

Schedule 13
Funding Request for the 2014-15 Budget Cycle

Department: EDUCATION
 Request Title: State Support for English Language Learners
 Priority Number: R-7

Dept. Approval by: [Signature] 10/22/13 Date Decision Item FY 2014-15
 Base Reduction Item FY 2014-15
 OSPB Approval by: [Signature] 10/29/13 Date Supplemental FY 2013-14
 Budget Amendment FY 2014-15

Line Item Information		FY 2013-14		FY 2014-15		FY 2015-16
		1	2	3	4	5
Fund		Appropriation FY 2013-14	Supplemental Request FY 2013-14	Base Request FY 2014-15	Funding Change Request FY 2014-15	Continuation Amount FY 2015-16
Total of All Line Items	Total	26,476,847	-	26,484,197	429,345	441,612
	FTE	4.6	-	4.6	4.1	4.5
	GF	3,101,598	-	3,101,598	429,345	441,612
	GFE	-	-	-	-	-
	CF	12,138,442	-	12,138,442	-	-
	RF	-	-	-	-	-
	FF	11,236,807	-	11,244,157	-	-
(2) Assistance to Public Schools, (B) Categorical Programs, (1) District Programs Required by Statute, English Language Proficiency Program	Total	26,476,847	-	26,484,197	429,345	441,612
	FTE	4.6	-	4.6	4.1	4.5
	GF	3,101,598	-	3,101,598	429,345	441,612
	GFE	-	-	-	-	-
	CF	12,138,442	-	12,138,442	-	-
	RF	-	-	-	-	-
	FF	11,236,807	-	11,244,157	-	-

Letternote Text Revision Required? Yes: No: If yes, describe the Letternote Text Revision:
 Cash or Federal Fund Name and COFRS Fund Number:
 Reappropriated Funds Source, by Department and Line Item Name:
 Approval by OIT? Yes: No: Not Required:
 Schedule 13s from Affected Departments:
 Other Information:

This page left intentionally blank



Cost and FTE

- The Department requests \$429,345 General Fund and 4.1 FTE in FY 2014-15 to provide additional support to school districts for their English Language Learner (ELL) programs. The ongoing funding in FY 2015-16 and subsequent years is \$441,612 and 4.5 FTE.

Current Program

- Districts around the State require additional support to build capacity to meet the needs of the State's English Language Learners (ELL) students. In 2013, Colorado public schools served 124,701 ELL students coming from homes where over 235 different languages are spoken.
- Although there has been progress in increasing achievement among Colorado's ELL students, the achievement gaps between ELLs students and other student subgroups are still too significant.

Problem or Opportunity

- The majority of ELL students in the State are enrolled in school districts that have been identified as Priority or Turnaround Improvement under the Colorado's system of educational accountability.
- Over the past 10 years, from FY 2002-03 to FY 2012-13, Colorado's ELL student population has increased by over 38,000 students (44.7 percent).

Consequences of Problem

- Without adequate systems, supports, and programs at their schools, ELL students will continue to lag in achievement and the performance of schools and districts will be impacted.
- At the Department's current level of funding, the Department is unable to provide the level of service and support required by the ELPA statutes, and as requested by the schools and school districts throughout the State.

Proposed Solution

- With the additional funding requested, the Department will be able to meet the needs and demands from schools and school districts to provide high quality linguistic and academic services to their pupils needing ELL services.

This page left intentionally blank



State of Colorado
Department of Education
FY 2014-15 Funding Request
November 1, 2013

John W. Hickenlooper
Governor

Robert K. Hammond
Commissioner

Department Priority: R-7
Request Detail: State Support for English Language Learners

Summary of Incremental Funding Change for FY 2014-15	Total Funds	General Fund	FTE
Other Assistance, English Language Learners (new line item)	\$429,345	\$429,345	4.1

Request Summary:

The Department requests \$429,345 General Fund and 4.1 FTE in FY 2014-15 to provide additional support to school districts for their English Language Learner (ELL) programs. The ongoing funding in FY 2015-16 and subsequent years is \$441,612 and 4.5 FTE.

