CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12

COLORADO

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (*ESEA*), as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
_X_Part I, 2011-12 ___Part II, 2011-12

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

_____ Wednesday, March 6, 2013, 5:16:25 PM
Signature

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on

School Year 2011-12

PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
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

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2013-14	2013-14	2013-14

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Colorado revised all academic content standards in 2009; the Colorado Academic Standards were adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education adopted these standards in December, 2009. In August, 2010, the State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards in English/language arts and mathematics. The Colorado Academic Standards in reading, writing, and communicating and mathematic were subsequently reissued in December 2011.

All standards will be implemented in the 2013-14 school year. No further revisions are anticipated this school year.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or “Not Applicable” to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Science Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards will be implemented in 2012-2014 at the elementary and middle school levels, and in 2014-2015 at the high school level.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.*

State has revised or changed	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-2015	2014-2015	2013-2014

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

For Science Alternative Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards, elementary and middle school will be in 2013-14 and high school will be in 2014-2015.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	12.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	88.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No Response
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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 Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	492,768	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	4,052	>=99
Asian	S	15,644	>=99
Black or African American	S	23,646	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	S	156,038	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,081	98
White	S	277,125	>=99
Two or more races	S	15,140	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	49,526	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	55,160	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	206,093	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,450	>=99
Male	S	251,659	>=99
Female	S	241,062	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	15,570	31.44
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,291	59.14
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,665	9.42
Total	49,526	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado only has the regular Math assessment and the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. There are no alternate assessments based either on grade-level standards or modified standards.		

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	S	492,420	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	4,062	>=99
Asian	S	15,620	>=99
Black or African American	S	23,597	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	155,750	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,081	>=99
White	S	277,134	>=99
Two or more races	S	15,132	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	49,327	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	54,925	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	205,736	>=99
Migratory students	S	1,439	>=99
Male	S	251,404	>=99
Female	S	240,961	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	

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.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	**# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating**	**Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment**
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	17,079	34.62
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,557	55.87
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,691	9.51
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	49,327	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado only has the regular Reading/Language Arts assessment and the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. There are no alternate assessments based either on grade-level standards or modified standards.		

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	S	180,648	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,556	98
Asian	S	5,729	>=99
Black or African American	S	8,793	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	55,551	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	383	>=99
White	S	103,149	>=99
Two or more races	S	5,472	>=99
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	S	17,791	97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	16,955	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	72,631	>=99
Migratory students	S	523	>=99
Male	S	91,968	>=99
Female	S	88,658	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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	6,587	37.02
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,499	53.39
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,705	9.58
Total	17,791	//
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado only has the regular Science assessment and the alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards. There are no alternate assessments based either on grade-level standards or modified standards.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

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 <u>not</u> 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	65,115	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	483	S	58
Asian	2,143	S	81
Black or African American	2,991	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	21,586	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	151	S	69
White	35,620	S	82
Two or more races	2,139	S	75
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,550	S	35
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,304	S	45
Economically disadvantaged students	29,342	S	55
Migratory students	218	S	40
Male	33,187	S	71
Female	31,924	S	70

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The minor discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

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	64,988	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	486	S	60
Asian	2,134	S	78
Black or African American	2,971	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	21,543	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	151	S	72
White	35,568	S	83
Two or more races	2,132	S	79
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,536	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,275	S	46
Economically disadvantaged students	29,319	S	59
Migratory students	216	S	45
Male	33,126	S	70
Female	31,857	S	77

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The minor discrepancy around the sum of male and female students not being equal to the total number of students is due to an occasional failure to have gender marked on the test booklet. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not test 3rd grade students on Science			

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	63,725	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	483	S	56
Asian	2,126	S	82
Black or African American	2,946	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	21,003	S	56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	111	S	70
White	35,014	S	82
Two or more races	2,038	S	75
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,796	S	32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,928	S	42
Economically disadvantaged students	28,608	S	56
Migratory students	203	S	43
Male	32,607	S	72
Female	31,114	S	71

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well.

