

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

COLORADO



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Colorado Department of Education	
Address: 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, CO 80202	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Patrick Chapman	
Telephone: 303-866-6780	
Fax: 303-866-6637	
e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Patrick Chapman	
_____ Signature	<u>Wednesday, March 5, 2008, 9:39:42 PM</u> Date

Data for Title IA, that is not able to be submitted through this system, will be submitted through EdFacts as soon as possible. However, the data is entered into the comment boxes. Data for Title ID, Subpart 2 will be updated during re-certification process when all facilities have submitted data and those with errors have been cleaned up.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. 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 content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Year of Science" Process

The Office of Learning and Results visited, presented and interviewed over 900 science-concerned policy, educator, media and university-based individuals. This nine-month series of study and listening, editing and asking was statewide. Research on data points and historical trend data was gathered from state and national resources, university faculty, and department staff including finance, licensure, assessment, regional managers, Title I and Information Management Services.

The website can be found at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoscience/index.htm>

Timeline (2005 - 2006)

September- Compare international & national science standards with student performance

September- Examine existing Colorado student science performance data

October- Examine history of CO Standards and Frameworks in science

Sept - April- Classroom observations, and interviews statewide

Sept - April- Examine science teacher preparation, licensure, and PD

Sept - April- Share data with:

- State Board of Education
- 15 sites statewide
- Higher Education Groups
- Superintendent and principal/ BOCES state meetings
- Teacher groups and professional development leaders
- Science educator professional associations

Jan - April- Review of current research on science cognition and learning

Jan - April- Identify, survey and interview schools making gains in science

March- Analyze gaps/ needs to strengthen Colorado Science Standards & Assessment

April- Review of existing science resources

April- Convene an alignment study for initial discussion

May-Sept- Compile recommendations and work with focus groups for accuracy

June 15th- Annual Standards & Assessment Conference

Fall- Board approval of any standards/frameworks change

The Forward Thinking plan from the Colorado Department of Education (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Communications/download/PDF/ForwardThinking.pdf>) calls for the department to develop and implement a revision of standards and assessments so clear expectations exist for P-3 learners. Such revisions must also occur so that opportunities and outcomes for K-12 students are enhanced and so that students exiting high school are prepared for success in life, work or the next level of schooling. The process will be handled by a third-party, with the guidance of the Governor's Standards and Assessment Development implementation Council (SADI) and will take place over the course of two years with the first year, from November 2007 through November 2008, being the time for the revision of the standards. From Dec 2008-October 2009 (with minimal changes), the state assessment will be reviewed and aligned. If the review requires major changes to the assessment, the process could go until October 2010.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. 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*. 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Following the review and the adoption of the standards by the State Board of Education, by January 2009, the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP) and the CSAPA (alternate) assessments will be reviewed by an inclusive group of stakeholders to determine the scope of modifications to the assessments for mathematics and language arts.

An RFP will be issued for the development of the CSAP, and the CSAPA based on the requirements of the aforementioned reviews by 2010. The Southwest Comprehensive Center (WestEd) is conducting this review.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards 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 content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Forward Thinking plan from the Colorado Department of Education (<http://www.cde.state.co.us/Communications/download/PDF/ForwardThinking.pdf>) calls for the department to develop and implement a revision of standards and assessments so clear expectations exist for P-3 learners. Such revisions must also occur so that opportunities and outcomes for K-12 students are enhanced and so that students exiting high school are prepared for success in life, work or the next level of schooling. The process will be handled by a third-party, with the guidance of the Governor's Standards and Assessment Development implementation Council (SADI) and will take place over the course of two years with the first year, from November 2007 through November 2008, being the time for the revision of the standards. From Dec 2008-October 2009 (with minimal changes), the state assessment will be reviewed and aligned. If the review requires major changes to the assessment, the process could go until October 2010.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2007 Science CSAP and CSAPA reflect the work of the year of Science referenced in 1.1.1.

Following the review and the adoption of the standards by the State Board of Education, by January 2009, the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP) and the CSAPA (alternate) assessments will be reviewed by an inclusive group of stakeholders to determine the scope of modifications to the assessments.

An RFP will be issued for the development of the CSAP, and the CSAPA based on the requirements of the aforementioned reviews by 2010.

Follow-up Questions: Please also address whether Colorado will have any science assessments in place for the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school years.

The 8th grade science CSAP was first administered in 2000. Grades 5 and 10 were then added in 2006. CSAP science will be administered to grades 5, 8 and 10 in 2008 and 2009.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Year of Science" Process

The Office of Learning and Results visited, presented and interviewed over 900 science-concerned policy, educator, media and university-based individuals. This nine-month series of study and listening, editing and asking was statewide. Research on data points and historical trend data was gathered from state and national resources, university faculty, and department staff including finance, licensure, assessment, regional managers, Title I and Information Management Services.