Problem or Opportunity:

Central to the Colorado Department of Education's strategic plan is the goal to increase achievement for all students and close achievement gaps that have persisted for years. Toward that end, the Department recognizes the importance of building capacity in the schools and districts to meet the needs of Colorado's English language learners (ELLs). Although there has been progress in increasing achievement among Colorado's ELLs, and gaps between ELLs and other student subgroups have closed, the rate of progress is insufficient. In order to accelerate achievement gains for ELLs, the Department must build its capacity to support school districts in meeting the instructional needs of ELLs.

Over the past 10 years, Colorado has experienced a steady increase in its number of English language learners. In 2003, Colorado's schools had 86,129 ELL students. That number has increased to 124,701 in 2013. One in seven Colorado students is an ELL. The number of districts with ELLs has also increased with a related decline in the number of districts that do not have ELLs. In over 30 school districts, ELLs comprise 20% or more of the student enrollment. These districts include both Colorado's largest school districts and also some Colorado's smallest school districts. Two hundred thirty-five languages besides English are spoken in the homes of Colorado's students.

Table 1 shows the ELL enrollment as a percentage of overall enrollment over the last 10 years.

Table 1: ELL Enrollment Compared to Overall Enrollment

Year	Total Student Population	Total Number of ELLs*	Percent ELL	Number of Districts with ELLs	Number of Districts with No ELLs
2002-2003	751,862	86,129	11.5%	NA	NA
2007-2008	802,639	106,413	13.3%	153	30
2012-2013	863,561	124,701	14.4%	160	23

*State Definition of ELL; based on Student Count October

The majority of ELLs (54 percent) are enrolled in districts that have been identified as Priority Improvement or Turnaround under Colorado’s system of educational accountability as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Percent of ELL Students in Priority or Improvement Districts

Total Priority Improvement / Turnaround Student Enrollment	Number of ELLs Enrolled	Number of ELLs in State	Percent of ELLs
214,041	67,697	124,701	54.3%

Outcomes for Colorado’s ELL Students

As noted above, Colorado has made gains in improving outcomes for ELL students relative to other subgroups of students, as shown in Chart #1 below. The lines reflect the performance of subgroups of Colorado’s students. The bars reflect CDE’s performance targets for achievement by year.

Chart #1: Achievement for ELLs Compared to Other Subgroups of Students



Table 3 shows ELL students' proficiency in reading, math, and writing when compared to non-ELL student proficiency. This table reflects the steady but inadequate progress Colorado has made in improving achievement outcomes for ELL students when compared to their non-ELL peers. For example, in 2004, there was a 39% gap between ELLs and non-ELLs in reading proficiency. In 2013, that gap was narrowed to 29%. There has been a similar narrowing of the gaps in math (2%) and writing (10%). However, at that rate of progress, it is projected that it would take 30 years to eliminate the achievement gap between ELLs and non-ELLs entirely.

Table 3: ELL Comparison of Proficiencies in Reading, Math, and Writing										
Reading Percent Proficient and Advanced										
	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Non-ELL	71.1	71.2	72.3	73.1	73.3	73.9	73.9	73.4	74.9	74.8
ELL	32.1	32.6	32.8	34.5	37.8	38.9	40.9	41.6	43.5	45.7
Math Percent Proficient and Advanced										
	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Non-ELL	45.5	54.2	55.6	57.1	57.2	58.5	58.9	59.7	59.9	60.7
ELL	20.1	27.6	29.3	30.9	32.0	34.0	35.2	36.9	36.9	38.6
Writing Percent Proficient and Advanced										
	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Non-ELL	57.0	58.7	58.0	59.2	58.6	59.9	58.1	60.5	58.8	58.8
ELL	22.8	24.5	21.8	24.4	25.0	27.9	27.2	30.5	32.1	33.2

ELL students lag significantly behind other students in indicators related to college and career readiness. Nearly 1 in 2 ELL students does not graduate. In 2004, ELL graduation rates were higher than the state average. In 2012, they lagged behind non-ELL graduation rates by over 20%. Dropout rates for ELL students are twice the state average. Average ACT scores for ELLs are 25% below the state average.