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	63,699	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	483	S	49
Asian	2,124	S	74
Black or African American	2,940	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	20,994	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	114	S	61
White	34,999	S	78
Two or more races	2,038	S	73
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,769	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,903	S	29
Economically disadvantaged students	28,596	S	49
Migratory students	203	S	34
Male	32,573	S	63
Female	31,118	S	71

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not test 4th grade students in Science.			

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	63,227	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	527	S	50
Asian	2,027	S	79
Black or African American	2,922	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	20,547	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	124	S	60
White	35,002	S	75
Two or more races	2,074	S	69
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,923	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,459	S	31
Economically disadvantaged students	28,136	S	48
Migratory students	190	S	36
Male	32,119	S	64
Female	31,103	S	65

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

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	63,000	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	530	S	53
Asian	2,007	S	77
Black or African American	2,899	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	20,426	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	124	S	57
White	34,944	S	81
Two or more races	2,064	S	76
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,894	S	24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,380	S	27
Economically disadvantaged students	27,997	S	52
Migratory students	188	S	30
Male	32,001	S	66
Female	30,991	S	73

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

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	63,264	S	49
American Indian or Alaska Native	530	S	33
Asian	2,023	S	59
Black or African American	2,921	S	24
Hispanic or Latino	20,559	S	27
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	124	S	42
White	35,035	S	63
Two or more races	2,068	S	54
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,931	S	17
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,457	S	9
Economically disadvantaged students	28,150	S	28
Migratory students	190	S	13
Male	32,129	S	49
Female	31,128	S	48

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies betwen the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

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	62,292	S	62
American Indian or Alaska Native	525	S	44
Asian	1,929	S	77
Black or African American	2,954	S	39
Hispanic or Latino	20,284	S	44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	128	S	55
White	34,556	S	73
Two or more races	1,911	S	67
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,573	S	22
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,026	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	27,102	S	44
Migratory students	178	S	37
Male	32,047	S	62
Female	30,240	S	61
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The change in migrant student numbers reflects the economy and the nature of Colorado agriculture.			

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	62,481	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	528	S	59
Asian	1,933	S	79
Black or African American	3,001	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	20,324	S	55
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	128	S	63
White	34,638	S	84
Two or more races	1,926	S	81
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,538	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,021	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	27,188	S	57
Migratory students	176	S	40
Male	32,120	S	69
Female	30,355	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The change in migrant student numbers reflects the economy and the nature of Colorado agriculture.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado's Science assessment is not administered at the 6th grade level.			

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	61,248	S	53
American Indian or Alaska Native	513	S	41
Asian	1,866	S	71
Black or African American	3,027	S	31
Hispanic or Latino	19,446	S	34
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	155	S	48
White	34,390	S	65
Two or more races	1,849	S	60
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,227	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,651	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	25,780	S	34
Migratory students	160	S	19
Male	31,311	S	53
Female	29,935	S	54

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

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	61,197	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	514	S	55
Asian	1,869	S	75
Black or African American	3,023	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	19,430	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	156	S	64
White	34,359	S	80
Two or more races	1,844	S	76
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,196	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,637	S	16
Economically disadvantaged students	25,742	S	51
Migratory students	161	S	27
Male	31,279	S	64
Female	29,915	S	73

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado's Science assessment is not administered at the 7th grade level.			

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	60,239	S	52
American Indian or Alaska Native	521	S	35
Asian	1,876	S	72
Black or African American	3,049	S	30
Hispanic or Latino	18,651	S	33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	124	S	55
White	34,248	S	63
Two or more races	1,764	S	57
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,914	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,828	S	10
Economically disadvantaged students	24,572	S	32
Migratory students	185	S	20
Male	30,752	S	51
Female	29,483	S	52

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well.

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	60,172	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	523	S	51
Asian	1,874	S	75
Black or African American	3,044	S	49
Hispanic or Latino	18,621	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	123	S	65
White	34,221	S	79
Two or more races	1,764	S	75
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,897	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,813	S	11
Economically disadvantaged students	24,537	S	48
Migratory students	185	S	29
Male	30,710	S	62
Female	29,458	S	73

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well.