The website can be found at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoscience/index.htm>

Timeline (2005 - 2006)

September- Compare international & national science standards with student performance

September- Examine existing Colorado student science performance data

October- Examine history of CO Standards and Frameworks in science

Sept - April- Classroom observations, and interviews statewide

Sept - April- Examine science teacher preparation, licensure, and PD

Sept - April- Share data with:

- State Board of Education
- 15 sites statewide
- Higher Education Groups
- Superintendent and principal/ BOCES state meetings
- Teacher groups and professional development leaders
- Science educator professional associations

Jan - April- Review of current research on science cognition and learning

Jan - April- Identify, survey and interview schools making gains in science

March- Analyze gaps/ needs to strengthen Colorado Science Standards & Assessment

April- Review of existing science resources

April- Convene an alignment study for initial discussion

May-Sept- Compile recommendations and work with focus groups for accuracy

June 15th- Annual Standards & Assessment Conference

Fall- Board approval of any standards/frameworks change

Follow-Up Questions: Please address specifically academic achievement standards in science Colorado may have in place for the

2007-08 and 2008-09 school year.

The State formally approved content standards in science for the 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12 grade level ranges (1995). The State formally approved revised content standards in science for the 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12 grade level ranges (2007). The same process employed to evaluate content standards in mathematics was used with the science standards. The evaluation raised legitimate need for the removal of curriculum activities and other redundancies from a patently state standards document.

The State has formally approved academic achievement standards that comprise four levels of achievement:

- Unsatisfactory
- Partially Proficient
- Proficient
- Advanced Proficient

Levels of Achievement are defined within CSAP Science Assessment Frameworks and are associated with a description of competencies expected in science for grades 5, 8 and 10.

**** New Performance Levels will be established and formally approved for grades 5, 8, and 10 following scheduled standard setting for science in May 2008.****

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	467551	467425	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	5585	5585	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	15539	15539	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	28755	28755	100.0
Hispanic	126890	126890	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	290683	290683	100.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49176	49176	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	72218	72218	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	162042	162042	100.0
Migratory students	4510	4510	100.0
Male	239735	239735	100.0
Female	227690	227690	100.0

Comments: The number of students tested represents the number of students for whom we had a test booklet, not the number with a valid test result.

The following data represents the state AYP participation rate data.

of Test booklets # of participants Participation Rate

All 467551 467390 99.97%

American Indian 5585 5585 100.00%

Asian 15539 15504 99.77%

Black 28755 28745 99.97%

Hispanic 126890 126799 99.93%

White 290683 290659 99.99%

IEP 49176 49175 100.00%

ELL 72218 72057 99.78%

FRM 162042 161943 99.94%

Migrant 4510 4508 99.96%

Male 239735 239652 99.97%

Female 227690 227613 99.97%

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	16197	32.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28338	57.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4640	9.4
Total	49175	
Comments: The numbers do not align because one student did not count as a participant although we have a test booklet for them. (They did not have a valid score).		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	467524	467417	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	5585	5585	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	15538	15538	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	28749	28749	100.0
Hispanic	126855	126855	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	290707	290707	100.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49218	49218	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	72209	72209	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	162005	162005	100.0
Migratory students	4525	4525	100.0
Male	239711	239711	100.0
Female	227706	227706	100.0

Comments: The number of students tested represents the number of students for whom we had a test booklet, not the number with a valid test result.

The following data is the AYP participation rate data for the state.

of Test booklets # of participants Participation Rate

All 467524 467115 99.91%

American Indian 5585 5585 100.00%

Asian 15538 15490 99.69%

Black 28749 28732 99.94%

Hispanic 126855 126546 99.76%

White 290707 290672 99.99%

IEP 49218 49211 99.99%

ELL 72209 71808 99.44%

FRM 162005 161723 99.83%

Migrant 4525 4486 99.14%

Male 239711 239488 99.91%

Female 227706 227523 99.92%

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	16931	34.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27611	56.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4669	9.5
Total	49211	
Comments: The discrepancy is based on the fact that 7 students did not count as participants although we had test booklets for them.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58782	54076	92.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	683	598	87.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2102	2002	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3620	2981	82.3
Hispanic	17566	14954	85.1
White, non-Hispanic	34801	33531	96.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6505	4721	72.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10962	8946	81.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23334	19938	85.4
Migratory students	693	550	79.4
Male	30042	27632	92.0
Female	28726	26430	92.0

Comments: EDEN numbers are incorrect because they included students with "No Score" as proficient.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58764	52566	89.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	680	559	82.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2098	1956	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3611	3010	83.4
Hispanic	17574	14188	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	34796	32848	94.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6503	4039	62.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10972	8236	75.1
Economically disadvantaged students	23399	19064	81.5
Migratory students	709	507	71.5
Male	30056	26375	87.8
Female	28699	26183	91.2