Table 4: Postsecondary Data for ELLs Compared to State Averages							
Postsecondary Data	Students	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2013
Graduation Rate	ELLs	88.6%	65.9%	52.0%	49.2%	53.3%	NA
	State Total (All students)	82.5%	74.1%	73.9%	72.4%	75.4%	NA
Dropout Rate	ELLs	5.3%	7.7%	6.8%	6.0%	5.1%	NA
	State Total (All students)	3.8%	4.5%	3.8%	3.2%	2.9%	NA
Colorado ACT Composite Score	NEP/LEP Students	NA	NA	12.7	12.6	16.1	13.6
	Students in ELL Programs	NA	NA	14.9	15.1	20.0	16.3
	State Total (All students with valid scores)	NA	NA	20.2	20.0	20.0	20.1

Colorado’s new system of educational accountability has performance targets for schools and districts related to the degree to which they are meeting expectations for ELL students in reading, writing, and math. Table 5 below shows a large disparity between the elementary, middle, and high schools assessed under Colorado’s accountability system as high performers versus those assessed as low performers. Percentages indicate the percentage of schools that did not meet expectations for ELLs.

Table 5: Priority Improvement and Turnaround (PI/TA) v. Non-PITA schools in Meeting Expectations for ELLs

Table 5: Priority Improvement and Turnaround (PI/TA) v. Non-PITA schools in Meeting Expectations for ELLs								
	Number of Schools	Reading		Math		Writing		Does not Meet on Graduation Rate for ELL
		Does not Meet on Academic Growth Gaps for ELL	Did not make Adequate Growth for ELL	Does not Meet on Academic Growth Gaps for ELL	Did not make Adequate Growth for ELL	Does not Meet on Academic Growth Gaps for ELL	Did not make Adequate Growth for ELL	
Elementary								
PITA Schools	112	22 19.6%	64 57.1%	24 21.4%	73 65.2%	21 18.8%	69 61.6%	
Non-PITA Schools	950	26 2.7%	145 15.3%	39 4.1%	288 30.3%	20 2.1%	223 23.5%	
Middle								
PITA Schools	77	10 13.0%	40 51.9%	18 23.4%	43 55.8%	7 9.1%	41 53.2%	
Non-PITA Schools	481	9 1.9%	111 23.1%	26 5.4%	220 45.7%	10 2.1%	194 40.3%	
High								
PITA Schools	55	2 3.6%	20 36.4%	8 14.5%	20 36.4%	3 5.5%	20 36.4%	22 40.0%
Non-PITA Schools	383	1 0.3%	68 17.8%	14 3.7%	154 40.2%	8 2.1%	140 36.6%	28 7.3%

* Includes AECs, based on AEC SPF rating.

Table 6 on the next page shows how ELL students in districts in Priority Improvement and Turnaround (PI/TA) status are performing when compared to ELL students in Non-PITA districts.

Table 6: Priority Improvement and Turnaround (PI/TA) v. Non-PI/TA districts in Meeting Expectations for ELLs

Based on the 2012 DPF Data	Number of Districts	Reading		Math		Writing		Does not Meet on Graduation Rate for ELL
		Does not Meet on Academic Growth Gaps for ELL	Did not make Adequate Growth for ELL	Does not Meet on Academic Growth Gaps for ELL	Did not make Adequate Growth for ELL	Does not Meet on Academic Growth Gaps for ELL	Did not make Adequate Growth for ELL	
		Elementary						
PITA Districts	24	3 12.5%	12 50.0%	3 12.5%	15 62.5%	2 8.3%	14 58.3%	
Non-PITA Districts	158	7 4.4%	30 19.0%	7 4.4%	54 34.2%	4 2.5%	41 25.9%	
Middle								
PITA Districts	24	4 16.7%	13 54.2%	5 20.8%	15 62.5%	2 8.3%	15 62.5%	
Non-PITA Districts	158	5 3.2%	39 24.7%	8 5.1%	66 41.8%	3 1.9%	63 39.9%	
High								
PITA Districts	24	1 4.2%	12 50.0%	4 16.7%	15 62.5%	2 8.3%	15 62.5%	9 37.5%
Non-PITA Districts	158	0 0.0%	28 17.7%	6 3.8%	52 32.9%	5 3.2%	50 31.6%	12 7.6%

