

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Part II**

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

For reporting on



PART II DUE THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2020

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

INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303¹ of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015(ESSA)².

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0724. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35.00 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

¹ SEC.8303. Consolidated Reporting – (a) In general: In order to simplify reporting requirements and reduce reporting burdens, the Secretary shall establish procedures and criteria under which a State educational agency, in consultation with the Governor of the State, may submit a consolidated State annual report. (b) Contents: The report shall contain information about the programs included in the report, including the performance of the State under those programs, and other matters as the Secretary determines are necessary, such as monitoring activities. (c) Replacement: The report shall replace separate individual annual reports for the programs included in the consolidated State annual report.

² All citations to the ESEA in this document are to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

OMB Number: 1810-0724
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson

Telephone:

303.866.6205

Fax:

n/a

e-mail:

mohajeri-nelson_n@cde.state.co.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson

Submitted Date and Time:

2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY

2.1.1 School Performance on Accountability Indicators

The following indicators are collected through ESS and compiled in the EDEN036 report via the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS) and will be posted as an accompanying report for every State:

- LEA Name
- NCES LEA ID
- State LEA ID
- School Name
- NCES School ID
- State School ID
- Title I School Status - DG 22 (FS129)
- Academic achievement indicator status – DG 835 (FS200)
- Other academic indicator status DG 836 (FS201)
- Graduation rate indicator status – DG 834 (FS199)
- Progress achieving English language proficiency indicator status - DG 837 (FS205)
- School quality or student success indicator status – DG 838 (FS202)

The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

2.1.2 Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, overall and by reason identified.

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non-Title I Schools
Lowest performing five percent of Title I schools	75		
High schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students	71	25	46
Title I schools that have received additional targeted support under Section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA and that have not exited that status after a State-determined number of years			
Total Identified	146		

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

2.1.3 Schools Implementing Targeted Support and Improvement Plans

In the table below, provide the number of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

	Number of Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Number of non- Title I Schools
Schools with One or More Consistently Underperforming Subgroups of Students	69	36	33
Schools in which any Subgroup of Students, on its own, would lead to Identification Under <i>ESEA</i> Section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) (i.e., Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support)	58	30	28

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

2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds

In the tables below, provide the amount of Section 1003 funds of the *ESEA* allocated to each district and school.

2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs

For each LEA receiving a 1003(a) allocation, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES LEA ID
- Amount of LEA's Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools

For each school receiving a Section 1003(a) allocation of the *ESEA*, list the amount of the allocation. The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN012 "Section 1003 Allocations to LEAs and Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS).

- Name of School Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) of the *ESEA* Funds in SY 2018-19
- NCES School ID
- Amount of School's Section1003(a) of the *ESEA* Allocation

The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report. Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN012 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR DOCX.

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

2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

This section collects data on graduation rates and rates of postsecondary enrollment.

2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the state's four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the current reporting period.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All students	66,852	54,239	81.13%
American Indian or Alaska Native	536	348	64.93%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,331	2,071	88.85%
<i>Asian</i>	2,156	1,938	89.89%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	175	133	76.00%
Black or African American	3,061	2,277	74.39%
Hispanic or Latino	22,284	16,490	74.00%
White	36,120	31,023	85.89%
Two or more races	2,520	2,030	80.56%
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,958	4,121	59.23%
English Learners	9,103	6,246	68.61%
Economically disadvantaged students	31,494	22,317	70.86%
Children in foster care	918	244	26.58%
Children who are homeless	3,210	1,783	55.55%

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on graduation rates:

What is the adjusted cohort graduation rate? The adjusted cohort graduation rate is described in sections 8101(23) and 8101(25) of the ESEA.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.2.2 Postsecondary Enrollment

In the table below, provide counts of students who enrolled in programs of postsecondary education during the current reporting period. If data are missing or incomplete, please explain in the comments.