Comments: EDEN numbers are incorrect because they included students with "No Score" as proficient.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57454	52161	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	644	550	85.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2087	1998	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3318	2692	81.1
Hispanic	16593	13789	83.1
White, non-Hispanic	34802	33126	95.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6425	4221	65.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10310	8294	80.4
Economically disadvantaged students	21949	18389	83.8
Migratory students	658	510	77.5
Male	29313	26600	90.7
Female	28130	25553	90.8

Comments: EDEN numbers are incorrect because they included students with "No Score" as proficient.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57434	49431	86.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	642	502	78.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2085	1900	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3319	2515	75.8
Hispanic	16583	12154	73.3
White, non-Hispanic	34796	32352	93.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6413	3483	54.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10304	6774	65.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21932	16376	74.7
Migratory students	655	404	61.7
Male	29304	24572	83.9
Female	28121	24851	88.4

Comments: EDEN numbers are incorrect because they included students with "No Score" as proficient.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57613	51071	88.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	716	590	82.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1996	1886	94.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3517	2664	75.7
Hispanic	16123	12890	79.9
White, non-Hispanic	35242	33027	93.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6512	3806	58.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9831	7543	76.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21607	17212	79.7
Migratory students	629	468	74.4
Male	29543	25913	87.7
Female	28052	25143	89.6
Comments: There have been changes in student demographics in Colorado. Students with disabilities are showing increased proficiency as we have focused on their educational needs.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57613	50037	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	715	589	82.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2001	1822	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	3527	2732	77.5
Hispanic	16113	12117	75.2
White, non-Hispanic	35242	32767	93.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6509	3534	54.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9836	6763	68.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21612	16493	76.3
Migratory students	633	380	60.0
Male	29531	24907	84.3
Female	28067	25119	89.5
Comments: There have been changes in student demographics in Colorado.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57404	49554	86.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	652	509	78.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2005	1868	93.2
Black, non-Hispanic	3467	2543	73.3
Hispanic	15698	11760	74.9
White, non-Hispanic	35571	32864	92.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6444	3373	52.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9101	6428	70.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20795	15651	75.3
Migratory students	584	396	67.8
Male	29591	25258	85.4
Female	27799	24285	87.4

Comments: There have been changes in the demographics of students in Colorado.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57399	51045	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	652	548	84.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2004	1861	92.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3469	2824	81.4
Hispanic	15695	12254	78.1
White, non-Hispanic	35573	33552	94.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6430	3824	59.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9100	6495	71.4
Economically disadvantaged students	20780	16382	78.8
Migratory students	584	378	64.7
Male	29587	25608	86.6
Female	27805	25430	91.5

Comments: There have been changes in the demographics of students in Colorado.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57844	49056	84.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	728	568	78.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1865	1735	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3598	2472	68.7
Hispanic	15688	11542	73.6
White, non-Hispanic	35949	32728	91.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6130	2981	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8812	6248	70.9
Economically disadvantaged students	20581	15051	73.1
Migratory students	565	381	67.4
Male	29704	24913	83.9
Female	28124	24132	85.8
Comments: The state experienced gains in 7th grade math as middle level math has been a need statewide, and has been receiving increased attention. Colorado has experienced demographic changes.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	57859	49860	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	726	595	82.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1865	1692	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3600	2768	76.9
Hispanic	15683	11433	72.9
White, non-Hispanic	35969	33359	92.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6149	3139	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8799	5755	65.4
Economically disadvantaged students	20561	15201	73.9
Migratory students	562	313	55.7
Male	29708	24872	83.7
Female	28135	24977	88.8
Comments: Colorado has experienced demographic changes.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59002	45027	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	731	484	66.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1763	1533	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3703	2057	55.5
Hispanic	15629	9195	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	37171	31757	85.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5905	1978	33.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8378	4574	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20165	11845	58.7
Migratory students	545	263	48.3
Male	30360	22856	75.3
Female	28637	22170	77.4
Comments: Colorado has experienced demographic changes. We are seeing increased proficiency in middle level math due to greater statewide focus.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	59045	51144	86.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	732	597	81.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1766	1602	90.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3707	2837	76.5
Hispanic	15624	11541	73.9
White, non-Hispanic	37207	34561	92.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5933	3064	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8379	5499	65.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20168	15061	74.7
Migratory students	545	307	56.3
Male	30380	25447	83.8
Female	28657	25693	89.7
Comments: Colorado has experienced demographic changes.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by *EDFacts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	119243	76602	64.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1426	700	49.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3716	2839	76.4
Black, non-Hispanic	7520	2863	38.1
Hispanic	29526	12117	41.0
White, non-Hispanic	77027	58076	75.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11177	2554	22.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14801	5437	36.7
Economically disadvantaged students	33526	13848	41.3
Migratory students	832	247	29.7
Male	61086	39148	64.1
Female	58109	37442	64.4
Comments: Colorado has experienced demographic changes.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	119204	106017	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1435	1193	83.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3714	3405	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	7507	5963	79.4
Hispanic	29518	23122	78.3
White, non-Hispanic	77000	72317	93.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11203	6816	60.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14799	10476	70.8
Economically disadvantaged students	33474	26345	78.7
Migratory students	834	526	63.1
Male	61047	52578	86.1
Female	58114	53412	91.9
Comments: Colorado has experienced demographic changes.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1677	1220	72.8
Districts	183	104	56.8

