,444	15,263	82.8
White, non-Hispanic	36,285	34,609	95.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,230	3,868	62.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,637	7,079	73.5
Economically disadvantaged students	25,686	21,449	83.5
Migratory students	389	290	74.6
Male	31,512	28,068	89.1
Female	29,969	27,726	92.5

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Colorado does not assess students in Science at third grade.			

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.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,483	55,051	91.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	697	586	84.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,230	2,114	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,739	2,976	79.6
Hispanic	18,051	15,230	84.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,762	34,141	95.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,644	4,411	66.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,925	5,971	75.3
Economically disadvantaged students	25,108	21,036	83.8
Migratory students	347	275	79.2
Male	30,943	27,971	90.4
Female	29,535	27,075	91.7

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,386	52,496	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	700	551	78.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,220	2,015	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,723	2,894	77.7
Hispanic	18,000	13,715	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	35,738	33,316	93.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,629	3,556	53.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,872	4,741	60.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,035	19,242	76.9
Migratory students	347	235	67.7
Male	30,889	26,165	84.7
Female	29,489	26,324	89.3

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Colorado does not assess students in Science in 4th grade.			

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.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,518	52,625	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	667	537	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,202	2,081	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,688	2,790	75.6
Hispanic	17,393	13,993	80.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,554	33,211	93.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,627	3,771	56.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,794	4,650	68.4
Economically disadvantaged students	24,014	19,129	79.7
Migratory students	349	265	75.9
Male	30,296	26,520	87.5
Female	29,209	26,094	89.3

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,462	52,042	87.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	666	536	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,196	2,027	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	3,679	2,915	79.2
Hispanic	17,361	13,542	78.0
White, non-Hispanic	35,548	33,011	92.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,612	3,514	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,770	4,096	60.5
Economically disadvantaged students	23,980	18,725	78.1
Migratory students	346	233	67.3
Male	30,249	25,743	85.1
Female	29,200	26,287	90.0

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59,403	50,538	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	667	516	77.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,199	1,969	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3,669	2,647	72.1
Hispanic	17,360	12,255	70.6
White, non-Hispanic	35,503	33,147	93.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,561	3,842	58.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,787	3,327	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	23,933	17,346	72.5
Migratory students	349	197	56.4
Male	30,215	25,717	85.1
Female	29,182	24,816	85.0

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,339	50,986	87.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	690	544	78.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,184	2,057	94.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3,375	2,533	75.0
Hispanic	16,535	12,855	77.7
White, non-Hispanic	35,549	32,992	92.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,285	3,374	53.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,449	3,289	60.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22,483	17,390	77.4
Migratory students	333	209	62.8
Male	29,821	25,819	86.6
Female	28,510	25,163	88.3

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,250	52,712	90.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	689	595	86.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,180	2,040	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,374	2,755	81.6
Hispanic	16,507	13,515	81.9
White, non-Hispanic	35,494	33,802	95.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,252	3,743	59.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,427	3,357	61.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,438	18,403	82.0
Migratory students	328	229	69.8
Male	29,756	26,385	88.7
Female	28,485	26,319	92.4

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Colorado does not assess students in Science at the sixth grade.			

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.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,057	50,003	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	718	569	79.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,069	1,937	93.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,519	2,547	72.4
Hispanic	15,989	12,077	75.5
White, non-Hispanic	35,753	32,866	91.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,989	2,991	49.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,682	2,616	55.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,681	16,297	75.2
Migratory students	290	187	64.5
Male	29,728	25,329	85.2
Female	28,319	24,667	87.1

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,053	50,940	87.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	713	604	84.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,069	1,880	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,525	2,770	78.6
Hispanic	15,986	12,193	76.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,750	33,486	93.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,980	3,082	51.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,660	2,146	46.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,662	16,649	76.9
Migratory students	288	175	60.8
Male	29,721	25,370	85.4
Female	28,323	25,564	90.3

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Colorado does not assess students in Science in the seventh grade.			

