

**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 2010-11

COLORADO



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2011
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2012

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) 2010-11 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2010-11 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 16, 2011**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 17, 2012**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2010-11, 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 2010-11 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 2010-11 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2010-11



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 16, 2011
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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.

No further revisions or changes are anticipated.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state is not making any changes to the assessment system for the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. Colorado is moving forward with a plan that would allow for the administration of new summative assessments, including alternate assessments in 2013-2014. Please see below for related activities and timeline.

Activity Timeline Completed

Stakeholder input Fall 2009 - Fall 2010 X

Adoption of assessment Fall 2010 X

system attributes by
State Board of Education
and Colorado Board of
Higher Education

Develop cost estimates Spring - Summer 2011 X

RFP release Fall 2011

RFP review Winter 2011

Contract award Winter 2011

Item Development Beginning in Spring 2012

(Key characteristics:
multiple item types
assessing the breadth
and depth of standards,
transition to on-line,
leverage advantages of
technology,

Field testing Spring 2013

Ongoing item
development Ongoing

First operational Spring 2014
administration

Standard setting Late spring- early summer 2014

(Key characteristics:
must be tied to
indicators of college
and career readiness)

Release of scores Summer 2014

There is the possibility that Colorado will not have the funding available to initiate development and field testing activities in 2012-2013, which would then mean the timeline is pushed out a year. Alternately, Colorado may choose to adopt one of the two multi-state consortia assessments for administration in 2014-2015.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11, 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) | 10.0 |
| To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results | 90.0 |
| Comments: | |

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2010-11 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) | <u>Yes</u> |
| 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) | <u>Yes</u> |
| Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7) | <u>No</u> |
| 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 | <u>Yes</u> |
| Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems | <u>Yes</u> |
| 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 | <u>Yes</u> |
| Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments | <u>No</u> |
| 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 | <u>Yes</u> |
| Other | <u>No</u> |
| Comments: | |

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 490,113 | 486,206 | 99.2 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 4,259 | 4,208 | 98.8 |
| Asian | 16,266 | 16,179 | 99.5 |
| Black or African American | 24,199 | 23,898 | 98.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 152,893 | 151,779 | 99.3 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 278,361 | 276,149 | 99.2 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 49,451 | 48,415 | 97.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 53,196 | 52,863 | 99.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 198,840 | 197,250 | 99.2 |
| Migratory students | 1,907 | 1,898 | 99.5 |
| Male | 250,872 | 248,731 | 99.1 |
| Female | 239,188 | 237,426 | 99.3 |

Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X081 state: "Which permitted values should be used?"

States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 15,384 | 31.8 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 28,523 | 58.9 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 4,508 | 9.3 |
| Total | 48,415 | |
| Comments: | | |

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

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 490,093 | 485,366 | 99.0 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 4,269 | 4,210 | 98.6 |
| Asian | 16,259 | 16,143 | 99.3 |
| Black or African American | 24,212 | 23,865 | 98.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 152,862 | 151,360 | 99.0 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 278,355 | 275,811 | 99.1 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 49,430 | 48,188 | 97.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 53,179 | 52,575 | 98.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 198,862 | 196,738 | 98.9 |
| Migratory students | 1,905 | 1,890 | 99.2 |
| Male | 250,875 | 248,224 | 98.9 |
| Female | 239,163 | 237,090 | 99.1 |

Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X081 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance.

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 16,959 | 35.2 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 26,690 | 55.4 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 4,539 | 9.4 |
| LEP < 12 months, took ELP | | |
| Total | 48,188 | |
| Comments: | | |

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 180,131 | 177,966 | 98.8 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 1,607 | 1,580 | 98.3 |
| Asian | 6,010 | 5,960 | 99.2 |
| Black or African American | 8,879 | 8,729 | 98.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 54,595 | 53,990 | 98.9 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 104,054 | 102,782 | 98.8 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 17,624 | 17,192 | 97.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 16,309 | 16,146 | 99.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 69,707 | 68,861 | 98.8 |
| Migratory students | 674 | 671 | 99.6 |
| Male | 92,318 | 91,165 | 98.8 |
| Female | 87,794 | 86,782 | 98.8 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X081 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 6,285 | 36.6 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 9,262 | 53.9 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 1,645 | 9.6 |
| Total | 17,192 | |
| Comments: | | |