In recent years, the U.S. Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Justice, and U.S. Department of Education have elevated efforts to clarify what is expected of states and school districts in providing educational opportunities for ELLs and has increased efforts to monitor schools districts against those expectations. Many Colorado school districts, particularly small rural school districts, are either unaware of the requirements or do not have the expertise locally to meet them. Consequently, they reach out to the Department for technical assistance and support. Similarly, as part of the 2013 TELL Survey, 41% of teachers responded that they need more professional development in providing effective instruction to English Language Learners. In a recent Department webinar conducted by the Department related to academic language and ELLs, many potential participants were unable to join as the webinar was at its capacity of 100. The Department also conducts monthly “ELL Office Hours” webinars and these routinely have between 60 and 100 participants. Although much is done to maximize the resources available and utilize technology where appropriate, the Department believes additional resources will enable it to provide significant, ongoing and onsite support to Colorado’s teachers in how to provide effective instruction to ELLs and significant support to school districts in establishing English Language Acquisition and core instructional programs that meet state and federal expectations.

Proposed Solution:

Colorado’s strategic plan in education focuses on preparing all students for postsecondary success, ensuring effective educators for all students, and increasing performance for all districts and schools. To accomplish

these ambitious goals, it is necessary to provide direct support to school districts to help ensure that the nearly one in seven Colorado students that is ELL has the instruction necessary to exit K-12 college and career ready. The Department currently lacks a critical mass of expertise and manpower to identify and assess ELLs and provide instructional resources and best practices guidance to districts, schools, and teachers. Currently, the Department is heavily reliant on a small staff of federally-funded personnel to meet both state and federal requirements and provide ELL-related support to schools, districts, and BOCES. However, the federal funds are allocated to the Department for a specific purpose and come with their own set of obligations. Although the Department has made every effort to maximize federal resources and staffing and utilize them in support of state requirements, they fall short of what is needed. The Department must build its capacity by bringing in individuals with proven success in English language development and a demonstrated ability to provide technical assistance to local education agencies of all sizes in all areas of Colorado.

In order to position itself to as an effective provider of support to Colorado's schools and school districts, the Department must first recruit and retain staff with strong expertise in the area of English language development and the academic instructional needs of ELLs. The Department will utilize these staff to build the capacity of schools and districts to meet the needs of Colorado's ELLs through data and root-cause analysis and targeted supports based on the needs of individual districts. The Department will provide extensive professional development to ensure all Colorado teachers have the skills necessary to provide effective instruction to ELLs.

The Department currently receives approximately \$40,000 annually to meet its obligations under ELPA and provide support for schools and districts in advancing achievement among ELLs. This request is for \$429,345 (ongoing) in support of 4.5 FTE and related operating expenses. These staff will build the capacity of the Department to provide ELL support services and will provide direct services to school districts. Among the services provided by staff supported with these funds will be:

- Technical assistance to school districts in planning, implementing, and evaluating English language acquisition programs;
- Technical assistance to school districts in meeting state and federal requirements as they relate to ELLs;
- Intensive, ongoing support for small rural districts that do not have the expertise to meet the needs of their ELLs;
- Professional development for teachers in providing instruction to ELLs;
- Technical assistance in Unified Improvement Planning and implementation for schools and districts that are not meeting expectations for ELL achievement and growth;
- Review of Priority Improvement and Turnaround Unified Improvement Plans;
- Participation in CDE Coordinated Support Teams for school districts;
- Technical assistance for school districts in identifying and assessing ELLs;
- Developing guidance, publications, and other materials that are supportive of schools in meeting the needs of ELLs;
- Integration of ELL work across CDE divisions, units, and offices; and
- Building the capacity across all offices of CDE to develop policies and procedures that are supportive of ELLs.

