

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

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

**For reporting on  
School Year 2012-13**

**COLORADO**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2012-13 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2012-13 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2012-13 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report          For          State Formula Grant Programs          under the          Elementary And Secondary Education Act          as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2012-13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2012-13		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Colorado Department of Education		
Address: 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, CO 80202		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Patrick Chapman		
Telephone: 303-866-6780		
Fax: 303-866-6637		
e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Patrick Chapman		
		<u>Wednesday, April 2, 2014, 2:32:01 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART II**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2012-13**



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 17, 2012  
5PM EST**

**2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)**

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

**2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs**

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

**2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	22,305	13,251	59.41
4	22,205	12,809	57.69
5	20,659	10,265	49.69
6	12,171	5,178	42.54
7	10,438	3,452	33.07
8	9,816	2,795	28.47
High School	9,262	1,523	16.44
Total	106,856	49,273	46.11
<b>Comments:</b>			

**2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)**

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	22,244	13,191	59.30
4	22,187	11,408	51.42
5	20,638	11,286	54.69
6	12,159	6,562	53.97
7	10,433	4,724	45.28
8	9,811	4,191	42.72
High School	9,225	4,329	46.93
Total	106,697	55,691	52.20
<b>Comments:</b>			

**2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)**

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	5,282	3,925	74.31
4	5,299	3,787	71.47
5	5,237	3,323	63.45
6	2,023	1,131	55.91
7	1,479	663	44.83
8	1,444	618	42.80
High School	1,489	412	27.67
Total	22,253	13,859	62.28
<b>Comments:</b>			

**2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)**

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	5,252	3,981	75.80
4	5,303	3,583	67.57
5	5,235	3,597	68.71
6	2,027	1,436	70.84
7	1,470	891	60.61
8	1,439	869	60.39
High School	1,477	979	66.28
Total	22,203	15,336	69.07
<b>Comments:</b>			



## 2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

### 2.1.2.1 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 SWP or TAS programs 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> )	22,119
Limited English proficient students	64,516
Students who are homeless	7,815
Migratory students	1,201
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.1.2.2 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 public 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	2,459
Asian	4,733
Black or African American	16,688
Hispanic or Latino	122,621
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	564
White	58,767
Two or more races	5,423
Total	211,255
<b>Comments:</b> These data are derived from a different source than the numbers by grade in Table 2.1.2.3 below, which creates some discrepancy, the student end-of-year collection. All students in schools with Title I school-wide programs are included, as well as any students flagged as Title I in schools with targeted assisted plans. Sometimes TA school students who did not actually receive Title I funded services are incorrectly coded as such. For Table 2.1.2.3 below, LEAs reported their overall numbers of students served in school-wide and targeted assisted programs throughout the year. Colorado has instituted a new, single-source, student-based system within its data pipeline for tracking students served by Title I for 2013-14 and the specific educational services they received, which will yield much more accurate data moving forward.	

**2.1.2.3 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 targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public 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 0-2		20			20
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	195	1,210	146		1,551
K	928	25,512	353	31	26,824
1	1,413	25,000	377	56	26,846
2	1,357	23,702	291	39	25,389
3	1,347	22,844	298	65	24,554
4	1,212	22,678	325	55	24,270
5	1,062	20,910	259	22	22,253
6	734	12,268	20	32	13,054
7	493	9,968	22	48	10,531
8	456	9,493	13	62	10,024
9	68	5,116	62	86	5,332
10	82	3,887	18	103	4,090
11	50	3,195	26	74	3,345
12	68	3,293	6	84	3,451
Ungraded					
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>9,465</b>	<b>189,096</b>	<b>2,216</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>201,534</b>

**Comments:** Blanks indicate no students served. Colorado does not have ungraded students--everyone is assigned to a grade. These data are derived from a different source than the numbers by ethnicity in Table 2.1.2.2 above, which creates some discrepancy. Table 2.1.2.2 is pulled from the student end-of-year collection. All students in schools with Title I school-wide programs are included, as well as any students flagged as Title I in schools with targeted assisted plans. Sometimes TA school students who did not actually receive Title I funded services are incorrectly coded as such. For Table 2.1.2.3, LEAs reported their overall numbers of students served in school-wide and targeted assisted programs throughout the year. If they did not check their 2012-13 student enrollments very carefully, they had the potential to under-report the number of students served. Colorado has instituted a new, single-source, student-based system within its data pipeline for tracking students served by Title I for 2013-14 and the specific educational services they received, which will yield much more accurate data moving forward.