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 not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| All students | 63,539 | 58,283 | 91.7 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 496 | 429 | 86.5 |
| Asian | 2,205 | 2,070 | 93.9 |
| Black or African American | 2,933 | 2,355 | 80.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20,983 | 18,053 | 86.0 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,991 | 33,588 | 96.0 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,277 | 4,368 | 69.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 11,069 | 9,000 | 81.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 28,358 | 24,352 | 85.9 |
| Migratory students | 279 | 221 | 79.2 |
| Male | 32,548 | 29,805 | 91.6 |
| Female | 30,986 | 28,474 | 91.9 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X075 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 63,313 | 57,168 | 90.3 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 496 | 428 | 86.3 |
| Asian | 2,192 | 2,013 | 91.8 |
| Black or African American | 2,927 | 2,473 | 84.5 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20,820 | 17,340 | 83.3 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,942 | 33,113 | 94.8 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,225 | 3,590 | 57.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 10,942 | 8,391 | 76.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 28,212 | 23,621 | 83.7 |
| Migratory students | 277 | 204 | 73.6 |
| Male | 32,431 | 28,639 | 88.3 |
| Female | 30,870 | 28,525 | 92.4 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X078 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 Alaskan Native | | | |
| Asian | | | |
| Black or African American | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | | | |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |

Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X079 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance.

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 | 63,157 | 57,690 | 91.3 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 557 | 485 | 87.1 |
| Asian | 2,114 | 1,969 | 93.1 |
| Black or African American | 2,974 | 2,341 | 78.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20,602 | 17,627 | 85.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,920 | 33,423 | 95.7 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,612 | 4,226 | 63.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 9,679 | 7,662 | 79.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 27,995 | 23,862 | 85.2 |
| Migratory students | 233 | 180 | 77.3 |
| Male | 32,165 | 29,219 | 90.8 |
| Female | 30,988 | 28,467 | 91.9 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X075 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 63,111 | 55,792 | 88.4 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 561 | 465 | 82.9 |
| Asian | 2,111 | 1,886 | 89.3 |
| Black or African American | 2,969 | 2,300 | 77.5 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20,591 | 16,445 | 79.9 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,889 | 32,864 | 94.2 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,584 | 3,432 | 52.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 9,657 | 6,544 | 67.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 27,967 | 22,372 | 80.0 |
| Migratory students | 233 | 167 | 71.7 |
| Male | 32,128 | 27,690 | 86.2 |
| Female | 30,978 | 28,099 | 90.7 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X078 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 Alaskan Native | | | |
| Asian | | | |
| Black or African American | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | | | |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |

Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X079 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance.