	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not enrolled in an IHE	# for which data are unavailable	Total
All students	34,782	2,212	20,901	57,895
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	15	217	439
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,677	60	427	2,164
<i>Asian</i>	1,606	53	366	2,025
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	71	7	61	139
Black or African American	1,606	94	1,006	2,706
Hispanic or Latino	8,760	720	8,570	18,050
White	21,231	1,246	10,013	32,490
Two or more races	1,301	77	668	2,046
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,228	150	2,827	4,205
English Learners	860	87	1,906	2,853
Economically disadvantaged students	7,504	624	8,027	16,155

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.3.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I Schoolwide Programs (SWPs) or Targeted Assistance programs (TAS) at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	37,676
English learners	65,823
Homeless students	9,069
Migrant students	2,045

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

2.3.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,683
Asian	5,451
Black or African American	19,400
Hispanic or Latino	143,311
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,035
White	74,409
Two or more races	9,228
Total	255,517

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

2.3.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public TAS, Title I SWP, private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age /Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	93	1,613	22	0	1,728
K	1,027	27,068	139	0	28,234
1	1,242	27,476	139	7	28,864
2	1,230	27,267	130	21	28,648
3	1,196	27,888	144	21	29,249
4	1,084	28,722	131	25	29,962
5	1,005	28,851	108	46	30,010
6	165	17,337	63	65	17,630
7	92	15,218	52	100	15,462
8	83	15,186	35	128	15,432
9	52	8,587	48	163	8,850
10	44	7,549	57	151	7,801
11	52	6,864	27	104	7,047
12	46	8,480	29	67	8,622
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	7,411	248,106	1,124	898	257,539

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

2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (MEP) (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migratory children
- Academic data of eligible migratory students
- Data of migratory children served during the performance period
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

Report a child in the age/grade category in which the child spent the *majority of their time* while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule:

1. A child who turns 3 during the performance period is reported as "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)," **only if the child's residency in the state was verified after the child turned 3.**
2. A child who turns 22 years of age during the performance is reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, 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 performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls 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 migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.4.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

a. How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means children 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 term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a "migratory child" are eligible for the MEP.

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

c. How is reporting a child "in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State" defined? A State must report a child in **only one** age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time **while residing in the State**. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

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 and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado does not have concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported 2018-19 child counts or underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migratory 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 performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This figure includes all eligible migratory children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	700
K	318
1	290
2	332
3	322
4	336
5	312
6	326
7	268
8	271
9	323
10	295
11	226
12	226
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	404
Total	4,949

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

There are several reasons for the slight decrease from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1. Agriculture processing plants closed their facilities, migrant housing was not available, H2A workers arrived without children and workers were over the age of 21 years old.

At the same time, however, there has been an increase of workers and their families moving to our State to work in Hemp. In order to address this decrease regional MEP programs will adjust their recruitment strategies (i.e. focusing on teamwork and communication) which will help find and enroll additional migrant children, thereby increasing the child count.

2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are several reasons for the slight decrease from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1. Agriculture processing plants closed their facilities, migrant housing was not available, H2A workers arrived without children and workers were over the age of 21 years old.

At the same time, however, there has been an increase of workers and their families moving to our State to work in Hemp. In order to address this decrease regional MEP programs will adjust their recruitment strategies (i.e. focusing on teamwork and communication) which will help find and enroll additional migrant children, thereby increasing the child count.

2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
Age Birth through 2	390

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

2.4.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migratory 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 performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance 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 who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	582
K	241
1	218
2	249
3	247
4	254
5	243
6	260
7	205
8	198
9	249
10	217
11	148
12	44
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	303
Total	3,658

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

2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease in Category 2 is due to regional staff confusion about entering services correctly in the new state data system, which reported lower numbers than Colorado's actual numbers. Also, some families are afraid to open the door for home visits. The SEA has responded by conducting regional and state training on entering services in the state data system and by requiring Module 3 State and local services training for all new recruiters and advocates to ensure there is not a re-occurrence of incorrect service entries. The number of students reported where the grade level for ungraded (UG) during the summer term is "zero".

2.4.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from age birth through 2 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 performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. 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.

Do not include:

- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0

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

2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following questions request information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) *during the performance period* and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were served for one or more days in a MEP- funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migratory student database.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA ensures the data system used to transmit migrant data to the Department, Students Migrating on the Right Track (SMART), accurately accounts for all migrant children reported to the Office of Migrant Education.

Data is captured seamlessly in our Student Information System called Students Migrating Academically on the Right Track (SMART) and populates all required state and federal forms. Electronic signatures are supported, approval workflows are automated, and notifications are sent to everyone involved. A Validation Tool can instantly indicate on-screen which data fields in a student record requires further information to complete the certification process.

Because data specialists and manager roles have immediate access to records, they can identify why a field recruiter data entry is not leading to faster eligibility review and certificate approval. Management users have become experts at using SMART's filtering tools to find unfinished record certifications for re-submission back to field offices. This kind of management level oversight is especially critical for State MEP departments to ensure each COE is processed in a timely manner.