**2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services**

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

**2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services**

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

<b>TAS instructional service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Mathematics	2,484
Reading/language arts	8,000
Science	22
Social studies	6
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services**

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

<b>TAS Support Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Health, dental, and eye care	11
Supporting guidance/advocacy	0
Other support services	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	210	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	53	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	13	
Clerical support staff	3	
Administrators (non-clerical)	4	
<b>Comments:</b>		

FAQs on staff information

- a. What is a "*paraprofessional*?" An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
  - (a) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
  - (b) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
  - (c) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
  - (d) Conducting parental involvement activities;
  - (e) Providing support in a library or media center;
  - (f) Acting as a translator; or
  - (g) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

**2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs**

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals <sup>3</sup>	3,176.00	100.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

<sup>3</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

### 2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2012 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012–2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012–2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	137	40
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	0	1,237,738
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	13,208,797	124,340,527
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.00	1.00

\*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocation.

**In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2012–2013.**

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Greeley implemented a plan to build collaborative parent/staff relationships focused on the best interests of children and families. They hired a facilitator to coordinate and improve activities that encourage parent involvement. Parents were surveyed to ensure activities and classes matched their needs; meetings and trainings were offered specific to needs at schools. Parent ESL and technology classes were held; childcare was included. A Welcome Center was developed, where students were registered for school and assessed for language needs. The calendar included: Family Night, Parent-Teacher Conferences/Grading Guidelines; Literacy Night; Assessments; Transition Supports/Procedures; Back-to-School Night; Report Cards; Math; Literacy; Bully Proofing; Technology; Science Carnival; Preventing Summer Slide; Writing; Kindergarten Transitions; Operation Graduation.

Aurora Title I Elementary schools developed Family and Community Involvement Plans and parent compacts. Each consulted with its Advisory Council (parents and community members) on how funds would be spent. All conducted a Family and Community Involvement Surveys. The area most in need of improvement was involving parents in leadership positions, especially around the Unified Improvement Plan.

Poudre's Title I schools submitted parent involvement plans, following parent participation, that described involvement strategies focused on educational outcomes are interactive and engaging. Strategies were informed by parent suggestions at the Community Parent Advisory Council (C-PAC). Plans were monitored and updated throughout the year, based on student needs and parent input. Each Title I site set goals and opportunities for parent involvement. C-PAC met with ELA and migrant parent advisory councils and provided opportunities for parents to participate and be trained in leadership roles. Parents rated childcare and meals during evening activities necessary and expressed the need for more leadership opportunities, teachers for home visits and parenting classes. They expressed a desire to partner with Unite for Literacy to create ebooks for children. Schools and parents met in the fall to develop plans and budgets. Three geographic areas funded with Title I, and two funded with migrant and Title III offered ESL classes for parents of Title I students and ELLs, a collaboration that allowed ESL courses in each geographic area so families could access them from work or home. ESL classes will continue to frame the curriculum with Parent Involvement topics that include math and reading standards, TCAP and other assessments, meeting with principals and preparing for parent-teacher conferences; "Parents as Educational Partners: A School-Related Curriculum for Language Minority Parents" was the foundation. Sites include Wellington, Harris Bilingual and Lincoln Middle School. 1-2 teachers are at each site, based on enrollment, and 2-3 childcare providers; 4 ESL teachers were trained in the curriculum. Childcare was provided during family literacy activities such as Parents and Children Learning Together. Parents completed questionnaires to measure involvement and changed perceptions/levels of comfort at their child's school and took assessments regarding their growth in English proficiency. Data showed that students from participating families were catching up to grade level; those from families that participated more than two years were performing at/above grade level. Parents who participated in the ESL Parent Involvement program over the past four years indicated that learning English in the context of parent involvement helped them understand the school system at the same time they improved their English skills.

In Colorado Springs 11, parent involvement was a collaboration of Title I, Family Literacy, Early Childhood Education, and ELL. Title I schools offered literacy and math nights to help parents assist their children at home. ECE educators supported parents with how to teach PK children day-to-day activities and through play. ELL teachers, coaches and liaisons coordinated family nights to help parents understand their role in the American education system, recruit them for ELL classes and help them help their children achieve with a language barrier. Non-public students' parents were actively solicited to participate in these activities. Schools involved parents through RtI problem-solving teams, PBIS plans, incentives for students and award events to honor students and families for achievement. Title I schools provided transition activities from 5th grade to middle school.