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	60,138	S	49
American Indian or Alaska Native	519	S	34
Asian	1,876	S	63
Black or African American	3,040	S	27
Hispanic or Latino	18,598	S	28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	123	S	43
White	34,218	S	62
Two or more races	1,760	S	55
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	5,901	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,807	S	5
Economically disadvantaged students	24,506	S	29
Migratory students	183	S	14
Male	30,683	S	49
Female	29,449	S	49

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well.

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	116,922	S	36
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,000	S	21
Asian	3,677	S	56
Black or African American	5,757	S	16
Hispanic or Latino	34,521	S	18
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	288	S	28
White	68,295	S	45
Two or more races	3,365	S	41
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,543	S	7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,964	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	42,553	S	18
Migratory students	316	S	9
Male	59,636	S	37
Female	57,263	S	35

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

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	116,883	S	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	998	S	57
Asian	3,679	S	75
Black or African American	5,719	S	50
Hispanic or Latino	34,412	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	285	S	66
White	68,405	S	79
Two or more races	3,364	S	75
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	10,497	S	21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,896	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	42,357	S	51
Migratory students	310	S	29
Male	59,595	S	63
Female	57,267	S	75

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well. The major change in number of migratory students is a function of the economy and Colorado agricultural needs.

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	57,246	S	50
American Indian or Alaska Native	507	S	36
Asian	1,830	S	57
Black or African American	2,832	S	25
Hispanic or Latino	16,394	S	28
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	136	S	43
White	33,896	S	63
Two or more races	1,644	S	58
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	4,959	S	14
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,691	S	4
Economically disadvantaged students	19,975	S	29
Migratory students	150	S	11
Male	29,156	S	51
Female	28,081	S	49

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The major discrepancies between the percentages scoring at or above proficient results from Colorado's accountability system under the NCLB Flexibility Waiver. For the 2011-12 school year, only students who scored Proficient or Advanced counted; in prior years for AYP, Partially Proficient students counted as well.

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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,813		
Districts	259		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado's prefill is derived from FS C029 as a response to the absence of DG 32- AYP Status. Because CO's CSPR section 1.4.1 will pull data from the Operational Status Data Groups (LEA 16; SCH 531) transmitted through the Directory file, the 'Total # of Districts' table prefilled with the literal count of Colorado's reported LEAs, despite their accountability responsibility. The Department of Education is currently examining the agency types included in the calculation of 1.4.1.2.1 for states with approved ESEA Flexibility requests. A change will be made in the calculation logic (and any necessary documentation) between the Part I close (12/20) and the Part I re-open (in late February). The Department recommends that flexibility states submit additional information in the 1.4.1 Comment box describing the actual number of districts you believe should be included in this count for the Part I certification. At this time, according to both the Educational Unit Profile, as well as the EDEN028 report, the 259 districts listed in this section are a direct reflection of the data transmitted by CO in the SY11-12 C029 LEA file.			

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 SY 2011-12 . 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	642		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	468		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	174		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado applied for and received an AYP waiver for SY 2011-12. We are not calculating AYP.			

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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
175		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado applied for and received an AYP waiver for SY 2011-12. We are not calculating AYP.		

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	15
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	
Replacement of the principal	6
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Blanks are where zero values would go.	

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	7
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Blanks are where zero values would go.	

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.

a. Change the governance structure of the school in a significant manner that either diminishes school-based management and decision making or increases control, monitoring, and oversight of the school's operations and educational program by the LEA;
b. Close 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);
c. Expand or narrow the grades served, for example, narrowing a K-8 school to a K-5 elementary school.

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.

The following describes the actions taken for districts that received Title I funds and were identified for Improvement.

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

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 experts. The CADI process is also a rubric based process and evidence is collected through document analysis, interviews and observations/walkthroughs. Once the report is complete, the CADI team leader works with district staff to plan a "roll out" of the findings to a variety of stakeholders in the district (i.e. School Board members, administrative staff, teaching staffs and parents and community members). Following the formal roll out, district central office staff convene meetings to develop the district's Unified Improvement Plan. Funding is then made available to the districts in order to focus on implementation of the improvement plan strategies and evaluation of the programs. The funding must be targeted toward activities that build the district's capacity for leadership and system improvement and are tied to the findings in the CADI report.