Comments: The number of school changes are due to the fact that you are taking this data from EDEN. We always submitted numbers based on the schools as defined by accountability (a K-8 school would be two schools- an elementary and a middle school). But since EDEN does not allow the data to be submitted that way you are seeing decreases in the number of schools.

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	594	420	70.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	357	213	59.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	237	207	87.3

Comments: The number of school changes are due to the fact that you are taking this data from EDEN. We always submitted numbers based on the schools as defined by accountability (a K-8 school would be two schools- an elementary and a middle school). But since EDEN does not allow the data to be submitted that way you are seeing decreases in the number of schools.

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
174	98	56.3

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed 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 missed 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 missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (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 the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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>.

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State School Support team process is available for Title I schools on improvement or corrective action. The role of school support teams is to conduct a comprehensive review of all facets of a school's program to include an analysis in the areas of:

Curriculum;

Assessment;

Instruction;

School culture;

Parent/community involvement;

Professional development and evaluation;

Leadership;

Organizational efficiency; and

Comprehensive planning.

The teams conduct the analyses through the use of document examination, observations, and interviews. Team members interview every staff person and a sample of students and parents. They also interview central office administrators. The team observes each teacher twice.

Each school receives a comprehensive report of the findings of the week's review. There is a narrative summary of themes and recommendations, a detailed report of findings by each indicator (sub tasks of the areas identified above) and an overall summary of ratings per indicator.

Each team is lead by a team leader and includes six members. The team composition includes a variety of individuals with backgrounds as former teachers, principals, independent consultants, superintendents, curriculum directors and school board members.

Following the completion of review, SEA staff and the school support team leader make an exit presentation to the school principal and central office staff. Another debriefing is held for school staff using the services of a trained facilitator. The facilitator assists the staff in understanding the report and in developing goals and strategic actions for a school improvement plan.

Each school that receives a school support team visit also receives a school improvement grant to assist in the implementation of the report's findings. The Title I staff serve as liaisons to the schools in order to assist them in further developing the improvement plan so that the funding is actually provided.

Once schools have finished their two year implementation process on the goals and activities defined in their school improvement plan, they are eligible to receive a re-visit from a school support team that includes at least one member of the original team. The process involves a 3 day visit and the development of a narrative report that offers further recommendations for improvement. Schools also receive additional school improvement grant dollars to assist in the implementation of the report's findings.

Twenty schools participated in the SST and SI Grant in the 06-07 school year. Since 04-05, 63 schools have participated.

In addition to the school support teams and the school improvement grant, the following additional supports are available for schools:

Re-visits to schools that have had the SST process

A facilitator cadre to provide on-going support to schools following the review

Web-based resources

Math and Science Partnerships

Support for Family Literacy

High Quality Professional Development in the following areas:

Mathematics

Leadership

On-line courses

The paragraphs above describe the nature of the assistance. The initial school support visit is a week in duration. The re-visits are three days.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	25
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	27
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed 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 missed 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 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 Identified for Improvement

In the space below, 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.

State Support for Districts

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

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

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

1. In 2006-2007, thirteen districts received support. The support processes provided either a comprehensive appraisal of the district operations in the areas identified above (i.e. curriculum, assessment, etc.) or a facilitated self assessment process that assisted districts in determining their own level of performance in the areas outlined above.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	46
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	09/27/07	09/13/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	08/13/07	08/13/07
Comments: Districts were notified of their school's potential Improvement status in Spring of 2007.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	48	48
Schools		143
Comments: Districts and schools can appeal a single target. They do not need to appeal the entire determination. Forty eight districts appealed at least one target, and all of those had at least one target change. As the SEA is in close communication with districts concerning their appeals before they are submitted, it is rare that we receive an appeal that can not be approved.		
As the LEAs are responsible for school AYP determinations and appeals, we only receive information about successful appeals. 143 schools were noted by districts as having appealed determinations. We do not have information about the number of appeals that were submitted, but not approved.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	09/27/07
---	----------

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In awarding Sec. 1003(g) funds, CDE gave priority to Title I schools that were the farthest along in the Improvement cycle and the lowest achieving with regard to state assessment profiles. CDE offered two types of grants to LEAs with Title I schools identified for Improvement:

SST review grants

School Support Team (SST) grants were awarded to school districts with schools identified for Improvement to pay for the cost of a School Support Team review. Priority was given to the lowest achieving Title I schools and those schools farthest along in the Improvement cycle. Title I schools that are willing to undergo such a review demonstrate their commitment to improve, as an SST review is time- and labor-intensive and opens the school up to the external scrutiny of the Team, the local community, and the media. Schools that are unwilling to undertake an SST review are ineligible to receive an award.