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 | 62,499 | 56,225 | 90.0 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 527 | 435 | 82.5 |
| Asian | 2,067 | 1,924 | 93.1 |
| Black or African American | 3,041 | 2,399 | 78.9 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20,348 | 16,978 | 83.4 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,673 | 32,796 | 94.6 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,696 | 3,868 | 57.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 8,207 | 6,038 | 73.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 27,342 | 22,680 | 82.9 |
| Migratory students | 284 | 221 | 77.8 |
| Male | 32,070 | 28,581 | 89.1 |
| Female | 30,419 | 27,640 | 90.9 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X075 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 62,434 | 54,846 | 87.8 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 527 | 420 | 79.7 |
| Asian | 2,061 | 1,863 | 90.4 |
| Black or African American | 3,046 | 2,376 | 78.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20,328 | 16,094 | 79.2 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,627 | 32,414 | 93.6 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,671 | 3,350 | 50.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 8,188 | 5,170 | 63.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 27,323 | 21,601 | 79.1 |
| Migratory students | 287 | 194 | 67.6 |
| Male | 32,033 | 27,404 | 85.5 |
| Female | 30,396 | 27,440 | 90.3 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X078 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 62,438 | 52,555 | 84.2 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 526 | 397 | 75.5 |
| Asian | 2,064 | 1,775 | 86.0 |
| Black or African American | 3,040 | 2,114 | 69.5 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 20,330 | 14,369 | 70.7 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,634 | 32,272 | 93.2 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,661 | 3,516 | 52.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 8,204 | 4,134 | 50.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 27,330 | 19,731 | 72.2 |
| Migratory students | 284 | 157 | 55.3 |
| Male | 32,023 | 26,863 | 83.9 |
| Female | 30,408 | 25,687 | 84.5 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X079 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 61,020 | 53,216 | 87.2 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 530 | 415 | 78.3 |
| Asian | 1,958 | 1,784 | 91.1 |
| Black or African American | 3,098 | 2,257 | 72.9 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 19,467 | 15,518 | 79.7 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,210 | 31,656 | 92.5 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,416 | 3,231 | 50.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6,281 | 4,030 | 64.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 25,809 | 20,316 | 78.7 |
| Migratory students | 241 | 163 | 67.6 |
| Male | 31,208 | 26,762 | 85.8 |
| Female | 29,811 | 26,453 | 88.7 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X075 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 60,955 | 55,073 | 90.4 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 531 | 442 | 83.2 |
| Asian | 1,953 | 1,766 | 90.4 |
| Black or African American | 3,094 | 2,447 | 79.1 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 19,443 | 16,318 | 83.9 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,178 | 32,447 | 94.9 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,393 | 3,594 | 56.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 6,257 | 4,195 | 67.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 25,767 | 21,445 | 83.2 |
| Migratory students | 239 | 162 | 67.8 |
| Male | 31,170 | 27,381 | 87.8 |
| Female | 29,782 | 27,689 | 93.0 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X078 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 Alaskan Native | | | |
| Asian | | | |
| Black or African American | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | | | |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |

Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X079 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance.

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 | 60,162 | 51,117 | 85.0 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 528 | 403 | 76.3 |
| Asian | 1,975 | 1,785 | 90.4 |
| Black or African American | 3,054 | 2,112 | 69.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 18,740 | 14,056 | 75.0 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,153 | 31,253 | 91.5 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,172 | 2,876 | 46.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5,465 | 2,946 | 53.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 24,582 | 18,344 | 74.6 |
| Migratory students | 255 | 153 | 60.0 |
| Male | 30,695 | 25,747 | 83.9 |
| Female | 29,459 | 25,366 | 86.1 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X075 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 60,080 | 52,832 | 87.9 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 527 | 428 | 81.2 |
| Asian | 1,973 | 1,757 | 89.1 |
| Black or African American | 3,051 | 2,325 | 76.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 18,709 | 14,726 | 78.7 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,118 | 32,027 | 93.9 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,136 | 3,116 | 50.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5,443 | 2,857 | 52.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 24,539 | 19,326 | 78.8 |
| Migratory students | 253 | 170 | 67.2 |
| Male | 30,630 | 26,093 | 85.2 |
| Female | 29,442 | 26,734 | 90.8 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X078 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 Alaskan Native | | | |
| Asian | | | |
| Black or African American | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | | | |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | | | |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |

Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X079 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance.