Districts identified for Improvement were also eligible to apply for 1003(a) reallocated funds to address identified needs in the areas of leadership, culture and climate and best first instruction. Districts that participated provided a plan that addressed the needs that were identified in a thorough needs assessement and an action plan that identified programs and activities that address the identified need.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 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 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	67
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 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado applied for and received an AYP waiver for SY 2011-12. We are not calculating AYP.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

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 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g)AIlocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1003g Tiered Intervention Grant - Technical Assistance and Support to districts:
The Office of School and District Improvement provides monthly onsite support to each grantee. Performance managers monitor the implementation of the scope of work identified in the schools' unified improvement plans. On a monthly basis,schools are expected to review and report out on all major improvement strategies and performance targets that were identified in their improvement plans. Grantees, with support from Performance Managers, work with district leadership to organize various trainings, revise schedules and establish new practices to ensure leadership capacity is developed at the building level. Grantees have established Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and building leadership teams to assist with the implementation of their unified improvement plans.
Grantees and Performance Managers co-presented at a Colorado administrator conference addressing the initial stages and lessons learned from the Tiered Intervention Grant development and implementation. Grantees are asked to share their grant
implementation experiences, systemic changes, and lessons learned from this process during quarterly PLCs.
Performance managers developed a tool and process to support the sites in the monitoring process for the grant and planning for the second round of grants. This includes revisions to the RFP, needs assessments/reviews, target setting, and
improvement planning applications for the eligible sites. The department is also utilizing information gathered from other states to assist in developing our monitoring process. The tool was shared with existing grantees, differentiated for each site based on the chosen reform model. Sites are being monitored to ensure they are meeting the requirements of their chosen reform model. Performance managers attend regional School Improvement Grants conferences and share the information with grantees. Support was provided to Cohort II sites for planning and needs assessments in preparation for the release of the RFP.
Evaluation:
Colorado is participating in the USDE funded evaluation of the 1003(g) grants. We are in the beginning stages of working with the external evaluators on the evaluation.

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 2011-12 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.

The following describes the actions take for Title I schools identified for Improvement supported by funds other than those of section 1003(a) and 1003(g).
Unified Improvement Planning: Schools placed on School Improvement, Corrective Action or Restructuring must submit a Unified Improvement plan. The districts have received technical assistance in the development of the plan, including how to assist their schools. Unified improvement planning provides a common approach for schools to prepare improvement plans required by state and federal law. More information regarding the Unified Improvement Plan process can be found at: http://www.schoolview.org/UnifiedImprovementPlanning.asp

Statewide System of Accountability and Support: The CDE Statewide System of Accountability and Support provides incentives, opportunities and support for districts and school as they manage their performance. By engaging in a continuous improvement cycle to manage their performance, districts and schools will improve their effectiveness and the outcomes for their students. That cycle includes:
• Focus attention on the right things.
• All learners prepared for postsecondary learning or to enter the workplace.
• Intermediate results evaluated based on state-defined performance indicators.
• Evaluate performance - gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data about performance in each indicator area (metrics) to evaluate/monitor performance.
• Plan improvement strategies based on data and root cause analysis and defining implementation benchmarks.
• Implement planned improvement strategies.
More information regarding the Statewide System of Accountability and Support can be found at: http://www.schoolview.org/documents/SSASSystemComponents.pdf

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.

Public School Choice	**# Students**
Eligible for public school choice	88,459
Applied to transfer	1,470
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,470
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 1,432,831

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.

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	16

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

[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*.

Supplemental Educational Services	**# Students**
Eligible for supplemental educational services	56,213
Applied for supplemental educational services	10,054
Received supplemental educational services	9,420
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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*.

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	**Amount**
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 10,123,022
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado spent $10,123,022 on Supplemental Educational Services and cannot seem to be able to enter that amount.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	262,584	261,718	99.67	866	0.33
All elementary classes	156,826	156,362	99.70	464	0.30
All secondary classes	105,758	105,356	99.62	402	0.38

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.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

Elementary School Classes	**Percentage**
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	15.34
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	16.34
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	34.11
Other (please explain in comment box below)	34.21
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Secondary School Classes	**Percentage**
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)	26.25
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	6.75
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	47.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	20.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes regular education teaachers who do not have subject-matter competency and are not fully certified.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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	41,012	40,966	99.89
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	43,146	43,011	99.69
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	25,501	25,395	99.58
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	36,909	36,842	99.82

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	72.90	20.50
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced cost lunch.	
Secondary schools	60.30	24.20
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced cost lunch.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *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.

b. *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.

c. *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.

d. *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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Chinese
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.