The ease and accuracy of SMART Migrant Student Tracking Software guarantees greater accuracy and resulting improvement of State's affirmation of eligibilities. Authenticated student data and staff approval help support a state's eligibility certification to count children who were 36 months of the QAD and who had a SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) entered in the States SMART Migrant Student Tracking System. SMART software can force the accuracy of data entry during the eligibility collection phase thereby guaranteeing greater record acceptance at the State level. SMART workflows focus on what data fields are necessary for eligibility, to ensure the student record is quickly processed through to final certification. SMART's end-to-end certification enables regional data specialists to immediately begin the record verification process after field recruiters have completed data entry. The electronic record is moved paperlessly through the SMART system from the regional office on to the State's MEP managers for final certification. If after review at each workflow if there is missing or invalid information the COE is rejected, and the COE processing workflow is reassigned to the recruiter for accurate certification.

Only children who have a SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) documenting their eligibility for the State of Colorado Migrant Education Program have been entered in SMART. The SMART software interface includes eligible children ages three through 21 that have a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) within 36 months if the child's eligibility expiration date does not occur prior to the start of summer/intersession term.

Colorado MEP conducts several Category 2 validation processes to ensures only unduplicated eligible migratory children who were served during the summer/intersession term are included in its child counts. The data validation process ensures all required data has undergone data cleansing to warrant the data quality is, valid, reliable, and accurate. SMART's reporting functionality uses validation rules and constraints to check for accuracy, completeness, and validity. Data that does not conform are not included in its Category 2 child count.

Colorado also cross-references its validation checks against other systems like MSIX using the Child Count Reconciliation Report to identify and resolve data quality issues that may cause our State child count and the MSIX child count to differ. This same validation process is utilized for both Category 1 and 2 child counts.

The SMART Validation Tool detects duplicate student records by running validation checks to determine if the student already exists in the system. Student records are also run against other Department Systems like the, Records Integration Tracking System (RITS) which assigns State IDs to students called (SASIDs). When MEP Field Recruiters complete a student search the system retrieves search results from both SMART and RITS. The validation tool identifies if two or more records represent the same student by checking for potential duplicate SMART IDs or SASIDs. If duplicate records are identified the records are merged and communication of the consolidation is sent to MEP field recruiters, regional data specialists and state-level managers in real-time. This ensures accurate counts of migratory children within SMART for Category 1 and 2.

Similarly, a Duplicate Report can be run from SMART to identify potential duplicate student records. The systems algorithm checks for potential matches within SMART IDs, State IDs, student name, DOB within (3, 6, 9, 12 months) and finally alike parent names. If duplicate records are identified the records are merged and communication of the consolidation is sent to MEP field recruiters, regional data specialists and state-level managers in real-time. This ensures accurate counts of migratory children within SMART for Category 1 and 2. Potential duplicate records in MSIX or in its States system are resolved immediately. A deletion flag is transmitted to MSIX to remove the duplicate record. Therefore, only one

record per student is included in the State's child count.

Students who have attained their HSED or who have graduated are reported by the school districts and verified as completers in End of Year Reporting. A student who attained HSED/Graduated is flagged in SMART, including documentation of the HSED/Graduation attainment date. Students who attained their HSED/Graduation during the 2019-20 performance period. The SMART Validation Tool ensures students who have attained their HSED/Graduated are not included in subsequent child counts.

Finally, the state data system or SMART has an automated process for Residency Verifications. The Regional Data Specialist will assign a residency verification notification for all non-attending students including age verifications for children two turning three to the appropriate regional recruiter. The regional recruiter will then contact the parent/worker and verify the residency of the specific student. Once residency is verified by the parent/worker the recruiter will "sign-off" by capturing their electronic signature. The regional data specialist receives a notification that the residency verification has been submitted and the data specialist will then review and approve the residency verification. The recruiter who completed the residency verification will then receive a notification that the residency verification is complete. The multiple steps ensure the validation is accurate and that data quality is maintained. MEP eligibility is determined at the time of the interview and is based on the worker's stated intention at the time of the move. For example: If the State is reporting for SY 2019-20, a child with a qualifying arrival date as early as Sep 2, 2016 could be included in the child count due to the child's 36-month period of eligibility. If the State is qualifying on a previous move, the child's eligibility period will be for the remainder of the 36 months.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every ED*Facts* data file? See the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question. Please respond in the table below.