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 | 58,706 | 47,085 | 80.2 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 519 | 375 | 72.3 |
| Asian | 1,946 | 1,744 | 89.6 |
| Black or African American | 2,820 | 1,816 | 64.4 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 17,689 | 12,003 | 67.9 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,110 | 29,774 | 87.3 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5,699 | 2,120 | 37.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4,353 | 1,812 | 41.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,765 | 15,250 | 67.0 |
| Migratory students | 202 | 111 | 55.0 |
| Male | 30,019 | 23,739 | 79.1 |
| Female | 28,682 | 23,343 | 81.4 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X075 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 58,663 | 52,764 | 89.9 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 519 | 446 | 85.9 |
| Asian | 1,945 | 1,747 | 89.8 |
| Black or African American | 2,819 | 2,294 | 81.4 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 17,649 | 14,560 | 82.5 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,113 | 32,205 | 94.4 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5,678 | 3,023 | 53.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4,325 | 2,436 | 56.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,709 | 18,601 | 81.9 |
| Migratory students | 203 | 137 | 67.5 |
| Male | 29,995 | 26,114 | 87.1 |
| Female | 28,662 | 26,645 | 93.0 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X078 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| All students | 58,462 | 44,608 | 76.3 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 511 | 332 | 65.0 |
| Asian | 1,944 | 1,611 | 82.9 |
| Black or African American | 2,801 | 1,595 | 56.9 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 17,591 | 10,382 | 59.0 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,011 | 29,360 | 86.3 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5,588 | 1,971 | 35.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4,337 | 1,021 | 23.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,691 | 13,487 | 59.4 |
| Migratory students | 203 | 92 | 45.3 |
| Male | 29,866 | 22,680 | 75.9 |
| Female | 28,590 | 21,924 | 76.7 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X079 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 117,123 | 80,561 | 68.8 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 1,051 | 567 | 53.9 |
| Asian | 3,914 | 3,078 | 78.6 |
| Black or African American | 5,978 | 2,746 | 45.9 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 33,950 | 17,273 | 50.9 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 69,092 | 54,567 | 79.0 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 10,543 | 2,653 | 25.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 7,809 | 1,783 | 22.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 40,399 | 20,582 | 50.9 |
| Migratory students | 404 | 127 | 31.4 |
| Male | 60,026 | 41,098 | 68.5 |
| Female | 57,081 | 39,456 | 69.1 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X075 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 116,810 | 107,243 | 91.8 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 1,049 | 917 | 87.4 |
| Asian | 3,908 | 3,516 | 90.0 |
| Black or African American | 5,959 | 4,993 | 83.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 33,820 | 28,966 | 85.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 68,944 | 65,891 | 95.6 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 10,501 | 6,528 | 62.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 7,763 | 4,662 | 60.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 40,221 | 34,252 | 85.2 |
| Migratory students | 398 | 280 | 70.4 |
| Male | 59,837 | 53,467 | 89.4 |
| Female | 56,960 | 53,767 | 94.4 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X078 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 | 57,066 | 40,175 | 70.4 |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 543 | 308 | 56.7 |
| Asian | 1,952 | 1,452 | 74.4 |
| Black or African American | 2,888 | 1,464 | 50.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 16,069 | 7,982 | 49.7 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | | | |
| White | 34,137 | 27,839 | 81.6 |
| Two or more races | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 4,943 | 1,469 | 29.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3,605 | 541 | 15.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 18,840 | 9,630 | 51.1 |
| Migratory students | 184 | 45 | 24.5 |
| Male | 29,276 | 20,436 | 69.8 |
| Female | 27,784 | 19,735 | 71.0 |
| Comments: Data for "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" students is included in the "Asian" group, as that is how the state calculates AYP. Additionally, the state is not yet using "Two or more races" for AYP calculations. Instructions in EDFacts file specs N/X079 state: "Which permitted values should be used? States should use whichever permitted values best align with the major racial and ethnic subgroups used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP) as outlined in their State Accountability Plan." Thus, data for those students are not reported here per USDE guidance. | | | |

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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | Total # that Made AYP in SY 2010-11 | Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2010-11 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Schools | 1,714 | 713 | 41.6 |
| Districts | 182 | 45 | 24.7 |
| Comments: Performance targets increased in 2010-11, thus the decrease in the percent of schools and districts making AYP. | | | |

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 2010-11. 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 2010-11 | Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2010-11 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| All Title I schools | 643 | 244 | 37.9 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 436 | 128 | 29.4 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 207 | 116 | 56.0 |
| Comments: Performance targets increased in 2010-11, thus the decrease in the percent of schools and districts making 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 2010-11. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2010-11 | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2010-11 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 174 | 42 | 24.1 |
| Comments: One district was incorrectly identified as receiving Title I funds. USDE has been notified and will update the Title I districts during the re-submission process. The above numbers should be 174 districts received Title I funds, 42 districts made AYP, and 24.14% made AYP. | | |

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

| Corrective Action | # of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2010-11 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 16 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | 1 |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | 1 |
| Replacement of the principal | |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | |
| Comments: | |

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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) | 3 |
| 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: | |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2011-12 based on the data from SY 2010-11. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2011-12 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. **(This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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>.

Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement

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

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

Curriculum;

Assessment;

Instruction;

District Culture;

Parent Community engagement;

Professional Development and Evaluation;

Leadership;

Organizational Effectiveness; and

Comprehensive Planning

Depending on the size of the district, the CADI process may take 2-3 weeks with teams that vary in size from 7-13 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.