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.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,867	46,808	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	646	456	70.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,119	1,923	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	3,468	2,268	65.4
Hispanic	15,459	10,362	67.0
White, non-Hispanic	36,170	31,794	87.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,839	2,313	39.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,901	1,705	43.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,654	13,755	66.6
Migratory students	319	190	59.6
Male	29,795	23,770	79.8
Female	28,060	23,030	82.1

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,822	51,148	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	645	544	84.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,116	1,935	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,460	2,786	80.5
Hispanic	15,458	12,032	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	36,136	33,844	93.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,831	3,089	53.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,889	1,804	46.4
Economically disadvantaged students	20,644	16,134	78.2
Migratory students	319	190	59.6
Male	29,764	25,520	85.7
Female	28,047	25,620	91.4

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57,629	44,130	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	636	421	66.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,116	1,776	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3,421	2,015	58.9
Hispanic	15,395	8,815	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	36,057	31,100	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,723	2,237	39.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,888	932	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,467	11,988	58.6
Migratory students	318	125	39.3
Male	29,635	22,609	76.3
Female	27,988	21,518	76.9

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,602	76,384	65.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,466	742	50.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,877	3,059	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	7,299	3,207	43.9
Hispanic	30,523	13,336	43.7
White, non-Hispanic	73,418	56,032	76.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,663	2,574	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,761	1,371	20.3
Economically disadvantaged students	36,095	15,953	44.2
Migratory students	532	153	28.8
Male	59,857	38,882	65.0
Female	56,717	37,491	66.1

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,258	107,291	92.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,457	1,301	89.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,873	3,596	92.8
Black, non-Hispanic	7,250	6,285	86.7
Hispanic	30,429	25,883	85.1
White, non-Hispanic	73,210	70,192	95.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,582	6,784	64.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,705	3,942	58.8
Economically disadvantaged students	35,933	30,478	84.8
Migratory students	524	355	67.8
Male	59,662	53,581	89.8
Female	56,561	53,678	94.9

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	56,405	41,398	73.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	675	422	62.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,858	1,476	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3,490	1,840	52.7
Hispanic	14,170	7,115	50.2
White, non-Hispanic	36,209	30,543	84.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,828	1,624	33.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,184	560	17.6
Economically disadvantaged students	16,320	8,506	52.1
Migratory students	247	77	31.2
Male	28,877	21,256	73.6
Female	27,522	20,138	73.2

Comments: • The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.

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.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,709	959	56.1
Districts	184	85	46.2
Comments:			

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 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	603	329	54.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	362	157	43.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	241	172	71.4
Comments:			

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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
171	78	45.6
Comments:		

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement ¹ Year 1, School Improvement ¹ 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.

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	7
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	1
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	15
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts changed the governance structure of the school in a significant manner that either diminished school-based management and decision making or increased 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). Districts reconstituted the school into smaller autonomous learning communities (e.g., school-within-a-school model, learning academies, etc.); Districts dissolved the school and assign students to other schools in the district/Districts contracted with outside expertise to facilitate their building leadership team in planning for and improving instruction at the school. 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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (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.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts placed on Program Improvement submit a Program Improvement plan. The districts have received technical assistance in the development of the plan.

Districts moving on to Corrective Action are offered the comprehensive appraisal for district improvement to assist them in the identification of barriers that are impeding academic achievement.

CDE provides grants for district improvement processes. The District Improvement Grant can be used for a comprehensive appraisal of district programs (CADI), a self assessment process, or implementation of the findings from either of the previous processes.

Both the district appraisal process and the self assessment process use rubrics based on the characteristics of high performing districts.

The rubrics are used to assess performance in the following areas:

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

Depending on the size of the district, the CADI process may take 2-3 weeks with teams that vary in size from 7-13. The CADI process is also a rubric based process and evidence is collected through document analysis, interviews and observations/walkthroughs.

Once the report is complete, the CADI team leader works with district staff to plan a "roll out" of the findings to a variety of stakeholders in the district (i.e. School Board members, administrative staff, teaching staffs and parents and community members).