Accuracy of ED<i>Facts</i> Data Files	Yes/No
The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required ED <i>Facts</i> data file.	YES

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	Yes/No
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	YES

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each MEP funded staff member is required to utilize MSIX to conduct mobility searches for state-to-state moves. A move notification is completed and sent to the sending state indicating the student now resides in Colorado. Subsequently, an email to retrieve qualifying information is sent to validate mobility and continuation of services.

Similarly, when the SEA receives a move notification, a search is completed in the State's Record Information Tracking System (RITS) to validate mobility for students attending school. Additionally, for students who are not attending school, a home visit is completed to determine eligibility.

Finally, when Colorado receives a move notification from another state informing that a student has moved and now resides in the other State, the student is withdrawn from Colorado's State Student Information System and the school district is notified of the move. Upon request, qualifying information is shared with the receiving State. The MEP protects the privacy of those whose data is collected, used, and shared. Thus, the MEP enforces additional guidelines and strict processes to ensure the security, confidentiality and privacy of every student. The State Data and User Administrator runs random MSIX data quality reports in order to ensure that the data submitted is valid, accurate and reliable, and to report leading practices regarding data collection and reporting. Modifications are made in the State system to address any data validity or logic discrepancies. Similarly, the MSIX Child Count Report is run periodically to identify child counts for funding purposes and to reconcile MSIX student counts with state data systems.

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

2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	50
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	16
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	16

Procedures	SY
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	2017-2018

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
NA

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

What are independent prospective re-interviews? Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migratory children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migratory children.

Obtaining Data from Families	Re-interview Method
Select how the re-interviews were conducted: Face-to-face re-interviews Phone Interviews Both	Both

Obtaining Data from Families	Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	YES
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	YES

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY 2018-19.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
NA

In the space below, refer to the results of **any** re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migratory children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.
The list of children with COE approval dates from 09/01/18 to 08/31/19 was opened in SMART (Colorado State data system). The random sample of 50 students was checked for appropriate qualifying arrival date (QAD) from a sample of 2,092 students. Of the 2,092 students, an algorithm was created based on the total number of eligible students within each of the 5 MEP regions. Region 1 was assigned 46% with a total of 23 randomly selected students from 964; Region 2 was assigned 18% with a total of 9 randomly selected students from 370; Region 3 was assigned 8% with a total of 4 randomly selected students from 160; Region 4 was assigned 10% with a total of 5 randomly selected students from 205; and Region 5 was assigned 18% with a total of 9 randomly selected students from 385.

Of the 50 re-interviews sampled, 16 were successfully completed face-to-face and all 16 re-interviews were determined eligible. Eighteen families were verified by a re-interviewer to have moved out of the area. The remaining 16 families could not be located. Subsequently, the SEA determined that the execution of the random sampling as one large sample (pulling the 50 random samples all at once near the end of the Performance Period) was not conducive to locating families in a timely manner.

In order to improve our quality control processes for the 2019 - 2020 Performance Period, the Colorado MEP will pull three random samples through the 2019 -2020 Performance Period. This should increase the probability of successfully completing a face to face interview with highly mobile migratory families. The random samples will include: Sample 1: 16 total students; Sample 2: 17 total students; and Sample 3: 17.

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

	Yes/No
Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of	YES

	Yes/No
Eligibility (COE)?	

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

2.4.4 Eligible Migratory Children

2.4.4.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	161
K	85
1	61
2	74
3	76
4	75
5	68
6	70
7	53
8	69
9	73
10	65
11	35
12	32
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	231
Total	1,228

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

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who 1) are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet challenging State academic standards, or 2) have dropped out of school.

2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who are also ELs. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	ELs During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	168
1	211
2	220
3	212
4	202
5	172
6	168
7	129
8	149
9	171
10	149
11	112
12	87
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	14
Total	2,172

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

2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who are also children with disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	20
K	33
1	23
2	30
3	37
4	41
5	35
6	29
7	30
8	23
9	18
10	22
11	13
12	19
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	373

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

2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children whose QAD occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2019 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	QAD During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	183
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	190
K	91
1	65
2	84
3	70
4	81
5	74
6	72
7	54
8	64
9	63
10	61
11	35
12	29
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	217
Total	1,433

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

2.4.5 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migratory students.