Other programs include (as reported by LEAs):Push-in ESL, Co-Teaching, Literacy Based ESL, Expanded Learning Time and Flex groups at elementary level, Immersion, Sheltered Content Instruction, Daily English Language Development Blocks, Tutoring, Provide in-classroom support for students through a push in pull out model, Systematic ELD instruction, Pull-Out ESL, and Tutoring w/heritage language support as needed.

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	112,529
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 Receiving Services	**#**
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	112,258
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	95,083
Vietnamese	1,866
Arabic	1,543
Chinese	1,206
Russian	1,049

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 students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121 (a)(2).

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	101,496
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	385
Total	101,881
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number tested on CELApro is lower than the number receiving services throughout the year because our English learners are highly migratory, often leaving Colorado and the U.S. for extended periods of time and, in so doing, were not here during the CELApro testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	9,527
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	9.35
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	101,238
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	385
Total	101,623
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado's English learner population is highly mobile, often leaving Colorado and the U.S. for extended periods of time. As such, many were not here during the testing window for CELApro.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	18,451

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

Title III Results	**Results #**	**Results %**	**Targets #**	**Targets %**
Making progress	39,799	48.07		
Attained proficiency	9,524	9.41	7,157	7.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. In alignment with Colorado's NCLB Flexibility Waiver, AMAO 1 (making progress) is determined based on the amount of English learning growth occurred within the context of what amount of growth took place in order to attain proficiency within a certain period of time. LEAs must earn 62.5% of the growth points possible to meet the target.				

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado offers Lectura, a Spanish language reading assessment, to eligible 3rd and 4th graders.	

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)
not applicable
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado does not offer a non-English mathematics assessment.

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: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. applies to 3rd and 4th grade only, for native Spanish speakers in the U.S. fewer than five years.

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)
not applicable
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
10,156	12,009	22,165
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,253	S	57	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,235	S	71	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
5,156	S	35	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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.)

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	61
////////////

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
8,557	4,193	26

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	6,204
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,500

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 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 and 1.6.4.)
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	126	//////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	102	//////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	87	//////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	61	//////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	57	//////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	24	//////////////////////
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	132	12,234
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	94	3,297
PD provided to principals	102	1,502
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	92	696
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	63	1,275
PD provided to community based organization personnel	22	1,936
Total	505	20,940

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: RTI for ELLs, Curriculum alignment for ELL students, Reality Spanish for Parent Involvement, Academic Content Standards (not specifically ELL standards), Differentiation, SIOP, PBIS, Pod casting, Technology - SMART Boards, Co-teaching approaches and structures, Instructional rounds using framework for best practice, Specific Writing instruction (Every Child a Writer), Design and Delivery of effective lessons, CELA pro training, Data evaluation, Intentional collaboration between core content and ESL teachers, Developing cultural proficiency, Instructional strategies for ELL students in the general education classroom, and curriculum mapping.

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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/11	07/01/11	30

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Comments: Preliminary allocations, based on USDE's preliminar 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 draw down. 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 draw down 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.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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	**#**	**# LEAs Reporting Data**
LEAs without subgrants	129	127
LEAs with subgrants	51	51
Total	180	178
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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)	164	1,014
K	472	1,655
1	468	1,730
2	506	1,558
3	467	1,551
4	442	1,462
5	418	1,327
6	369	1,225
7	374	1,234
8	376	1,106
9	312	1,016
10	320	1,004
11	288	1,003
12	480	1,339
Ungraded		
Total	5,456	18,224
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There were no homeless children/youth in public school LEAs with or without grants who were ungraded.		

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.