Following the formal roll out, district central office staff convene meetings to develop the district's improvement plan. Funding is available to assist with the implementation of the districts' plan.

Closing the Achievement Gap

CDE conducted a request for information process to identify external providers with a track record of closing achievement gaps at the school or district level. The list of providers is now posted on CDE's Web site under the link for the Achievement Gap and Academic Support Unit.

In April 2008, districts were invited to attend meetings to discuss the opportunity to partner with CDE in addressing their identified gaps. Grant funds were made available for districts. The funding was provided for a needs assessment and for the development of a comprehensive plan.

In May 2008, four districts received the Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement (CADI) process.

In June 2008, districts were invited to attend a two-day showcase where the achievement gap providers. The providers offered presentations on their models for improvement. Districts selected providers to invite for additional discussions, interviews, etc.

In July 2008, CDE staff and two achievement gap consultants developed a bank of questions for districts to use in conducting additional interviews with providers. Provider interviews were held in Eagle, Summit, Yuma, St. Vrain and Greeley.

In August 2008, each district selected a provider. Each provider assisted districts in the development of comprehensive plans to focus on addressing identified gaps. Draft plans were submitted in August 2008.

In September 2008, reviews of the plans and budgets were conducted; feedback was provided to the districts; a grant process was established for allocating funds for implementing the project.

In October 2008, grant budgets were reviewed and approved; districts were provided with funding.

Project implementation began in November. The three identified providers worked with districts to implement formative assessment and professional development designed to improve classroom instruction for students with English Language Learning needs.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	56
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 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	11	9
Schools	28	28

Comments: Districts and schools can appeal a single target. They do not need to appeal the entire determination. 11 districts appealed at least one target, and 9 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. 28 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.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	10/05/09
---	----------

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 2008-09.

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 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	13,395	13,439
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	9,660	9,428
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	72.1	70.2
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	13,252	13,421
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	9,830	10,056
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 2008-09	74.2	74.9
Comments:		

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

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 2008-09 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 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	8
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	5
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	45
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
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.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		2	1	0	B	
6 = Combo 1	1 and 2	8	1	2	D	B and C
7 = Combo 2	1, 2, and 3	19	1	1	D	B and C
5	The CDE provided technical assistance through the use of school support team (SST) reviews. The CDE provided technical assistance through the use of school support team (SST) reviews.	24	1	1	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."

5	Districts were provided with the opportunity to have a Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement (CADI) review to analyze how the district as a whole functions and where improvements needed to be made.	3	0	0	D	Districts were served. Districts received an in-depth analysis of their strengths and areas for improvement. Data entered for districts, not schools.
5	Districts that received a CADI review in 07-08 were eligible for an implementation grant in 08-09 to assist them with moving forward with the recommendations in the CADI report.	4	0	0	D	Districts were served. Districts were able to implement recommendations from the prior year CADI report. Data entered for districts, not schools.
	Six districts were					
5	identified as Closing the Achievement Gap pilot districts. As part of the pilot they received Comprehensive Appraisals for District Improvement reviews.	6	0	0	D	Increased focus on the use of data to drive decision-making and inform instruction. Data entered for districts, not schools.
5	Recruitment and Retention Grant. This grant was offered to provide assistance in teacher recruitment and retention, for conducting needs assessments, for the equitable distribution of teachers, and for professional development for the reasons the district was not making AYP.	13	0	0	B	Districts were served. Data entered for districts, not schools.
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools and districts that have received school and district level grants participated in numerous informational meetings and in a facilitated review debriefing process that provided staffs with an understanding about the recommend practices. Recommended practices are those based in research (e.g. the need to have a standards based instruction program) and have shown the most effectiveness with struggling schools. Schools and districts then prioritized the recommended strategies for implementation so that the school or district improvement plan included the most relevant strategies for effective improvements.