Implementation grants

Implementation grants were offered to schools that had undergone an SST review and had developed a plan that addressed the findings and recommendations of the School Support Team's report as well as the requirements of Sec. 1116. LEAs had the discretion to choose from among any of five improvement strategies. However, to receive approval, the strategy selected must be implemented in a manner consistent with what research indicates is effective and with the needs of the school. Priority was given to the lowest achieving Title I schools and those that are farthest along in the Improvement cycle.

In summary, "greatest need" and "strongest commitment" can be defined as:

"greatest need" - Title I schools that are farthest along in the School Improvement cycle that have not yet undergone a comprehensive, external appraisal of what's working and not working in the school. Priority is given to the lowest achieving schools and consideration is given to other grants received by the school.

"strongest commitment" - Title I schools that choose to undergo a School Support Team review have demonstrated a strong commitment to improving student academic achievement. The reviews are an objective, comprehensive appraisal of what is working and not working in the school conducted by an external team. Only those building leaders and faculty with a strong commitment to increasing student achievement undertake such a process.

SST review grant awards were made in the amount of \$50,000. This amount covers the cost of an SST review and additional costs associated with plan development and early implementation.

Implementation grant awards were made in amounts ranging from \$50,000 to \$100,000. This ensures that the award is of sufficient size to effect reforms and improvement but not so large that the funds will not be spent or that the improvement plans that are implemented are unsustainable once the funds run out.

State Support for Schools:

The State School Support team process is available for Title I schools on improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The role of school support teams is to conduct a comprehensive review of all facets of a school's program to include an analysis in the areas of:

Curriculum;

Assessment;

Instruction;

School culture;

Parent/community involvement;

Professional development and evaluation;

Leadership;

Organizational efficiency; and

Comprehensive planning.

The teams conduct the analyses through the use of document examination, observations, and interviews. Team members interview every staff person and a sample of students and parents. They also interview central office administrators. The team observes each teacher twice.

Each school receives a comprehensive report of the findings of the week's review. There is a narrative summary of themes and recommendations, a detailed report of findings by each indicator (sub tasks of the areas identified above) and an overall summary of ratings per indicator.

Each team is lead by a team leader and includes six members. The team composition includes a variety of individuals with backgrounds as former teachers, principals, independent consultants, superintendents, curriculum directors and school board members.

Following the completion of the review, SEA staff and the school support team leader conduct an exit presentation to the school principal and central office staff. Another debriefing is held for school staff using the services of a trained facilitator. The facilitator assists the staff in understanding the report and in developing goals and strategic actions for a school improvement plan.

Each school that receives a school support team visit also receives a school improvement grant to assist in the implementation of the report's findings. The CDE Title I staff serve as liaisons to the schools in order to assist them in further developing the improvement plan. In order to receive approval, the school improvement plan and the school improvement grant application must address the findings and recommendations of the SST and the requirements of Sec. 1116.

As noted above, comprehensive, in-depth appraisals of what is working and what is not working in a school is the foundation of Colorado's statewide system of school support. However, such a review and its subsequent report are just the first step in turning around schools that have been identified for Improvement. Following receipt of the report, the school, in partnership with its LEA and SEA must identify the strategy or strategies most likely to lead to increased student achievement and exiting of Improvement status. To facilitate the development of an effective improvement plan, recipients of grants under 1003(g) will have access to a facilitator, Title I liaison, and Regional Service Manager or Coordinator. In order to be effective, school and district support must be needs-driven and customized.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	49
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	98
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	55087
Who applied to transfer	1180
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	1180

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

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 637465
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	6
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	64
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" 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	30997
Who applied for supplemental educational services	4400
Who received supplemental educational services	4400
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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	\$ 4658894
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	217638	213607	98.1	4031	1.9
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	34184	33612	98.3	572	1.7
Low-poverty schools	39287	38603	98.3	684	1.7
All elementary schools	137623	135278	98.3	2345	1.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	21276	20468	96.2	808	3.8
Low-poverty schools	36338	35541	97.8	797	2.2
All secondary schools	107475	104517	97.2	2958	2.8
Comments: The total number of classes is less than the sum of the elementary and secondary classes, because of how schools are defined in Colorado. We have schools that span one, two and three grade spans. When they span more than one grade span, the same data is reported for all levels. For example, a K-8 school that has 100 teachers, and 95 are Highly Qualified, contributes 100 teachers to the elementary total and 100 to the secondary total. We cannot currently separate the data in schools that cross grade spans.					