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	638	2,297
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,249	14,517
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	125	537
Hotels/Motels	444	873
Total	5,456	18,224
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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 Birth Through 2	257
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,014
K	1,672
1	1,754
2	1,579
3	1,562
4	1,480
5	1,342
6	1,238
7	1,248
8	1,112
9	1,020
10	1,004
11	1,007
12	1,405
Ungraded	
Total	18,694
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Colorado reports all students within a grade-there are no students ungraded.	

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.

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,736
Migratory children/youth	482
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	2,165
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	2,732
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,299	694
4	1,204	492
5	1,141	516
6	1,014	501
7	980	441
8	921	374
High School	1,432	613
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	1,296	626
4	1,212	578
5	1,136	449
6	1,019	353
7	987	249
8	924	225
High School	1,453	173
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	1,142	265
6		
7		
8	923	193
High School	723	151
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. These blanks reflect that there were no students in grades 3, 4, 6 or 7 who received a valid score and were assigned a proficiency level.		

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	435
K	268
1	280
2	296
3	265
4	288
5	277
6	271
7	236
8	237
9	234
10	194
11	198
12	240
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	300
Total	4,019
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

Economic forces - Decreased opportunities for new workers, decreased jobs available; less workers moving into the area compared to historical patterns of prior years.

Drought - Decreased crop production; decreased workers needed for harvesting, less families moving into the state.

Immigration concerns - Less migrant families moving to Colorado.

High numbers of families that are end of eligibility - Migrant families that EOE are staying in area instead of moving on, as in the past. EOE parents are being hired for jobs traditionally filled by new arrival migrant families.

Closing labor camps - Decreased housing. Landlords of apartments are unwilling to rent to "groups of workers" per contract regulations. Limited housing options.

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	36
K	27
1	38
2	17
3	34
4	44
5	29
6	23
7	19
8	23
9	33
10	16
11	14
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	359
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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 2011-12 Summer Grant opportunity allowed MEP Regional and LEA programs to design and implement new summer programs to serve students and families. The Summer Grant opened the door for increased student participation in summer programs.

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.

Colorado is part of the New Generation System (NGS) Consortia and used NGS as its student information system to compile and generate the Category 1 and 2 child counts for the 2011-12 reporting period.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NGS Student Information System was used to collect the state's child count data.

The data reported for this period includes students ages 3-21 who were attending, residency only and two year olds turning three.

The activities used to collect the data for this reporting period included students K-12 who were verified with school records and validated against the Department's Student End of Year Report.

Residency verifications were conducted by completing a home visit to verify the residency of children ages 3-5 not attending school, out of school youth, and two year olds turning three.

Home visits were conducted for those students who had made an eligible move. Once verified, a COE was completed and a signature was collected to document the students eligibility for the 2011-12 reporting period. This information was validated against the state's Record Integration Tracking System (RITS) and MSIX, to verify the accuracy of the move from a previous State or district.

The Colorado Migrant Education Program is responsible for the timely identification and recruitment (ID&R) of all eligible migrant children and youth. Through an annual application process the Colorado Department of Education accepts applications from regional migrant programs which include an identification and recruitment plan and processes of how they will conduct regional identification and recruitment. There are six regional migrant offices located throughout Colorado that house 23 recruiters. All recruiters are year-round employees. The recruitment process is a daily activity that happens at different times of the day and according to the days and hours a migrant worker is available to complete a face to face interview. Each new recruiter must complete 16 hours of identification and recruitment training provided by the state to become state certified with an additional eight hours mid-year. All other seasoned recruiters must attend two 8-hour trainings provided mid-year and again in September. All recruiters receive additional support by way of webinars, and site visits. The state recruiter is responsible for ID&R training and utilizes the National ID&R curriculum. All eligible children and youth are recruited by Colorado state certified recruiters through a face to face interview. Visits take place within the home, at the work site, schools, community organizations, or other mutually agreed upon venue. Recruiters utilize an electronic Certification of Eligibility (COE), known in Colorado as the, "COE bundle" which consists of the National Certificate of Eligibility (NCOE), Recruiter and Data Specialist COE Worksheet (WS), and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) form. At the completion of each interview the recruiter will print out the COE bundle documents, collect the parent/guardian signature, scan documents and submit electronically to the regional data specialist, who reviews the information. After the regional data specialist has completed their review, the COE is submitted to the State Education Agency (SEA) for final review and approval. COEs that are unapproved by the SEA are resubmitted to the region for clarification and supporting documentation. Upon approval of the COE, the SEA will notify the regional migrant program which in turn will notify the migrant family of their eligibility for the Migrant Education Program. Below is a link to a sample of the Colorado COE Bundle.
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cde_english/download/Migrant/COE_bundle_English_sample.pdf.