2.4.5.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	2
8	3
9	12
10	12
11	15
12	27
Ungraded	
Total	71

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

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropouts" defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2018-19 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2018-19) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another 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. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2018-19 performance period should not be reported in this item.

2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g. GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtain HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	6

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

2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to migratory children during the performance period.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migratory child; (2) address a need of a migratory child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migratory families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migratory children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	379
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	690
K	314
1	284
2	322
3	318
4	334
5	308
6	322
7	265
8	264
9	316
10	291
11	221
12	211
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	381
Total	5,220

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

2.4.6.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	161
K	80
1	59
2	70
3	73
4	72
5	64
6	67
7	52
8	66
9	72
10	65
11	33
12	31
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	227
Total	1,192

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

2.4.6.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Section 1304(e)(2–3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	2
9	2
10	2
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	8

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

FAQ on Continuation of Services:

What is Continuation of Services? The “continuation of services” provision found in Section 1304(e) of the ESEA provides that: (1) a child who ceases to be a migratory child during a school term shall be eligible for services until the end of such term; (2) a child who is no longer a migratory child may continue to receive services for one additional school year, but only if comparable services are not available through other programs; and (3) secondary school students who were eligible for services in secondary school may continue to be served through credit accrual programs until graduation.

2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	182
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	571
K	223
1	221
2	237
3	239
4	254
5	219
6	243
7	194
8	197
9	261
10	226
11	182
12	168
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	144
Total	3,761

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

2.4.6.4 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of **eligible** migratory children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7	6	
K	9		
1	12		
2	8	1	
3	11	2	
4	14	1	
5	14	1	
6	6	1	
7	5	1	
8	10	8	79
9	14	6	112
10	12	2	112
11	8	6	75
12	1	1	62
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	2	2	99
Total	133	38	539

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? MEP-funded instruction, funded in whole or in part by MEP funds, in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. High school credit accrual includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. High school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12. NOTE: Children receiving a MEP-funded high school credit accrual service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

2.4.6.5 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migratory children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	306	118
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	646	67
K	305	34
1	276	22
2	313	20
3	310	26
4	331	30
5	300	24
6	311	57
7	260	49
8	259	72
9	301	107
10	282	105
11	215	77
12	199	67
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	324	180
Total	4,938	1,055

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

FAQs on Support Services:

a. What are support services? These MEP-funded educationally-related services are provided to students. These services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migratory children; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. Activities related to identification and recruitment, parental involvement, professional development, program evaluation, and the one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

b. What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, or between students and students in MEP peer-to-peer counseling activities, or between students and MEP-funded staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy. NOTE: Children who receive a MEP-funded counseling service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

2.4.7 School Data during the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migratory children in schools during the regular school year.

2.4.7.1 Schools and Enrollment – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migratory children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migratory children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	516
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	2,806

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

The increase by 25% between the total number of migratory children reported in FS165 Migratory School Data from SY 2017-18 to SY 2018-19 was due to the implementation of Colorado Student Information System, Students Migrating Academically on the Right Track (SMART). SMART utilizes web services to pull in school information from the Colorado Department of Education School Directory which yearly collects school information directly from districts. This type of communication and interface has provided efficient technology transmission and increase in quality and quantity to better track public schools and the migrant students attending those schools. Automated updates in real-time have enhanced the way we collect and report migratory school data.

2.4.7.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in SWPs – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migratory children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools	

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

2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth that is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non- secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.5.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.5.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	5	108
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	5	

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

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	5
Adult corrections	0
Other	0
Total	5

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

2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*) and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			1,084		
Total Long Term Students Served			534		

Provide the number of students served by special populations

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			261		
English Learners (ELs)			18		

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			6		
Asian			5		
Black or African American			239		
Hispanic or Latino			447		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			4		
White			383		
Two or more races			0		
Total			1,084		

Provide the number of students served by gender.

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			935		
Female			149		
Total			1,084		

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		
6			0		
7			0		
8			0		
9			0		
10			0		
11			0		
12			0		
13			0		
14			24		
15			72		
16			158		
17			274		
18			330		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
19			155		
20			62		
21			9		
Total			1,084		

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2018.

2.5.1.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days after Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90-day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit					

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED					74					
Obtained high school diploma					119					

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Adult Corrections - In fac.	Adult Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					925					
Enrolled in a GED program					89					
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					21					
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					385					
Obtained employment					11					

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2018/19 reporting period, Colorado Division of Youth Services (DYS) did not have the ability to track students after being released from their facilities. Moving forward, the expectation is to be able to accurately report these data.