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 2010-11 (based on SY 2009-10 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 2010-11 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards | |
| Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district | |
| Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds | 58 |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP | |
| Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district | |
| Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district | |
| Restructured the district | |
| Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2009-10 and beginning of SY 2010-11 as a corrective action) | |
| Comments: | |

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2010-11 data and the results of those appeals.

| | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Districts | 7 | 1 |
| Schools | 41 | 10 |
| <p>Comments: In Colorado, districts and schools can appeal a single target; they do not need to appeal the entire determination. At the district level, there were seven appeals of which five resulted in at least one target change. Only one of these changes resulted in a district making AYP overall.</p> | | |
| <p>As the LEAs are responsible for school determinations and appeals, we only receive information about successful appeals. At the school level, there were 41 appeals. Of these, 10 resulted in the school making AYP.</p> | | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2010-11 data was complete | 9/20/11 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|

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 2010-11.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2010 (SY 2010-11) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

Comments:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

For SY 2010-11 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2010-11.

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 2010-11 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 here:

<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 here:

<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.

| | # Students |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Eligible for public school choice | 80,206 |
| Applied to transfer | 1,624 |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 1,624 |
| Comments: | |

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

| | Amount |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | \$ 1,915,920 |

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

| | # LEAs |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice | 15 |

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: Not all districts have reported the total dollar amount spent on public school choice transportation. We will have all the information collected by the re-submission process and will update it then.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

| | # Students |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Eligible for supplemental educational services | 47,511 |
| Applied for supplemental educational services | 8,625 |
| Received supplemental educational services | 7,562 |
| Comments: | |

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

| | Amount |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services | \$ 7,523,026 |
| Comments: There may be updates to the data reported above during the re-submission window. | |

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 | 256,313 | 255,106 | 99.5 | 1,207 | 0.5 |
| All elementary classes | 159,246 | 158,511 | 99.5 | 735 | 0.5 |
| All secondary classes | 97,067 | 96,595 | 99.5 | 472 | 0.5 |

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

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

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

| | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Elementary School Classes | |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 19.8 |
| 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 | 15.6 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 19.2 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 45.4 |
| Total | 100.0 |

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.

| | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Secondary School Classes | |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers) | 27.5 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 8.7 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 55.6 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 8.2 |
| Total | 100.0 |

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.

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 | 41,243 | 41,217 | 99.9 |
| Low-poverty Elementary Schools | 42,137 | 41,916 | 99.5 |
| Secondary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty secondary Schools | 20,385 | 20,285 | 99.5 |
| Low-Poverty secondary Schools | 36,970 | 36,777 | 99.5 |

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 | 71.6 | 20.8 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch. | |
| Secondary schools | 59.1 | 21.3 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent of students eligible for free/reduced price 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/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other programs include (as reported by LEAs): Push-in, After School Tutoring, Spanish Language Arts, Co-Teaching (General Ed and ESL), Content based ELD Instruction, Tutoring, Technology Based Supports, Immersion, Literacy Based ESL and Newcomer Programs.

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 | 110,377 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| | # |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year. | 110,206 |
| Comments: | |

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

| Language | # LEP Students |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Spanish; Castilian | 93,984 |
| Vietnamese | 1,939 |
| Arabic | 1,331 |
| Chinese | 1,253 |
| Russian | 1,063 |

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).

| | # |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 99,127 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 373 |
| Total | 99,500 |
| <p>Comments: The total LEP population (110377) reported in question 1.6.2.1 counts any student (non-duplicated) who was coded as NEP or LEP in Colorado either in January at the CELAPro count and/or in the End of Year data file (which looks at students' status for the entire school year). Students who have left the state before January or entered school in the state in February after CELApro are in the Student EOY but not in the CELApro file. There is tremendous mobility of LEP students in Colorado.</p> | |

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

| | # |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 8,705 |
| Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 8.7 |
| <p>Comments:</p> | |

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.