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 child count data is entered into NGS by the MEP regional or LEA program personnel.

The SEA reviews and either approves, or denies each child count data entered by the MEP program personnel prior to being uploaded into the state's student information system.

If necessary, data will be verified by an SEA validation committee prior to final approval.

Updates are completed by the MEP regional or LEA program personnel and validity checks are run against the state's

Student Information System, MSIX, and when necessary, a home visit is conducted by the SEA.

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 count for category 2 is entered by the MEP regional or LEA program personnel. A student's summer/intercession enrollment is verified by a summer school district attendance record or MEP summer literacy program attendance record.

Summer/Intercession enrollments cannot be entered unless category 1 counts have been closed out. Category 2 counts can be entered between the months of June 1st through August 31st of that reporting period, depending on the length of a summer held district school or MEP literacy program.

The SEA reviews, approves, or denies each category 2 child count data entered by the MEP regional or LEA program personnel prior to being uploaded into the states student information system.

If necessary, data will be verified by an SEA validation committee prior to final approval.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2011-12 category 1 child count is an unduplicated count of students by district or state.

Students are selected based upon the enrollment period and federal eligibility criteria.

Each student is counted once, based upon a unique student ID, even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the reporting time period.

The regular, summer/intercession and residency only enrollments include an enrollment date if the student was enrolled for at least one day during the reporting period and if the student is between the ages of 3-21 years old for at least one day during the reporting period as verified by: school records, home visit, COE, and residency verification forms.

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

The 2011-12 Category 2 child count is an unduplicated count of students by district or state.

Students are selected based upon their academic need to attend a district held summer/intercession school. Participation in MEP funded summer/intercession projects must be reported to the SEA and reflected within budget submitted to the SEA. In addition, the SEA has revised its budget template required as part of the MEP application process to identify allocations to districts including summer/intercession projects.

Each student is counted once, based upon a unique student ID, even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the summer intercession term.

A student's summer/intercession enrollment is verified by a summer school district attendance record or MEP summer literacy program attendance record.

A student's qualifying arrival date for a summer/intercession enrollment must be active in order to be counted towards the category 2 counts.

<u>If your State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system from the Category 1 count, please describe each system separately.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State did not use a different system to generate the States Category 2 count. Below is a description of how the State generated it's Category 2 child counts.

The 2011-12 Category 2 child count is an unduplicated count of students by district or state.

Students are selected based upon their academic need to attend a district held summer/intercession school. Participation in MEP funded summer/intercession projects must be reported to the SEA and reflected within budget submitted to the SEA. In addition, the SEA has revised its budget template required as part of the MEP application process to identify allocations to districts including summer/intercession projects.

Each student is counted once, based upon a unique student ID, even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the summer intercession term.

A student's summer/intercession enrollment is verified by a summer school district attendance record or MEP summer literacy program attendance record.

A student's qualifying arrival date for a summer/intercession enrollment must be active in order to be counted towards the category 2 counts.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's Quality Control System facilitates multiple reviews of every certificate of eligibility, first by the MEP regional or LEA program data specialist and ID&R coordinators, second by SEA data specialist, third by auditors and validation committee members to determine the eligibility of each child included in the states child counts for the 2011-12 reporting period.

The SEA conducts MEP program ID&R trainings, as well as, quarterly SEA ID&R trainings with technical assistance visits as needed to support best practices that comply with federal regulations. The SEA conducts statewide ID&R training through teleconferencing, program site visits, program director meetings, and at the annual Statewide Migrant Conference.

The SEA publishes an ID&R manual based upon the current guidance of the Office of Migrant Education. The State provides communication to the field regarding Migrant ID&R policy, procedure and guidance.

Each MEP regional or LEA program data specialist must be trained and certified on the National ID&R Curriculum and data management procedures before being allowed access to the States student inforamtion system NGS.