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

2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.5.2.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			91		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			30		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			24		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			93		
Total students pre/post- tested			238		

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in mathematics pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			108		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			26		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			68		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			77		
Total students pre/post- tested			279		

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

2.5.3 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.5.3.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	12	84
Other	0	0
Total	12	

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

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.5.3.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	12
Other	0
Total	12

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

2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*), and EL status, by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served				2,046	
Total Long Term Students Served				655	

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)				657	
ELs				119	

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native				32	
Asian				17	
Black or African American				489	
Hispanic or Latino				719	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander				8	
White				708	
Two or more races				73	
Total				2,046	

Provide the number of students served by sex.

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				1,546	
Female				500	
Total				2,046	

Provide the number of students served by age.

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8				2	
9				3	
10				13	
11				23	
12				50	
13				100	
14				235	
15				357	
16				477	
17				513	
18				221	
19				41	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
20				11	
21					
Total				2,046	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

2.5.3.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90-day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit				203	

Outcomes (once per student) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned a GED							75	0		
Obtained high school diploma							22	0		

Outcomes (once per student per time period) - # of Students Who	At-Risk Programs - In fac.	At-Risk Programs - 90 days after exit	Neglected Programs - In fac.	Neglected Programs - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Detention - In fac.	Juvenile Detention - 90 days after exit	Juvenile Corrections - In fac.	Juvenile Corrections - 90 days after exit	Other Programs - In fac.	Other Programs - 90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits							1,144	83		
Enrolled in a GED program							67	38		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education							16	12		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs							211	24		
Obtained employment							36	108		

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.5.4 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.5.4.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				14	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				75	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				153	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				138	
Total students pre/post- tested				380	

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.5.4.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in mathematics pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2018, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				15	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				78	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				202	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				94	
Total students pre/post- tested				389	

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)**2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A**

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	0.00
Safe and Healthy Students	0.00
Effective Use of Technology	0.00

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

Colorado implemented a system to collect Title IV, Part A expenditures by content area beginning in the 2019/2020 school year.

2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the number of LEAs who spent funds by the content areas under Title IV, Part A of the *ESEA*. For the “Any” category, report the number of LEAs that spent funds in any of the three content areas. An LEA should be included in the count of each content area it spent funds on (i.e. an LEA may be represented in more than one content area in the table below). The data are reported through the Annual Performance Reporting Tool.

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	0
Safe and Healthy Students	0
Effective Use of Technology	0
Any Content Area	132

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

Colorado implemented a system to collect Title IV, Part A expenditures by content area beginning in the 2019/2020 school year. For the 2018/19 school year, LEAs spending funds in any content area were counted at the consortia level; each consortia counted as one LEA, regardless of how many districts were members.

2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)**2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate whether the State transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY 2018-19?	NO

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

2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the State that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).	17

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

2.7.3 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	4	5
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	15	0
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		11
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		2
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		0

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2018 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	108,691.00	146,355.00
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	1,020,516.00	0.00
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)		912,431.00
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)		0.00
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)		0.00
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)		70,421.00
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)		0.00

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

2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title V, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.8.1 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title V, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2018-19 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	12
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	12
Activities authorized under Title III	1
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	6
Parental involvement activities	3

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

2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the objectives and outcomes for the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has worked with LEAs through their consolidated applications to administer this funding to align with and enhance other federal, state, and local programs. The specific measurable program objectives and outcomes for each LEA receiving RLIS funds will be aligned with the specific Title program(s): Use of Funds and Program Objectives and Outcomes

- Title I, Part A: Academic Achievement goals and measures of interim progress under Section 1

- Example of LEA use of RLIS funds to meet outlined objective:

- Support for Cortez Middle School (CMS) to participate in University of Virginia turnaround professional development and coaching for leaders and teacher leaders. The UVA turnaround work is an evidence based practice that is also part of the state-approved district pathways plan. CMS has had difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers due to the challenges of turnaround. A key priority of the UVA turnaround PD and consulting is focused on talent management and the recruitment, development, and retention of teachers. This PD will be provided to the school leadership team at Cortez Middle School and key teacher leaders and will consist of cohort based week long PD as well as job embedded PD and coaching provided as part of a site visit. Three school leaders and the school teacher leadership team will participate.