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| | # |
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 98,996 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 372 |
| Total | 99,368 |
| Comments: The Title III LEP population (110206) reported in question 1.6.2.2 counts any student (non-duplicated) who was coded as NEP or LEP in Colorado either in January at the CELAPro count and/or in the End of Year data file (which looks at students' status for the entire school year). Students who have left the state before January or entered school in the state in February after CELAPro are in the Student EOY but not in the CELAPro file. There is tremendous mobility of LEP students in Colorado. | |
| In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress). | |
| | # |
| Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. | 19,487 |

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:

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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%).

| | Results | | Targets | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------|---------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % |
| Making progress | 36,977 | 46.5 | 39,760 | 50.00 |
| Attained proficiency | 8,697 | 8.8 | 5,930 | 6.00 |
| Comments: Grade Count of 1st time assessed: K=12782; 1st=1224; 2nd=799; 3rd=633; 4th=558; 5th=497; 6th=455; 7th=433; 8th=399; 9th=494, 10th=470; 11th=362; 12th = 381. We do not have a count by Newcomer. | | | | |

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---------------------------------|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: Not applicable |

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Spanish |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: Lectura is the Spanish version of our reading assessment which is given in third and fourth grades only. |

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
|----------------------------------|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: Not applicable. |

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

| # Year One | # Year Two | Total |
|------------------|------------|--------|
| 5,560 | 6,650 | 12,210 |
| Comments: | | |

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 13,086 | 11,351 | 86.7 | 1,735 |
| Comments: | | | |

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.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 13,070 | 12,536 | 95.9 | 534 |
| Comments: | | | |

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 4,687 | 3,572 | 76.2 | 1,115 |
| Comments: | | | |

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

| | # |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| # - Total number of subgrantees for the year | 62 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 9 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1 | 39 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2 | 59 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3 | 9 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs | 0 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2009-10 and 2010-11) | 44 |
| # - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2010-11 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years | 41 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11) | 36 |

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Consortia were only counted once. Each consortia counted as a single subgrantee.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

| | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs | <u>No</u> |
| Comments: | |

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 9,873 | 4,585 | 24 |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

Note: Section 3301(8) v The term 'Language 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.

| | # |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 6,005 |
| 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 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

| Type of Professional Development Activity | # Subgrantees | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students | 135 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 105 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 80 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 51 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 74 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 29 | |
| Participant Information | # Subgrantees | # Participants |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 126 | 19,014 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 94 | 4,165 |
| PD provided to principals | 100 | 1,101 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 72 | 422 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 60 | 2,506 |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel | 23 | 1,346 |
| Total | 475 | 28,554 |

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: Language Acquisition, Quality programs for Online Education; including standards, strategies, RTI, podcast, technology; Parent Involvement, Developing Cultural Proficiency, Academic Content Standards, Technology- SMART Boards, Differentiation, SIOP, Development of ELL Resource Handbook, Research Based Strategies for Poverty and Minority Students, Co-Teaching Approaches and Structures, Math Recovery, Reading First, Technology/21st Century Skills, Instructional Strategies for ELLs in the General Classroom, ELL students and Special Education, Supporting ELLs in the Standards Based Classroom, Professional Learning Communities for ELL teachers, Vocabulary and District ELA Policies and Procedures for Administrators.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2010-11 funds July 1, 2010, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2010, for SY 2010-11 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/\$\$ Distribution |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 7/1/10 | 7/1/10 | 30 |
| <p>Comments: Comments: Preliminary allocations, based on USDE's preliminary allocations, are available to districts in the Spring of each year for budgeting and application process purposes. These are provided with anticipation that LEAs applying for funds will have Substantial Approval by July 1st. Applications and budgets are due by June 30th of each year. However, application extensions are granted to LEAs that request them.</p> <p>Each LEA application is reviewed on a case-by-case basis within 30 days of receipt. After review, each LEA is notified that its application has been given final approval, substantial approval, or no approval. If the Department is unable to give an application final approval, the LEA is notified of the changes that must be made in order to give the application final approval. Substantial approval means that an LEA may obligate funds but may not draw down funds. Once an LEA has received final approval of its application, funds are available for drawdown.</p> <p>However, any carryover funds continue to be made available to districts prior to final approval of its current application. Also, Colorado does not allow any LEA to drawdown funds until Colorado receives grant award notification from USDE, which typically occurs in mid-July.</p> <p>However, funds are available for LEA draw down as soon as Colorado receives its award notification from USDE and the Department has established that the LEA has met federal and state NCLB requirements for release of the funds.</p> | | |

