

Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

Due: September 1, 2003



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

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.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)

STATE RESPONSE

The State of Colorado has set high linguistic and academic expectations for our English Language Learners (ELL). The department has commissioned and constructed developmentally appropriate English Language Development (ELD) standards and benchmarks. The ELD Standards provide performance expectations that clearly define a pathway to fluency in English. They will provide classroom teachers with benchmarks on which to focus instruction. The document allows teachers to establish a foundation for student achievement on the benchmarks outlined in the Colorado English Language Arts Content Standards.

The ELD Standards will outline basic frameworks for the instruction of students who have been identified as eligible for linguistic and academic support in English. They will support and provide parameters for tracking student progress towards the acquisition of English.

Proficiency Levels:

Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced

Grade Range

K-2

3-5

6-8

9-12

There are two types of standards critical to this document, content and performance. Content standards specify what students should know and be able to do (knowledge and skills – receptive and expressive skills). Performance standards determine the degree to which the content standards have been attained. These ELD Standards were developed to facilitate instruction at the appropriate grade and proficiency level and are inclusive of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension domains.

ELD Standards are linked and aligned to the Colorado Language Arts Content Standards, are research-based and have been prepared by experienced and highly qualified ESL/Bilingual teachers and educators. Furthermore, external consultants with a strong and deep understanding of linguistic and academic expectations of ELL students will provide further review of these standards prior to Board of Education approval.

Timeline for Implementation:

June 15, 2003 – October 1, '03 - Comments from Colorado Educators

October 2, 2003 – November 1, '03 - Revisions

November 2003 - Submit to the Office of Professional Services –and Dorothy Gotlieb for final formatting

December / January 2003 - Board review and approval

January / February 2004 - Disseminate

Spring/Summer 2004 - Professional Development

Fall 2004 – Implementation

(See attached document in Appendix A)

(See copy of the Standards in Appendix A.1)

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.

- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

ELP Assessment (s)	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Basic	Number and Percentage at Intermediate	Number and Percentag e at Fluent Advanced	Number of students in Monitoring phase Year 1	Number of students in Monitoring phase Year 1	Number and Percentage at
(1)*	(2)	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Fluent Advanced Level 3	Fluent Advanced Level	Fluent Advanced Exited
(1)*	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
IPT LAS Woodcock Muñoz	86,129 11.5%	34,175 4.5%	37,365 5.0%	14,589 1.9%	8,750	5,839	3,587 .05% of the total LEP population (2) 25% of the monitored students columns (6) and (7)

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

The State has sanctioned the following assessments for SY 2002-2003 and SY 2003-2004:

- a. IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test – IPT*
- b. Woodcock Munoz Language Scales*
- c. Language Assessment Scales*

Assessment grade range:

- K-5*
- 6-8*
- 9-12*

Composite scores were designated using the guidelines provided in the assessment technical manual.

Woodcock Munoz:

The standard score for the Woodcock Munoz is based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. They are peer comparison statements and derived from raw scores. The W scores are recalculated based on the Rash Logistic Scales to net individual domain scores, Grade and Age Equivalencies, NCE and Composite score.

LAS

The LAS is computed on a standard score, based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. It is weighted in a similar fashion to the Woodcock as a ratio of the proficiency of subject score to proficiency of the comparison group. The manufacturer provides NCE or composite scores.

IPT

The IPT is computed on a standard distribution and raw scores. It shows how a standard score departs from the mean of the distribution. It nets a percentile, standard scores, rank and normal curve equivalencies and composites.

In SY 2000- 2001 representatives from the three assessment companies met to support CDE in creating general guidelines for the use of the instruments. A crosswalk for each of the three measures was created and has served as guidance to date. The chart included in this document is reflective of the work.

(See Chart Appendix A.2)

In the spring of 2005 the State will implement a new assessment measure presently in the development stage. The Western States Consortia language proficiency instrument will define the scoring frameworks and the ELA Unit will reframe the reporting process as required.

Competency Levels:

- Beginner/Basic
- Intermediate
- Fluent / Advanced

Grade Level Range

K-2
3-5
6-8
9-12

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

The number of identified students for school year 2002-2003 as collected on the October 1, 2002 count is 86,129.