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>No</u>
---	-----------

If the answer above is no, please explain:

CDE is in the process of collecting special education staffing data for 2007-2008 and integrating this information into the HQ process. CDE discovered a reporting error for special education teacher during the 2006-07 HR collection. Data for the vast majority of special teachers were not captured properly in the collection and prevented accurate reporting on their HQ status. The 2007-08 HR collection has been fixed and administrative units have received increased training on these particular reporting requirements.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State uses a departmentalized approach so that a full-day self-contained classroom at the elementary level is comparable to a

full course load at a secondary school.

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	50.8
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	
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	35.5
Other (please explain)	13.7
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	27.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	63.6
Other (please explain)	9.4
Total	100.0
<p>Comments: "Other"= teachers who do not have a valid license nor content knowledge.</p> <p>Some special education teachers are included in the other categories. The rest of special education teachers will be included in the 2007-2008 data collection.</p> <p>CDE discovered a reporting error for special education teacher during the 2006-07 HR collection. Data for the vast majority of special teachers were not captured properly in the collection and prevented accurate reporting on their HQ status. The 2007-08 HR collection has been fixed and administrative units have received increased training on these particular reporting requirements.</p>	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	63.7	15.2
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	52.2	14.7
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced lunch.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

- # Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
- Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
- Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
- % Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
- OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
12	Dual language	Spanish	50.0	50.0
5	Two-way immersion	Spanish		
14	Transitional bilingual	Spanish		
6	Developmental bilingual	Spanish		
5	Heritage language	Spanish		
48	Sheltered English instruction			
20	Structured English immersion			
17	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
46	Content-based ESL			
56	Pull-out ESL			
27	Other (explain)			

Comments: Two-way immersion Transitional bilingual Developmental bilingual and heritage language are difficult to determine percentages in either language as they are based on the needs of the individual student.

Other: These are authentic responses from Districts participating in Title III grants.

"Literacy based ESL and Content instruction using ESL strategy Saturday school for Spanish speakers prep for classes in English Spanish enrichment classes students who transitioned to English Classroom based ELA Newcomer Program Practical excursions: library stores local sites Student mentoring and translation in native language Tutoring after school Custom schedules grade 7-12 Push In is also used where the ESL teacher goes into the classroom to support the needs of the ELL Co-teaching program with LEP students Sheltered Instructional strategies within general education classrooms and aided by pull out for ESL instruction Push-

In and Co-Teaching Language Acquisition educational program Differentiated instruction and one on one tutoring Green Jane Fell Language!; Sopris West 2005 Gr. 4-12 Co-teaching support and the use of Homogeneous literacy groupings".

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	89881
Comments: This data point is taken from the Student October reporting - this contains all students attending schools on October 1 of each year. Due to the highly mobile nature of this population and the fact that Colorado serves many binational students that have not returned from Mexico at the time of the assessment, numbers can vary from total LEP students served during the school year and total tested at the time of the CELA Assessment window. The CELA testing window is set at three weeks for the purpose of high quality data from the publishing company. Some students move to another State, another country, private school, or fail to return home in time to take the CELA exam.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	106693
Vietnamese	2786
Russian	1347
Korean	1236
Hmong	937

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	85722
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	85722
LEP/One Data Point	25234
Comments: Not all ELL students in Colorado attend school districts where Title III dollars are accepted. Thus, the difference in number is ELL students in Colorado vs.. Title III ELL students participating in Title III programs.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	85389
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	85389
LEP/One Data Point	25097
Comments: Not all ELL students in Colorado attend school districts where Title III dollars are accepted. Thus, the difference in number is ELL students in Colorado vs.. Title III ELL students participating in Title III programs.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	55.0	36819	59.1	Y
No progress		25884		
ELP attainment	25.0	7216	32.9	Y
Comments: Not all ELL students in Colorado attend school districts where Title III dollars are accepted. Thus, the difference in number is ELL students in Colorado vs.. Title III ELL students participating in Title III programs.				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments:				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	13140
MFLEP/AYP grades	9530
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	33827
LEP HS/Non-AYP	10314
LEP other grades	45740
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Grade	Language
3	Spanish
4	Spanish
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
1809	1420	78.5
Comments:		