If not approved, CDE will be unable to meet the need for school and district support and it is anticipated that Colorado’s ELLs will continue to lag significantly behind their non-ELL peers in reading, writing, and math achievement, graduation rate, and college and career readiness.

Anticipated Outcomes:

The Department’s request allows the Department to build its internal capacity so that it can provide the necessary technical and expert assistance need by schools and districts to improve the achievement goals related for their ELL students. The success of this initiative will be measured using student assessment results, graduation rates, dropout rates, and school and district performance frameworks. Success will be defined as the Department achieving its performance objectives and targets related to ELLs such as increasing middle school proficiency levels on the state reading assessment from 41.8% to 70.9% by the spring of 2015. As mentioned earlier, although there have been small but steady gains in outcome measures for ELLs in recent years, ELLs lag behind their non-ELL peers significantly in reading, writing, math, ACT scores, and graduation rates. If this request is approved, it is anticipated that the additional supports provided by the Department to school districts and the integration of ELL work across Department offices will accelerate those gains, close the gap between ELLs and non-ELLs in student achievement, and enable the Department to meet its strategic goals and objectives.

Assumptions and Calculations:

This request is an ongoing request for \$429,345 in FY 2014-15 and \$441,612 annually to support 4.5 FTE and associated operating, printing, travel, and consulting expenses. The request assumes a caseload of approximately 40 school districts and BOCES per FTE and standard costs for benefits and operating. The request also assumes the need for a small amount of funding to cover printing costs for resource materials, travel costs to provide universal and targeted supports for school districts, consulting fees for contracts with national experts, and other fees associated with conferences and training.

Table 1 below summarizes the anticipated costs and Table 2 on the next page provides calculations for the FTE costs..

Table 1: Summary of the Request’s Cost Components		
Description	FY2014-15	FY2015-16
4.5 FTE, personnel costs	\$266,043	\$290,250
Employee benefits	\$ 74,090	\$81,432
One-time operating costs	\$ 19,282	\$0
Rent	\$ 29,930	\$29,930
Standard Operating Costs	\$3,895	4,275
Other operating costs: travel, printing, consulting	\$ 36,105	\$35,725
Total Request	\$429,345	\$441,612

Table 2: FTE Position Calculation Details

Calculation Assumptions:

Personal Services – Based on the Department of Personnel and Administration’s August 2011 Annual Compensation Survey Report, 4.5 Senior Consultants at the middle of the pay range will require a monthly salary of \$5,375.

Operating Expenses – Base operating expenses are included per FTE for \$500 per year. In addition, for regular FTE, annual telephone costs assume base charges of \$450 per year.

Standard Capital Purchases – Each additional employee necessitates the purchase of a Personal Computer (\$900), Office Suite Software (\$330), and office furniture (\$3,473).

General Fund FTE – New full-time General Fund positions are reflected in FY 2014-15 as 0.9166 FTE to account for the pay-date shift.

Expenditure Detail	Monthly Salary	FY 2014-15		FY 2015-16	
		FTE	Funding	FTE	Funding
Personal Services					
Principal Consultant/Programmer	\$5,375	4.1	\$266,043	4.5	\$290,250
PERA			27,003		29,460
AED			10,642		12,771
SAED			9,977		12,336
Medicare			3,858		4,209
STD			505		551
Health-Life-Dental			<u>22,105</u>		<u>22,105</u>
Subtotal Position 1, ## FTE		4.1	\$340,133	4.5	\$371,682
Operating Expenses	Operating Base Cost				
Regular FTE Operating Expenses	\$500	4.1	\$2,050	4.5	\$2,250
Telephone Expenses	450	4.1	1,845	4.5	2,025
PC, One-Time	1,230	4.5	5,043		0
Office Furniture, One-Time	3,473	4.5	14,239		0
Rent-Leased Space	2,500	4.5	<u>29,930</u>	4.5	<u>29,930</u>
Subtotal Operating Expenses			\$53,107		\$34,205
TOTAL REQUEST					
Personal Services		4.1	\$340,133	4.5	\$371,682
Operating			<u>53,107</u>		<u>34,205</u>
TOTAL FTE Request (General Fund)			\$393,240		\$405,887