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

The number of LEP students certified for services in August 2003 is 86,129. Verification of the number identified for service will occur through the October Student Certification Count of 2003.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments
- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.

STATE RESPONSE

State Definition of Proficient

A student is reclassified as proficient when the following criteria have been met:

- a. *Has reached a "fluent" level of proficiency on a valid, reliable language proficiency assessment in the areas of reading/comprehension, writing, speaking, and listening.*
- b. *Has achieved a level of partially proficient or proficient on the Colorado Student Achievement Assessment (CSAP) in the areas of reading/comprehension, writing, speaking, and listening.*

(See Appendix A.3 Assessment Cut Scores and Identification Matrix)

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments
- A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)
- A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next

STATE RESPONSE

State Definition of Making Progress

Limited English proficient students will make adequate progress if they:

- ✓ **Successfully participate in a standards-based Language Instruction Educational Program that provides ongoing opportunity to develop comprehensive language skills.**
- ✓ **Consistently move from one level of proficiency to another as outlined in our Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives.**
- ✓ **Consistently meet the benchmarks and skills described in the English Language Development and Language Arts Content Standards and make significant progress from the emergent levels of proficiency through Fluent, Redesignation and Formal Exit.**

The State of Colorado will map the movement of students from one proficiency level to another through a seven year continuum.

Levels of Proficiency :

- NEP – Non English Proficient or Emergent
- LEP – Limited English proficient or Intermediate Fluency
- FEP - Fluent English proficient
- Redesignated: Monitoring year 1 and year 2
- Formal Exit

Each spring, students given the state Language Proficiency assessment become the cohort for the upcoming year and the base for all calculations. In year two of the assessment program the progress of these students will be compared to the targets designated by our annual measurable objectives defined in the enclosed chart. Each year students will be assessed and a year added to their academic history.

(See AMAO chart, Appendix A.4)

New students to the state of Colorado are considered year 1 students. Current students (who were in the state of Colorado during Spring 2002) will also come in as year 1 students as either Emergent, Intermediate or Fluent). All students initiate the move through the graph as either an Emergent or Intermediate student.

In the model described in this document, the State will not run multiple "cohort" groups, instead, every spring, students present in the state, becomes the baseline "cohort" for the post measure the following year. If students move out and don't posttest, they are not included in the calculations. Students moving within state in the middle of the year are not counted in the cohort unless they have participated in the spring assessment or posttest. This essentially follows Title 1 AYP where only students registered to the school for 1+ years (CSAP to CSAP administration timeline) are count in the AYP calculations.

Each year, the state, the district and the school will be expected to move a certain percent of students from Emergent to Intermediate, and from Intermediate to Advanced (Partially Proficient/Proficient as reflective of our definition). The attached table above shows the expected percentage targets.

The targets where developed by close analysis of the numbers presently moving within proficiency levels in several large school districts and state-wide figures and the desire to construct a tighter accountability system for tracking the movement from Emergent to Exit.

A student who is new to the state of Colorado and enters as an Emergent student has (at the most) 6-7 years to achieve Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency commensurate with mainstream students and three years to accommodate Intermediate language proficiencies. The majority of students will be expected to be English language proficient, monitored or exited within a 5-6 year range.

Each year, the state, the district and the school will be expected to move a certain percent of students from Emergent to Intermediate, and from Intermediate to Advanced (Partially Proficient/Proficient as reflective of our definition). The attached table above shows the expected percentage targets.

The targets where developed by close analysis of the numbers presently moving within proficiency levels in several large school districts and state-wide figures and the desire to construct a tighter accountability system for tracking the movement from Emergent to Exit.

A student who is new to the state of Colorado and enters as an Emergent student has (at the most) 6-7 years to achieve Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency commensurate with mainstream students and three years to accommodate Intermediate language proficiencies. The majority of students will be expected to be English language proficient, monitored or exited within a 5-6 year range.

To ensure equitable sanctions, a safe harbor rule that applies to the calculation of what constitutes making progress will be initiated. The safe harbor provision is in line with Title 1. Students who score partially proficient on a CSAP will be counted and included in the AYP calculations for a school, district and state accountability.