- This position as a classroom teacher also provides English Language Arts/Reading Intervention to students within remedial courses at their designated school. Each classroom caters to students of all minorities and non-minorities, and fosters positive peer relationships and support regarding coursework. Students that are members of subgroups such as FRM, ELL, READ ACT, Migrant, and Gifted and Talented all actively participate in the classroom curriculum taught. Each grade level learning team in each school begins the process by developing a plan i.e.; (learning objectives) that give an end result that each teacher/interventionist would like to accomplish with their students over the course of the school year. Next, the teams utilize an assessment culture that's main focus is to establish a personal connection with each student. Teachers utilize test results with immediate feedback to create the cornerstone of the student/teacher relationship. Lamar RE2 utilizes DIBELS, NWEA, CMAS PARCC/Science/Social Studies, ACCESS 2.0/DLM/KITE exams to develop comprehensive learning goals and strategies that prioritize services for each child. Each child then receives a minimum of 40 extra minutes in the primary classroom and in the intervention areas so that each student gets the help they need in ELL and Reading.

- Title II, Part A: Rates that low-income and minority students are taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers compared to their peers under Section 5.3

- Example of LEA use of RLIS funds to meet outlined objective:

- The instructional coach will monitor and provide feedback to instructional staff in regard to implementing the adopted curricula and instructional strategies to support the curricula: 1) fidelity of implementation; 2) posting objectives aligned with curriculum; 3) best practice instructional strategies unit planning. The Instructional Coach will monitor and provide feedback on effective instructional practices including: 1) curriculum implementation; 2) alignment of instruction with curricular expectations; 3) differentiation/engagement - strategies and related 21st century skills; and 4) Capturing Kids Hearts strategies. With this level of support instructional practices will improve.

- Title III: English Language Proficiency goals and measures of interim progress under Section 1

- Example of LEA use of RLIS funds to meet outlined objective:

- Provide Cultural and Linguistically diverse teacher for students requiring EL services.

- Title IV, Part A: Academic Achievement goals and measures of interim progress under Section 1

- Example of LEA use of RLIS funds to meet outlined objective:

- Prime for Life is an evidence-based therapeutic education program with demonstrated success in significantly altering attitudes, increasing abstinence, reducing high-risk drinking and drug use, and reducing recidivism. Prime for Life is listed on the National Registry of Evidence - Based Programs and Practices (NREPP), a service of Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).

- Payment of AP testing costs for low income students in need

- Safety and At-risk coordinator for training of self and training of staff for all emergency situations and working in conjunction with law enforcement and OEM personnel to ensure proper protocols are developed and followed

- Title I, Section 11116 Parent Involvement

- Examples of LEA use of RLIS funds to meet outlined objectives:

- Parent Involvement-Family Night Events parents will be educated as to the additional support programs available for the most at risk student population. This will allow teachers and parents to be able to focus on academic student success. Intended Outcome: Teachers and Parents will be able to collaborate together in order to meet the individual student needs. The Building Level Accountability Committee (BAC) will send Parent Surveys out to families the day following the Family Night Activity in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the activity. This information will be shared with the building level administrator.

2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in providing technical assistance for RLIS LEA sub-grantees as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has enhanced LEA's capacity to administer these funds by providing technical assistance through 20 regional network meeting in 5 regions of the state. Four virtual training webinars, ongoing emails, and regular telephone support throughout the year to support LEAs in using RLIS funds to meet district needs aligned with intent and purpose of the RLIS program. CDE shared several communications and provided trainings with LEAs to support dual-eligible districts in making informed decisions on participation in RLIS vs. SRSA program.

2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination

Please report the method the SEA used to award grants to eligible LEAs. If the SEA used a competitive process, please describe that process and include a description of the methods and criteria the SEA used to review applications, award funds to LEAs, and how the LEAs were notified of the process. If the SEA used a formula besides one based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State, please describe that formula, including an explanation of how this alternative formula enables the SEA to allot grant funds in a manner that serves equal or greater concentrations of children from families with incomes below the poverty line, relative to the concentration that would be served if the SEA used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

Comments: The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado awards grants by the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds

In the table below, provide information on state administrative funds.

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	5.00%
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	75.00%

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

2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received. This information will be collected from SEAs outside of the CSPR collection tool.

- NCES LEA ID
- LEA Name
- RLIS Award Amount

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

2.8.7 Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) Program, Alternative Fund Use Authority (AFUA)

	Number	Percentage
What number and percentage of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.	55	52.38%

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