Monthly data management trainings are held via teleconferencing, program site visits, face to face meetings, and at the Statewide Migrant Conference to ensure data deadlines and procedures are followed.

At the local level regional recruiters submit difficult eligibility determinations to their regional identification and recruitment (ID&R) coordinators and regional directors. The regional ID&R coordinators and regional directors review the information and make eligibility determinations utilizing the current Non-Regulatory Guidance and Colorado's ID&R Guidebook. If the regional Migrant education Program is unable to resolve the eligibility question they submit their eligibility question to the state migrant director. The state director, with her team, provides responses regarding all eligibility determinations in writing to the regional migrant program. All eligibility determinations are added to the frequently asked questions (FAQ's) page located on the Colorado Department of Education's webpage.
http://www.cde.state.co.us/cde_english/download/Migrant/FAQ's.pdf.

Information gathered from these difficult eligibility determinations are used in future ID&R trainings and current guidance publications to the regional migrant programs from the SEA.

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 Colorado Migrant Education Program (MEP) took a sample of students who were recruited and enrolled in the program during the 2011-2012 school year. The sample students were selected from a report pulled from the New Generation System (NGS), the state migrant data base. The state is divided up into seven migrant regions, therefore a unique count was pulled for each region. Each regional report was alphabetized and then every fifth student was sampled. Every student pulled for the sample was verified to ensure that the students selected were not duplicating families. There was a second sample using the described sample method also verifying that the students were not a duplicate family from the first and second sampling.

The SEA chose to use a "simple random sample" based on the number of students recruited and enrolled during the 2011-2012 school year. The method is one of the recommended forms of sampling from the "Technical Assistance Guide Book on Re-Interviewing." (See page 20, Selection of Sampling) Each interview was completed by a face to face home visit.

A total of 671 students with a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2012 were used in the sample. At the conclusion of the re-interview a total of 85 students were interviewed. Of the 85 students interviewed a total of 12 students (five COE's) were found ineligible for the MEP and 73 were found eligible.

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 student record submission and either approves/denies it on a case by case basis.

The SEA verifies that no duplicate child counts are reported in the state's migrant counts by monthly running reports to verify eligibility and validity.

Children K-12 are tracked by their unique state student ID number. The state's student information system has an edit check to validate the student state ID being entered does not already exist in the system and therefore does not allow for a duplicate entry.

Multiple search methods using the state's information system and other state data sources within the department, as well as MSIX, are conducted to verify the accuracy of the child counts.

Should a duplicate record be found in the states student information system. The duplicate records are consolidated. The consolidation is first verified by the SEA, then by the MEP regional or LEA program.

An email notification is sent out automatically to all users associated with the student record, that a consolidation has taken place. All users are required to modify the students record to correspond with consolidation.

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 SEA validates each child count against several database sources.

A final validation is run against the department's Student End of Year Report to reaffirm accuracy for students K-12. Any discrepancies are removed and not reported on the state's category 1 child counts.

Residency only students are verified with a parent's signature. Those residency only students who are not verified with a parent's signature are not included in the state's child counts.

Category 2 counts are verified against a school district or MEP literacy attendance rosters. Any discrepanices are removed and not reported on the state's category 2 child counts.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have removed the students off the list of 2011-12 SY eligible migrant counts in Colorado that were deemed ineligible by the prospective re-interview. The families will be notified of the misidentification of eligibility to the Migrant Education Program and termination of migrant services.

CDE will conduct up to ten prospective interviews every month, with an average yearly minimum of six per month. The purpose of the increased prospective interviews will be to find any discrepancies in identification early and to make adjustments in our
training and guidance to our recruiters and data specialists. This will also support the idea of conducting interviews close to the qualifying arrival date of the family in order to have a lower percentage of families that have moved before the reinterview.

We have analyzed the misidentifications of certificates of eligibility's and are planning training accordingly for the MEP in Colorado. Webinars and face to face trainings will take place in 2013 to address the issues found through the analysis of misidentifications.

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.

Colorado currently has no concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported child counts or underlying eligibility determinations on which the 2011-12 counts are based.