Even though a student may not show movement from Intermediate to Fluent to Advanced Proficiencies on the Language Proficiency Assessment they will be included in the AYP calculations if they meet the above criteria.

** Note that this provision will pertain primarily to Intermediate students who have not moved to "Fluent or Advanced levels in the language proficiency assessment."*

Percentage of Expected Growth

The State of Colorado has developed annual measurable targets to ensure the movement of students from one language proficiency to another within a reasonable time. The State model is based on the number of years a student participates in a Language Instruction Educational Program. The basic premise is that simplicity and efficient processes will net the desired profile.

(Attach Chart : ELL Student Movement)

Example:

Year 1: School A has 75 ELL students in their building who take the spring ELP assessment. 20 students are Emergent and 55 are Intermediate.

($75 \times 40\% = 30$ students)

($75 - 30 = 45$) 45 students did not make progress their first year.

Year 2: At this spring testing, School A had 2 Emergent students and 5 Intermediate students withdraw before year 2 testing. These students are dropped from the initial pool tested last spring.

Emergent ($45 - 2 = 43$)

Intermediate ($30 - 5 = 25$)

They also enrolled an additional 5 Emergent students and 8 Intermediate students after the spring testing in year 1.

Emergent ($43 + 5 = 48$)

Intermediate ($25 + 8 = 33$)

School A has (48) Emergent students, and (33) Intermediate students

Year 3: Schools adjusts the numbers and calculates the figures to represent their population. School A now has 48 Emergent students, and 33 Intermediate students take the spring assessment.

Each year, a school will track and evaluate the movement of students given an additional year in the program (year 3 students are added; year 4 students are added, etc.).

All calculations done by the state will be longitudinally analyzed to determine the districts ability to ensure that Limited English Proficient students are making progress towards English competency.

Measurable Growth

The State of Colorado has developed annual measurable targets to ensure the movement of students from one language proficiency level to another within a reasonable time. The State model is based on sound research based practice and reflects the number of years a student participates in a Language Instruction Educational Program. The basic premise is that simplicity and efficient processes will facilitate tracking.

(See chart in Appendix A)

Key Model Components:

1. Time in language program
2. Target number and percent of students making progress
3. Progressive change in the number and percent by year
4. Desegregated by grade spans of K-5, 6-8 and 9-12.

Each year, the state, the district and the school will be expected to move a certain percent of students from Emergent to Intermediate and from Intermediate to Fluent/Advanced. The table enclosed in the Appendix shows the expected percentage targets.

Colorado program targets were developed through close analysis of the numbers presently moving within proficiency levels in several large school districts, state-wide figures and the necessity to construct tighter accountability structures for tracking the movement from Emergent to Exit.

A student who is new to the state of Colorado at the Emergent level has, at most, 6-7 years to achieve Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency commensurate with mainstream students and three years to accommodate Intermediate language proficiencies. The majority of students will be expected to be English language proficient, monitored or exited within a 5-6 year range.

To ensure equitable evaluations, a safe harbor rule that applies to the calculation of what constitutes making progress will be implemented. This measure or safe harbor provision is in line with Title 1 guidance.

Safe Harbor:

The State will deem a student to be making progress if said students scores *partially proficient* on CSAP and the score is included in the AYP calculations and for other purposes of state accountability. This will be so even though a student may not be making progress from Intermediate to Fluent/Advanced Proficiencies on the Language Proficiency Assessment.

** Note that this provision will pertain primarily to Intermediate students who have not moved to "Fluent or Advanced levels in the language proficiency assessment.*

Additional considerations have been built into the model to ensure that equity and flexibility are incorporated when evaluating if a districts population has made Annual Measurable Achievement targets.

- Student must be present in Colorado from one language proficiency administration to another.
- Targets have been set at 98% proficiency to accommodate the twice exceptional student.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The State will collect the data by proficiency level cohorts for each level of proficiency yearly.