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

| | # |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Persistently Dangerous Schools | 0 |
| Comments: | |

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Graduation Rate |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| All Students | 72.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 50.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 82.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 63.7 |
| Hispanic | 55.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 80.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 52.0 |
| Limited English proficient | 49.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 58.8 |
| Migratory students | 53.8 |
| Male | 68.7 |
| Female | 76.3 |
| Comments: | |

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2009-10). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 5.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 8.6 |
| Hispanic | 9.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 3.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 4.0 |
| Limited English proficient | 10.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 5.9 |
| Migratory students | 7.5 |
| Male | 5.9 |
| Female | 4.8 |
| Comments: Unfortunately, the dropout rate reported in the CSPR in past years was the dropout rate that the state calculated, and not the NCES CCD 9th-12th grade definition. Thus, the data now reported looks much higher than previous rates reported, since it used a different definition. | |

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

| | # | # LEAs Reporting Data |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| LEAs without subgrants | 133 | 133 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 51 | 51 |
| Total | 184 | 184 |
| Comments: The 51 LEAs with subgrants includes BOCES. | | |

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

| Age/Grade | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 187 | 1,019 |
| K | 456 | 1,536 |
| 1 | 443 | 1,473 |
| 2 | 418 | 1,340 |
| 3 | 390 | 1,307 |
| 4 | 371 | 1,227 |
| 5 | 358 | 1,153 |
| 6 | 321 | 1,087 |
| 7 | 297 | 981 |
| 8 | 254 | 834 |
| 9 | 312 | 959 |
| 10 | 297 | 893 |
| 11 | 297 | 790 |
| 12 | 487 | 1,137 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4,888 | 15,736 |
| Comments: | | |

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

| | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care | 537 | 2,315 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 3,823 | 12,546 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 167 | 342 |
| Hotels/Motels | 361 | 533 |
| Total | 4,888 | 15,736 |
| Comments: | | |

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

| Age/Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 1,098 |
| K | 1,598 |
| 1 | 1,529 |
| 2 | 1,396 |
| 3 | 1,353 |
| 4 | 1,294 |
| 5 | 1,212 |
| 6 | 1,134 |
| 7 | 1,029 |
| 8 | 879 |
| 9 | 1,012 |
| 10 | 941 |
| 11 | 894 |
| 12 | 1,230 |
| Ungraded | |
| Total | 16,599 |
| Comments: | |

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

| | # Homeless Students Served |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Unaccompanied youth | 1,177 |
| Migratory children/youth | 914 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 2,010 |
| Limited English proficient students | 2,629 |
| Comments: | |

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 | 1,176 | 924 |
| 4 | 1,197 | 906 |
| 5 | 1,110 | 806 |
| 6 | 992 | 788 |
| 7 | 902 | 668 |
| 8 | 747 | 568 |
| High School | 1,542 | 1,210 |
| Comments: | | |

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 | 1,192 | 958 |
| 4 | 1,200 | 968 |
| 5 | 1,111 | 852 |
| 6 | 998 | 722 |
| 7 | 905 | 609 |
| 8 | 750 | 430 |
| High School | 1,552 | 625 |
| Comments: | | |

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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) | 480 |
| K | 297 |
| 1 | 311 |
| 2 | 334 |
| 3 | 323 |
| 4 | 329 |
| 5 | 346 |
| 6 | 293 |
| 7 | 282 |
| 8 | 259 |
| 9 | 262 |
| 10 | 248 |
| 11 | 197 |
| 12 | 247 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 375 |
| Total | 4,583 |
| Comments: | |

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Colorado MEP decrease is attributed to several factors:

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

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, 2010 through August 31, 2011. 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) | 38 |
| K | 32 |
| 1 | 12 |
| 2 | 16 |
| 3 | 14 |
| 4 | 11 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 11 |
| 7 | 12 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 14 |
| 10 | 12 |
| 11 | 8 |
| 12 | 4 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 199 |
| Comments: | |

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 increase for Category 2 child counts for the 2010-11 SY was not substantial. It included 10 more students than what was reported for the 2009-10 reporting period. These students elected to attend a district held summer school to support their academics and those secondary students who are accruing high school credit. Tuition for those who elected to attend was paid for with MEP Funds. These students received either an instructional service, support service, or secondary high school credit.