The CDE website provides information about effective strategies on the Professional Development and School Support Program website. This website provides information aligned to the standards used to analyze performance in the district and school reviews.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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: Colorado reserved 4% for 1003(a) school improvement. We then reserved 5% of that 4% for state administration.

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Technical assistance was provided to the districts and schools that were eligible for improvement funding. Each eligible district and school received an orientation visit and an informational brochure explaining the School Improvement Grant process and requirements.

Schools that finished their two year implementation process on the goals and activities defined in their school improvement plan were eligible to receive a re-visit from a school support team that included at least one member of the original team. The process focused on evaluating the progress made in the two years of implementation and provided technical assistance in how to proceed. The re-visit process involved a 3 day visit and the development of a narrative report that offered further recommendations for improvement.

The Evaluation of NCLB Title I, Part A: School Improvement Grant Process 2006-2008 Academic Years' Data Progress Report prepared by the Omni Institute in June 2009 provided an evaluation of the school improvement grant program. The findings of the report indicated that the improvement grant schools and the match control schools had higher median percentages of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch, limited English proficiency programs, and/or were identified as ethnic minority. Changes in performance were unclear possibly due to the small sample size.

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

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 2008-09 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.

Title I schools identified for improvement have a number of funding options in addition to those of Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g). A number of districts have participated in the Colorado's Closing the Achievement Gap initiative, with some funding being used to target achievement gaps at particular schools in the districts. The Read to Achieve grant program has provided funds to elementary schools with a high percentage of struggling readers in third and fourth grades. In addition, Colorado has provided the School Counselor Corps grant program to promote the increase of school counselors for secondary students with an emphasis on increasing the graduation rate and preparing students for postsecondary success. Title I schools that meet the requirements of the Reading First program have an opportunity to target early literacy issues. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program has provided funding to meet the needs of struggling students at many schools throughout the state, including those in improvement status.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	54,454
Applied to transfer	1,103
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,103

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 795,085

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	8

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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	38,530
Applied for supplemental educational services	5,025
Received supplemental educational services	4,716
Comments:	

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	\$ 6,202,355
Comments: Data will not be available until after the new year. See email from Audrey Langham on 11/23 stating that this is not an issue.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	254,905	251,036	98.5	3,869	1.5
All elementary classes	159,226	157,246	98.8	1,980	1.2
All secondary classes	95,679	93,790	98.0	1,889	2.0

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.

Elementary classes are counted multiple times, so that the data is comparable to secondary level classes.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	22.1
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	8.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	53.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	16.5
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.

	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)	20.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	12.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	56.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	10.4
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.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	39,981	39,467	98.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	45,123	44,728	99.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	20,304	19,713	97.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	35,150	34,713	98.8

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	63.6	15.9
Poverty metric used	Percent of students who submitted paperwork for free and reduced price lunch eligibility.	
Secondary schools	53.1	16.6
Poverty metric used	Percent of students who submitted paperwork for free and reduced price lunch eligibility.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	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.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	97,132
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	96,994
Comments:	

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; Castilian	84,260
Vietnamese	1,630
Arabic	1,058
Chinese	992
Russian	929

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	88,249
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	336
Total	88,585
Comments:	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	3,589
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	18.0
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	88,089
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	336
Total	88,425
Comments: 1.6.2.2. includes more students than in 1.6.3.2.1 because we use the End of Year report, combined with CELA results to get the most accurate number of Title III students. We have a fairly mobile population, and thus additional students enter the system that are not enrolled during the CELA testing window.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	24,199

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	31,422	46.6	38,399	60.00
ELP attainment	3,584	5.3	4,982	25.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	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
Comments:	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
NA
Comments: No mathematics tests are given in native language.

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 ESEA accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
Spanish
Comments: Lectura is given to test reading content knowledge in Spanish in the third and fourth grades only.