NEP – Non English Proficient or Emergent

LEP – Limited English proficient or Intermediate Fluency

FEP- Fluent English proficient or Advanced

Report by grade level in 2003-2004

Elementary K-5

Middle School – 6-8

High School – 9-12

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort:** _____

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
NEP- Non English Proficient or Emergent		100% of students who have been redesignated and in the monitoring period will formally exit program
2003-2004 School Year	40% - 20,505	
2004-2005 School Year	83% - 11,346	
2005-2006 School Year	90% - 2,278	
2006-2007	98% - 48	
LEP or Intermediate Fluency		
2003-2004 School Year	10% - 3,736	25%
2004-2005 School Year	40% - 13,451	25%
2005-2006 School Year	90% - 18,160	25%
2006-2007 School Year	98% - 40	25%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	85.65%	84.57%
2003-2004 Target	90%	90%
2004-2005 Target	95%	95%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

Note: Colorado collected data on the number and percentage of teachers that met the definition of highly qualified based on their credentials and teaching assignments. Teachers were considered to be highly qualified if they were teaching 100% of their instructional time in areas in which they were qualified.

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State's definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

Colorado offers the following four options for teachers to be considered “highly qualified,” in compliance with Sec. 1119, of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Option I

Initial (Provisional) License and Endorsement = “Highly Qualified”

A Colorado “highly qualified” teacher shall mean a teacher who holds a Colorado initial (provisional) or professional teacher license. To qualify for such license, the teacher must:

- Hold a bachelor's or higher degree.
- Have completed an approved teacher preparation program, or is participating in an alternative teacher preparation program, in elementary or secondary education, as appropriate.
- **For elementary education**
The elementary education teacher shall have passed the State's K-8 elementary education content test, which includes content assessment in English/language arts, science, mathematics, social studies, humanities, wellness, and physical education.
- **For middle school education:** (*Note: Colorado does not have a middle school license.*)
 - If the middle school teacher is a generalist, responsible for teaching all content areas, s/he shall have passed the State's K-8 elementary education content test, which includes content assessment in English/language arts, science, mathematics, social studies, humanities, wellness, and physical education.
 - If the middle school teacher is responsible for teaching in a specific secondary content area(s), s/he shall have passed the State's secondary, or K-12, content-area test(s), in the content area(s) being taught.
- **For secondary education (excluding middle school – see above):** The secondary education teacher shall have passed the State's secondary, or K-12, content-area test(s), in the secondary content area(s) being taught.

Options II & III
Initially (Provisionally) or Professionally Licensed & Endorsed, But...
Is Teaching Outside of the Original Content Area(s) = “Highly Qualified,”
With: 24-Semester Hours, OR the Equivalent, OR
Passage of the Content-Area Test(s)

An educator who possesses a Colorado initial (provisional) or professional license, but who is teaching outside of his/her endorsed content area(s), may be considered “highly qualified,” if that educator:

- *Has 24-semester hours of credit in the additional content-area(s) being taught, as verified by the school district of employment. The 24-semester hours of credit may be accumulated, as follows:*
 - College/university credit.
 - Coursework must be relevant and applicable to the teacher’s non-endorsed content area(s) being taught.
 - College/university credit must be awarded by an accepted two or four-year institution of higher education.
 - ***Note: Certification of this requirement is the responsibility of the educator’s employing school district.*** The school district is required to keep all college transcript credits on file, as evidence of successful completion of coursework.
 - Professional development activities
 - Professional development must be relevant and applicable to the teacher’s non-endorsed content area(s) being taught, and may include, but not be limited to: district and other approved professional development activities, inservices, and curriculum development.
 - The teacher must provide documented evidence that the professional development activities were relevant and applicable to the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the non-endorsed content area(s) being taught.
 - ***Note: Certification of this requirement is the responsibility of the educator’s employing school district.*** The school district is required to keep, on file, documented evidence of successful completion of professional development.
 - Relevant travel
 - The teacher must have prior approval from the school district, which authorizes that the travel is appropriate to the enhancement of skills and knowledge in the non-endorsed content area(s) being taught.
 - The teacher must provide evidence, including, but not limited to reports, materials, or work products, to document the relevance and applicability of the travel to increasing educator’s knowledge and skills in the relevant non-endorsed content area(s) being taught.
 - One-semester hour of credit may be awarded for each 15-clock hours of documented travel, up to a maximum of 6-semester hours. Travel time to and from the intended destination will not be included.