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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
7415	5688	13103
<p>Comments: The difference in the number of Monitor students from year to year, can be for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Colorado serves many migrant, highly mobile and binational ELL students. Students have simply not returned to Colorado schools for reasons of job opportunities, political climate or they moved to another State or country.</p> <p>2) Colorado state law requires ELL Students to be monitored for two years then exited to ensure that students are able to equitably participate in English only classrooms with no support. Monitor students can be moved back into program if the district feels that the student needs more support. This can happen for a variety of reasons given the highly mobile characteristics and interrupted education many of our ELL youngsters face.</p>		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9816	8272	84.3	1544

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: Districts may re-designate students into Monitor status by their own policy and procedures. Some Districts re-designate students after the October 1 count date which 1.6.3.4.3 is pulled from.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9794	8992	91.8	802

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: Districts may redesignate students into Monitor status by their own policy and procedures. Some Districts redesignate students after the October 1 count date which 1.6.3.4.3 is pulled from.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	57
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	21
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	34
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	34
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	2
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

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

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
15391	6754	35

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

Comments: Immigrant status is a very concrete definition. Many of our students that qualified for immigrant status do not meet the definition after three years. Colorado has faced rapid growth in the last five years, it is not surprising that some students no longer qualify for immigrant. Districts do not always accept Title III Immigrant dollars just because they receive an allocation. Given the increased reporting and workload, they choose to decline these funds.

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	5161
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	1490
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	2500

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

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students (formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	57	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	53	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	45	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	46	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	36	
Other (Explain in comment box)	11	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	54	9331
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	54	2437
PD provided to principals	52	646
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	44	286
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	38	1082
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	18	311
Total		14093
Comments: These numbers represent all districts participating in Title III programs including LEAs and their member districts.		
Other: These are authentic responses from all districts participating in a Title III grant - "Cultural Awareness SIOP Cultural Competency PD for coaching teachers Language Acquisition and Second language development Speech Therapy Special Education Interpreters Progress Monitoring and RTI for ELLs".		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/07	7/1/07	30
Comments: Funds are available immediately once a grant has substantial or final approval.		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Preliminary allocations, based on USDE's preliminary allocations, are available to districts in the Spring of each year for budgeting and application process purposes. These are provided with anticipation that LEAs applying for funds will have Substantial Approval by July 1st. Applications and budgets are due by June 30th of each year. However, application extensions are granted to LEAs that request them.

Each LEA application is reviewed on a case-by-case basis within 30 days of receipt. After review, each LEA is notified that its application has been given final approval, substantial approval, or no approval. If the Department is unable to give an application final approval, the LEA is notified of the changes that must be made in order to give the application final approval. Substantial approval means that an LEA may obligate funds but may not draw down funds. Once an LEA has received final approval of its application, funds are available for drawdown. However, any carryover funds continue to be made available to districts prior to final approval of its current application.

Also, Colorado does not allow any LEA to drawdown funds until Colorado receives grant award notification from USDE, which typically occurs in mid-July.

However, funds are available for LEA draw down as soon as Colorado receives its award notification from USDE and the Department has established that the LEA has met federal and state NCLB requirements for release of the funds.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	56.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	62.7
Hispanic	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	80.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	68.5
Limited English proficient	65.9
Economically disadvantaged	69.7
Migratory students	70.5
Male	70.3
Female	78.0
Comments: Graduation rates dropped due to improvement in tracking individual students.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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.

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 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6.6
Hispanic	8.2
White, non-Hispanic	2.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.6
Limited English proficient	7.7
Economically disadvantaged	5.0
Migratory students	6.1
Male	4.8
Female	4.0
Comments: Drop out rates increased due to better tracking of individual students.	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	154	142
LEAs with subgrants	26	26
Total	180	168
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)	181	643
K	273	990
1	255	946
2	246	838
3	231	765
4	209	705
5	207	650
6	179	578
7	187	514
8	178	549
9	184	625
10	160	460
11	134	438
12	171	456
Ungraded	<N	<N
Total		
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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	562	1698
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1877	6908
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	242	120
Hotels/Motels	127	444
Total	2808	9170
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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)	643
K	990
1	946
2	838
3	765
4	705
5	650
6	578
7	514
8	549
9	625
10	460
11	438
12	456
Ungraded	<N
Total	

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	477
Migratory children/youth	542
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1217
Limit English proficient students	1595

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	12
2. Expedited evaluations	5
3. Staff professional development and awareness	13
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
5. Transportation	13
6. Early childhood programs	11
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	14
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	10
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	11
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	14
12. Counseling	10
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	10
15. School supplies	14
16. Referral to other programs and services	12
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	12
18. Other (optional)	1
19. Other (optional)	4
20. Other (optional)	3
Comments: #18 is full day kindergarten, #19 is GED, ESL, non-traditional credit accrual programs and job search activities, #20 is emergency support for basic needs, and #21 should be 2 subgrantees for extra school fees and school related activities.	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	2
2. School Selection	5
3. Transportation	6
4. School records	3
5. Immunizations	4
6. Other medical records	3
7. Other Barriers	3
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	565	465
4	509	345
5	490	361
6	442	331
7	408	269
8	429	315
High School	642	493

Comments: Data differs from EDEN data as EDEN data included all homeless students in the state, some of which are not served by McKinney-Vento.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	601	503
4	526	419
5	492	386
6	445	304
7	411	246
8	429	227
High School	653	229

Comments: Data differs from EDEN data as EDEN data included all homeless students in the state, some of which are not served by McKinney-Vento.