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 ESEA accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
NA
Comments: No Science assessments are given in languages other than English.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program 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
9,261	8,576	17,837
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
13,472	11,137	82.7	2,335
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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
13,447	12,616	93.8	831
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned 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 total 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
4,633	3,340	72.1	1,293
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# -Total number of subgrantees for the year	60
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	11
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	24
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	37
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	15
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	20
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	41
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	41
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	13
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The State of Colorado did not meet any 08-09 AMAO targets.	

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.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
10,350	3,959	22

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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 under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) - 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.	8,372
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	400

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	144	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	11	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	76	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	61	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	90	
Other (Explain in comment box)	27	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	135	12,765
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	95	2,067
PD provided to principals	96	762
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	62	434
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	60	1,396
PD provided to community based organization personnel	12	261
Total	460	17,685

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Subgrantees in the tables above include district Grantees (LEAs) and districts signing over dollars to Consortium LEAs. Other includes: Literacy Based ESL, Tutoring by ESL translator, Co-taught (ESL/content teachers) mainstream classes, Newcomer programs, in-classroom support (content), ELD block schedule, Push in ESL, tutoring, immersion, and Friday School.

The total number of participants is 17,685, but the system won't allow me to enter it the information.

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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/08	7/30/08	30
Comments:		

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.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: Colorado had 0 (zero) persistently dangerous schools identified from the 2008-09 school year. The data analysis and identification process for all schools was completed during the summer, prior to the start of the 2009-10 school year.	

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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	71.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	55.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	63.7
Hispanic	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	78.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	63.0
Limited English proficient	52.0
Economically disadvantaged	59.3
Migratory students	58.0
Male	68.7
Female	75.3
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5.5
Hispanic	6.6
White, non-Hispanic	2.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.8
Limited English proficient	6.8
Economically disadvantaged	4.0
Migratory students	4.7
Male	4.0
Female	3.5
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	146	144
LEAs with subgrants	33	33
Total	179	177
Comments: LEAs with subgrants consist of 32 districts and 1 BOCES.		

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)	178	959
K	300	1,136
1	292	1,157
2	283	1,058
3	263	988
4	264	940
5	250	894
6	203	769
7	199	789
8	173	729
9	188	861
10	153	636
11	177	574
12	191	720
Ungraded	160	350
Total	3,274	12,560
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	358	2,018
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,389	9,737
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	267	192
Hotels/Motels	260	613
Total	3,274	12,560
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	959
K	1,136
1	1,157
2	1,058
3	988
4	940
5	894
6	769
7	789
8	729
9	861
10	636
11	574
12	720
Ungraded	350
Total	12,560
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	740
Migratory children/youth	1,034
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,210
Limited English proficient students	2,274
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	18
Expedited evaluations	15
Staff professional development and awareness	23
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	21
Transportation	18
Early childhood programs	13
Assistance with participation in school programs	20
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	17
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	21
Coordination between schools and agencies	23
Counseling	14
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
Clothing to meet a school requirement	19
School supplies	25
Referral to other programs and services	24
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	18
Other (optional – in comment box below)	13
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

5-Food baskets and backpacks full of food for the weekend 2-hygiene items 1-volunteer coordination 1-payment of school fees 1-laundry packs 1-GED prep 1-recreation passes 1-book subsidy assistance

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	9
School Selection	8
Transportation	10
School records	9
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	4

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2-identification 1-immediate enrollment 1-identification of migrant

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	848	681
4	829	611
5	796	583
6	672	520
7	677	497
8	618	447
High School	1,002	817
Comments:		

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 ESEA 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	878	755
4	832	672
5	798	604
6	681	483
7	678	481
8	628	356
High School	1,021	366
Comments:		

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	878
K	392
1	492
2	520
3	440
4	405
5	405
6	364
7	338
8	355
9	356
10	310
11	224
12	181
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	663
Total	6,323
<p>Comments: The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifying work in the state.</p>	

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

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

1. The end of participation in the NGS Consortium and corresponding implementation of COMEP, a migrant data system for Colorado.
2. A decline in the number of available temporary agricultural employment opportunities, based on current OME ID&R policy.
3. Migrant families who elect to remain permanent residents and discontinue migration.
4. State immigration reform and enforcement that impacts migrant family mobility changing state agricultural patterns -housing rather than agricultural land.
5. H2A visas for temporary employees do not make provision for the families of the workers to accompany them.