- ***Note: Certification of this requirement is the responsibility of the educator's employing school district.*** The school district is required to keep, on file, documented evidence of relevant travel experiences.
- ***Or...passage of the State's content test or national certification organization content test, in the additional content-area(s) being taught.***
 - ***Note: Certification of this requirement is the responsibility of the educator's employing school district.*** The school district is required to keep, on file, the teacher's assessment results, as evidence that the test has been passed.

The information contained in the definition of meeting the 24-semester hours of credit was adopted from the Colorado Code of Regulations 301-37. These Rules establish the standards and criteria for the issuance of licenses and authorizations to teachers, special services providers, principals, and administrators.

Note: Teachers who fulfill any of the options cited above, are encouraged to, and may wish to, complete the requirements for endorsement, in any additional content area(s) in which they teach. Information regarding Colorado educator licensing is available on-line, at: www.cde.state.co.us, then click on Educator Licensing.

Option IV
Colorado's HOUS(S)E
Highly Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation
Proposed Pilot Project

As an alternative to the 24-semester hours in a content area being taught, or its equivalent in professional development, or the passing of the State's content-area assessment, an educator teaching out of an endorsed content area may demonstrate his/her knowledge through application of Colorado's Highly Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE), as based on student progress.

Proposed Pilot Project

- In partnership with a local school district, the Colorado Department of Education will develop uniform statewide evaluation criteria, based on longitudinal achievement data, as an alternative method of determining a teacher to be "highly qualified."
- A district with fully-established longitudinal assessment systems in place may be selected for the pilot program. The district's qualification to participate in this program will be based on submitted and approved supporting documentation.
- The pilot project will evolve over the next two (2) school years.
- If the pilot project proves successful in meeting all aspects of the HOUSSE provisions, it will subsequently be made available to other districts.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	60.33%
2003-2004 Target	75
2004-2005 Target	90%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	22.19%
2003-2004 Target	45%
2004-2005 Target	70%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, 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 the school year, 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.

The Secretary approved each State’s definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State’s accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	81.8
African American/Black	73.7
American Indian/Native Alaskan	58.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	86.2
Hispanic	65.5
White	86.4
Other	NA*
Students with Disabilities	75.0**
Students without Disabilities	NA*
Limited English Proficient	NA*
Economically Disadvantaged	NA*
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	NA*
Migrant	NA*
Male	78.5
Female	85.2

*Data not collected by these subgroups for the 2001-02 school year.

**Formula used was per the requirements of the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
African American/Black	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Hispanic	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
White	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Other	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Students with Disabilities	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Students without Disabilities	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Limited English Proficient	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Economically Disadvantaged	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Migrant	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Male	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0
Female	55.3	55.3	57.4	57.4	57.4	59.5	59.5	59.5	61.6	61.6	61.6	65.0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	2.6
African American/Black	3.0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	5.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.5
Hispanic	4.6
White	4.6
Other	2.0
Students with Disabilities	19.0*
Students without Disabilities	NA**
Limited English Proficient	NA**
Economically Disadvantaged	NA**
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	NA**
Migrant	NA**
Male	2.9
Female	2.3

*Formula used was per the requirements of the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs.

**Data not collected by these subgroups for the 2001-02 school year.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
African American/Black	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Hispanic	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
White	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Other	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Students with Disabilities	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Students without Disabilities	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Limited English Proficient	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Economically Disadvantaged	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Migrant	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Male	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5
Female	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5

	ELL Student Movement				
	No Child Left Behind Compliance				
	Percentage of Expected Growth* in English Language Acquisition by Year in Program to meet AMAO				
	Number of Years in Program				
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year3	(After 3 years in programs, 98% of "A/B" Emergent students expected to progress to a "C" level or Intermediate status)
A/B Students	34,175				
Emergent	% to LEP	40%	83%	98%	(Percentages are multiplied by the remaining # of students from
Basic Level 1	# to LEP	20,505	11,346	2,278	previous year)
	remaining	13,670	2,324	46	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (After 4 years in programs, 98% of
					students are expected to progress to an Advanced/
C Students	37,365				Proficient status) Year 5 will add a year of support for
Intermediate	% to FEP	10%	40%	90%	98% exceptional students
Level 2	# to FEP	3,736	13,452	18,159	1,978
	remaining	33,629	20,177	2,018	40
Formal					(25% of Fluent/Advanced students
Exit		25%	25%	25%	25% will be formally exited from Language Instruction
					educational programs)
	* Making progress is defined as steady movement from one language proficiency level to another as				
	measured by an approved English language proficiency assessment [LAS-IPT-Woodcock Muñoz].				