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 NGS Consortia and uses NGS as its student information system to compile and generate the Category 1 and 2 child counts for the 2010-11 reporting period.

The child counts for the 2009-10 reporting period were generated from a previous state system called COMEP.

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 Colorado Education 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 2010-11 reporting period. This information was validated against the States Record Integration Tracking System (RITS) and MSIX, to verify the accuracy of the move from a previous State or district.

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

Summer/Intersession enrollments cannot be entered unless category 1 counts have been closed out. Category 2 counts can be entered between June 1st and 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 regional 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.

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 by the regional MEP 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 states student information system.

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

Updates are completed by the regional MEP program personnel and validity checks are run against the Department'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 State's Category 2 counts are collected and maintained the same as the Category 1 count.

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

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 2010-11 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/intersession school. Participation in MEP-funded summer intersession 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/intersession projects.

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

A student's summer/intersession 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/intersession enrollment must be active in order to be included in the category 2 counts.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's category 2 count for the 2010-11 child count is an unduplicated count of students by district or state. Students are selected based upon the category 2 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.

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 regional MEP program data specialist and ID&R coordinators, second by SEA data specialist, auditors and validation committee members to determine the eligibility of each child included in the states child counts for the 2010-11 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 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.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Procedure

The Colorado MEP completed a prospective re-interviewing for the 2010-11 SY. A sample of students who were recruited and enrolled during the 2010-2011 school year. The criteria used in the report for the sample is as follows: father and mother first and second last name, mother and father first name, current city, family identification number, enrollment dates between September 1, 2010 - August 31, 2011, and a qualifying arrival date (QAD) of September 1, 2010-August 31, 2011, New Generation System (NGS). The report generated a total of 306 students who fell within this criteria. Every seventh student was selected for re-interview until a total of 50 students from the sample were selected, and a second sample of 50, using the same selection method was also selected as a backup for those families who were not able to be re-interviewed. The SEA chose to use a "simple random sample" based on the small number of students recruited and enrolled during the 2010-2011 school year. This was one of the recommended forms of sampling from the "Technical Assistance Guide Book on Re-Interviewing (September 2010, page 20, Selection of Sampling) Each interview was completed by a home visit. Families were not notified in advance of the re-interview/visit. The re-interview was with the parent/guardian that signed the original COE and the responses were documented on the State Education Agency (SEA) Interview Questionnaire document. The COE's were sealed in an envelope with parent/guardian's first, last names and home address. The interviewer only opened the sealed envelope after the re-interview was completed. The interviewer then compared the original COE from the first initial interview to the information collected during the re-interview. If there was incorrect or conflicting information the interviewer re-verified the information with the parent/guardian.

Findings

At the conclusion of the re-interviews;
22 re-interviews were completed and 66 students eligibility was reviewed
65 students were determined to be eligible for the MEP

One child was found ineligible for the MEP, because the child was born after the QAD. The regional MEP program was contacted regarding the error and notified that the student would be removed from the system immediately. The child was not included in the States 2010-11 child counts.

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 accuracy. Children K-12 are tracked by their unique State Student ID number. The states student information system has an edit check to validate the student state ID being entered, does not currently exist and therefore does not allow the duplicate entry.

Multiple search methods using the states information system and other state data sources are conducted to verify the accuracy of the child counts for residency only 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 local MEP 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 migrant student counts.

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

Training is provided to the regional MEP program data specialist on the States required data management procedures. The SEA denies access to users who fail to comply with the required data management practices.

The regional MEP program data specialist also received training on OME's eligibility determination changes and federal requirements regarding the national COE. Additional Training was held to address the 2010 Chapter 2 Eligibility Requirements published by OME.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA determined based on the reinterview's some recruiters were incorrectly documenting home addresses on the COE. The SEA provided additional training to address this issue and continues to monitor those recruiters. The SEA provided mandatory training by way of webinar on May 20, 2011 and statewide training on September 7, 2011.

In January 2012 recruiters are required to attend one of four face to face trainings. Trainings will consist of the OME ID&R Curriculum Module 6 - Completing A COE and Module 9 - Quality Control.

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 2010-11 counts are based.