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	27
K	49
1	62
2	66
3	53
4	56
5	38
6	28
7	27
8	24
9	39
10	36
11	23
12	N<16
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	538

Comments: The decrease in totals is a reflection of the states decrease in migrant child counts that received a service during the summer/intersession term. Summer school opportunities for all students have been limited, due to decreased funding to the districts from the state.

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

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

- 1 The end of participation in the NGS Consortium and corresponding implementation of COMEP, a new migrant data system.
- 2 A decline in the number of available temporary agricultural employment opportunities, based on current OME ID&R policy.
- 3 Migrant families who elected to remain permanent residents and discontinued migration.
- 4 State immigration reform and enforcement that impacts migrant family mobility.
- 5 H2A visas for temporary employees do not make provision for the families of the workers to accompany them.
- 6 State and local budget deficits have negatively impacted district summer schools.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COMEP database system and New Generation System were both used to compile and generate the Category 1 and 2 child counts. A data upload from NGS into COMEP was used to capture the Category 1 count and the Category 2 count was derived from COMEP only.

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 two (2) year olds turning three years old (3).
1 The Category 1 and 2 attending data counts were verified by districts and input into both NGS and COMEP by regional and state offices.
2 The Category 1 non-attending data counts were verified by regional MEP and input into NGS and COMEP by regional and state offices.
3 The Category 1 and 2 students who were two-years-old and turned three-years-old were verified by regional MEP and input into NGS and COMEP by regional and state offices.
4 The Category 2 count was collected and entered in COMEP by regional MEP offices who verified district summer school and regional MEP project enrollment.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The enrollments for attending and non-attending are entered by regional MEP personnel. While the state was a participant in the NGS Consortium, the NGS approval component was used, which allowed the state agency to verify accuracy. With the COMEP database, regional MEP personnel input data which is reviewed, approved, or denied by the SEA migrant data specialists before being added to the MEP enrollment.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All enrollments for the Category 2 count were entered by regional MEP personnel into the COMEP database if the student was enrolled in a summer program and received services. The Category 2 enrollments were reviewed by the SEA.

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 COMEP 2008-09 unduplicated student count report is based upon qualified migrant students who meet the federal eligibility requirements in the enrollment period.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The quality control inherent in the state's database facilitates multiple reviews of every certificate of eligibility, first by regional data specialists and ID&R coordinators, second by SEA data specialists, auditors, and validation committee members. The SEA conducts regional ID&R trainings and bi-annual and quarterly ID&R training, with technical assistance visits as needed to support best practices that comply with federal regulations.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA auditor and Validation Committee reviewed certificate of eligibility submissions to both NGS and COMEP data base systems. Students who do not meet the federal requirements are denied before they become a part of the state data system. The SEA auditor and Validation Committee reviewed 67 submissions.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA reviews each submission and either approves/denies it on a case by case basis. The SEA verifies that no duplicate students are entered into the system.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The regional MEP staff reviews student rosters for accuracy against local district enrollments. The migrant child count report is reviewed by the SEA's Information Management Services department prior to the submission to ED.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA conducts statewide ID&R training through teleconferences, regional technical assistance site visits, regional director meetings, and an annual ID&R conference. The SEA held three week-long data implementation sessions. The SEA publishes an annually-updated ID&R manual based upon the current guidance of the Office of Migrant Education. The state data system includes updates and clarifications to MEP recruiters and data specialists, and an electronic newsletter publishes updates to regional directors.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Training on OME's 2008 eligibility determination changes and federal requirements and the national COE has been conducted throughout the state. Additional training will be held during 2009-2010 to comply with the OME Chapter 2 Non-Regulatory Guidance revisions upon OME's finalization of the draft version and will include the SEA temporary employment documentation.