	ELL Student Movement				
	No Child Left Behind Compliance				
	Percentage of Expected Growth* in English Language Acquisition by Year in Program to meet AMAO				
	Number of Years in Program				
	Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year3	(After 3 years in programs, 98% of "A/B" Emergent students expected to progress to a "C" level or Intermediate status)
A/B Students	34,175				
Emergent	% to LEP	40%	83%	98%	(Percentages are multiplied by the remaining # of students from
Basic Level 1	# to LEP	20,505	11,346	2,278	previous year)
	remaining	13,670	2,324	46	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (After 4 years in programs, 98% of
					students are expected to progress to an Advanced/
C Students	37,365				Proficient status) Year 5 will add a year of support for
Intermediate	% to FEP	10%	40%	90%	98% exceptional students
Level 2	# to FEP	3,736	13,452	18,159	1,978
	remaining	33,629	20,177	2,018	40
Formal					(25% of Fluent/Advanced students
Exit		25%	25%	25%	25% will be formally exited from Language Instruction
					educational programs)
	* Making progress is defined as steady movement from one language proficiency level to another as				
	measured by an approved English language proficiency assessment [LAS-IPT-Woodcock Muñoz].				

Table 3.2: Levels of English Proficiency

Yr2002-2003

GRADES	TOTAL # of ELL Students Enrolled	TOTAL% of ELL Students Enrolled	TOTAL # of NEP Students Enrolled	TOTAL% of NEP Students Enrolled	TOTAL # of LEP Students Enrolled	TOTAL% of LEP Students Enrolled	TOTAL # of FEP Students Enrolled	TOTAL% of FEP Students Enrolled	REDESIGNATE D/M EX-YEAR 1	REDESIGNATE D/M EX-YEAR 2	EXITED YEAR 3	TOTAL STUDENTS ENROLLED
1	10,319	18.2	5,769	10.2	3,595	6.3	955	1.7	466	300	9	56,739
2	9,471	17.0	4,430	7.9	4,055	7.3	986	1.8	530	387	62	55,734
3	8,729	15.6	2,923	5.2	4,481	8.0	1,325	2.4	971	415	146	55,996
4	8,106	14.1	2,083	3.6	4,388	7.7	1,635	2.9	1,148	592	187	57,318
5	7,472	12.7	1,930	3.3	3,930	6.7	1,612	2.7	990	751	333	58,895
6	6,251	10.6	1,584	2.7	3,119	5.3	1,548	2.6	1,106	579	486	58,906
7	5,688	9.6	1,786	3.0	2,613	4.4	1,289	2.2	831	647	478	58,973
8	5,101	8.8	1,809	3.1	2,167	3.8	1,125	2.0	556	578	554	57,664
9	5,756	9.1	2,249	3.6	2,304	3.7	1,203	1.9	685	554	540	63,076
10	3,836	6.9	1,434	2.6	1,442	2.6	960	1.7	497	390	314	55,938
11	2,824	5.5	839	1.6	1,223	2.4	762	1.5	389	347	275	51,593
12	2,106	4.5	526	1.1	944	2.0	636	1.4	316	260	202	46,790
Kindergarten	7,266	13.5	3,896	7.2	2,822	5.2	548	1.0	264	39	1	53,872
Pre-K	3,204	15.7	2,917	14.3	282	1.4	5	0.0	1	0	0	20,368
TOTAL	86,129	11.5	34,175	4.5	37,365	5.0	14,589	1.9	8,750	5,839	3,587	751,862

* Total Percent of Exited Year 3 = .48