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	1424
K	752
1	790
2	842
3	780
4	721
5	668
6	630
7	589
8	588
9	545
10	459
11	338
12	303
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2184
Total	11613
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We are reporting a decrease from last year's 12 month student count due to the following: students are at the end of eligibility, families have settled out, recruiter turnover, immigration issues, and changes in our state's agricultural productivity.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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)	577
K	103
1	102
2	131
3	95
4	89
5	81
6	56
7	43
8	30
9	52
10	21
11	24
12	<N
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2899
Total	
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We are reporting a decrease from last year's summer student count due to the following: students at their end of eligibility and immigration issues. Families report that they are afraid to migrate within the State or to the State of Colorado due to documentation issues.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Student Information System used: New Generation System

Last year's system used: New Generation System

Category 2 count (Summer) used : New Generation System

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

How was data collected: The child data count was collected for attending non-attending (residency only) and students who were two (2) turning three (3).

Activities conducted to collect the data: Child data counts for attending students were collected by providing districts with a list of student state ID's and were verified based on attendance for SY 06-07.

Non-Attending data counts were collected on a re-enrollment form by verifying the student's residence in the state during fiscal year of 9/1/06-8/31/2007.

Students who were two and turned three within the funding period were verified with a signature from the parent/guardian on or after their date of birth during the fiscal year of 9/1/2006-8/31/2007.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

First time enrollments are completed by regional MEP personnel by utilizing the NGS Approver Component.

Entries are entered into the NGS by the regional program and sent electronically to the SEA for final approval.

The NGS Approver Component allows the SEA to check for accuracy before allowing regional entries to be downloaded into the SEA's database. Any discrepancies found are rejected or deleted from the 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.

Same methods were used to collect and maintain child counts for Category 2.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The system counts any student whose is between ages 3-21 and who was counted and served during the reporting period of 9/1/2006 through 8/31/2007.

This report counts each student once based upon a unique ID even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the reporting time period.

A residency student will have a verification date collected on a re-enrollment form within the fiscal year 9/1/06-8/31/2007.

Students who are counted and served for the Category 2 count will show an enrollment date within 6/1/2006 - 8/31/2007 as an enrollment type of summer or intercession.

The Unique Student Count Report for Category 1 and 2 calculates an unduplicated count of students. NGS selects students based upon the enrollment period and federal eligibility criteria.

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.

Same methods were used to collect and maintain child counts for Category 2.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A random review of COE's through phone and home interviews are completed by the SEA and the Regional MEP. These re-interviews are completed to ensure accuracy of information provided on behalf of the families is accurate. The re-interviews are completed on COE's collected for the current funding period. An eligibility questionnaire is completed with interviewee's response.

Periodically training of staff is provided on the processes for ensuring accuracy. Annually we evaluate the effectiveness of our quality control processes.

New ID&R process has been implemented in which an ID&R consultant will be responsible for ensuring recruiters are certified to recruit families and that proper eligibility is being documented based on the recruiters determinations.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

All SEA re-interviews are submitted to the MEP Validation Committee for review to ensure that any unbiased was used.

Each validation committee member checks that the re-interviewers were correctly applying re-interview protocols.

If the MEP Validation Committee is unable to determine a family's eligibility the re-interview is forwarded to the State Director for a final decision.

At this time we are unable to give the number of families that were re-interviewed as part of our quality control process.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

All enrollments are submitted to the SEA for final approval prior to being downloaded into the State's database. Any inaccuracies found are rejected or deleted from the system until proper verification has been made.

Periodically training of staff is provided by offering bi-annual statewide ID&R trainings regional monthly recruitment and data entry trainings.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Monthly auditing is completed by the SEA.

The SEA generates reports from NGS which is used to verify that child counts are unduplicated. A reviewing process is completed to ensure for accuracy.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Colorado is in the process of developing a new ID&R Plan by implementing a Task Force to review all current ID&R practices regionally and by the SEA. The task force will address the following to ensure best practices are being adhered:

Address ID&R Mobility

Clear understanding of a migrant worker

Responsibility of the Regional MEP Director

Integrity of the process with the recruitment interview

List of resources

Contact log

Quality Control Process

Program Focus

Dissemination of information

Program activities tied to program outcomes/Program aligns to Measureable Program Objectives (MPOs)

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

No concerns at this time.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.