Communications were translated into Spanish and interpreters for Spanish and other languages were provided upon request. Many Title I schools conducted home visits for parents unable to come to the school site for conferences, etc. Many parents of Griffith Center students had lost parental rights and were not involved. When possible, parents were encouraged to work with staff and the child to address their child's educational needs. When appropriate, parents were invited to IEP meetings and monthly case conferences. Parents/Guardians/Case Managers received educational summaries, report cards, and progress reports linked to IEPs or Personal Education Plans. Parents were encouraged to attend events. Clinicians and therapists facilitated parenting. Letters were sent explaining Title I services provided and suggesting ways parents could be more involved (sending books, tapes, calculators) to encourage/support their child.

Jefferson County increased parent awareness of Title I and its importance to student and school success. Title I schools provided parent and community awareness of the instructional support and SES provided through federal funding. Schools made Title I information visible on bulletin boards, signage and brochures in languages parents understood. Schools made parents aware of the new district curriculum and how their support related to their child's academic success. With parent input, Title I schools determined specific areas of interest/need and created Parent Engagement goals, included in the Unified Improvement Plans, which formed parental involvement activities for the year. Schools developed specific goals and consistently measured parent feedback on supporting activities. Parent Liaisons, childcare and interpreters supported parents as stakeholders in their children's education. The Title I initiative "Families as Coaches" provided additional parent involvement opportunities. The district parent council sponsored a Day of the Child/Dia del Nino Conference. There was a back-to-school parent event, quarterly parent institutes and monthly FAC leadership meetings. The conference focus was engaging parents to participate and access ICAP and career planning for their students and address concerns about bullying, school safety, etc. The focus was strengthening parents' math and reading skills so they felt empowered to support their child(ren). Institutes were held quarterly; the FAC program was a collaboration of HIPPPY, Indian Education, Dropout Prevention, Migrant, Homeless Program Services, and Title I schools.

## 2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children
- Academic data of eligible migrant students
- Participation data of migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the performance period would only be performance in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

### 2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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 SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

**Note:** In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the 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:

1. *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 could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2011 v August 31, 2012), youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

#### 2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is



calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	408
K	273
1	271
2	302
3	264
4	236
5	276
6	253
7	250
8	219
9	249
10	211
11	184
12	269
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	213
Total	3,878
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

### 2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children from age 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, 2012 through August 31, 2013.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	212
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the **summer term or during intersession periods** that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained 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 served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs.
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	18
K	21
1	31
2	24
3	34
4	16
5	25
6	20
7	24
8	21
9	26
10	18
11	13
12	20
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	311

**Comments:** There were a number of reasons why eligible student counts decreased by 13% during the summer term. The number of districts that held summer school was either not available or not accessed by our migrant families due to statewide flooding. Destruction of agricultural crops and the closure of the Mushroom Plant in the Southwest part of the state led to fewer families moving to seek agricultural work during the summer term.

**2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant 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, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age birth through 2	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

<b>Student Information System</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
NGS	<u>Yes</u>
MIS 2000	<u>No</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>No</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>No</u>
NA	

<b>Student Information System</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	<u>Yes</u>

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA
----

**2.3.1.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

<b>Data Collection and Management Procedures</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
Does the State collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	<u>Yes</u>

### 2.3.1.3.3 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 are accounted for in the performance period . In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- Children who were age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- 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 counted once per age/grade level for each child count category
- Children two years of age that turned three years old during the performance period.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The procedures used to include students who had a qualifying arrival date within three years of the reporting period are as follows:

- Attending students grades PK-12 whose attendance was verified by school records and validated against the Department's Student Information System "Data Pipeline"
- Residency verifications were conducted by completing a home visit to verify the residency for children ages 3-5, out of school youth and two year olds turning three during the reporting period.
- Home visits were conducted for those students who had made a qualifying move within the state or district. Once verified, a COE was completed and a signature collected to document the student's eligibility for the 2012-13 reporting period. Each new enrollment was validated against the state's Record Integration Tracking System (RITS) and MSIX, to verify the accuracy of moves from a previous State or district.

Each student is included once, based upon a unique student ID, even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the reporting time period, who met the program by having a qualifying move within three of the reporting period, were a resident in our State for at least 1 day during the reporting period and who were served for one or more days by the MEP during either regular school year or summer term.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED*Facts* data file?

The SEA reviews each student enrollment record submission and either approves or denies it on a case by case basis. The student enrollment record is not included in the States' migrant child counts unless the SEA has approved the submission. Each enrollment record submission goes through the following verification process:

The SEA runs data quality reports to verify that no potential duplicate child counts are reported in the states' migrant counts by running monthly reports to verify eligibility and validity.

If a duplicate record is found in the state's student information system, the duplicate records are consolidated into one. The consolidation is first verified by the SEA, then by the MEP regional or LEA program. An email notification is sent out automatically to all users associated with the student record, informing them that a consolidation has taken place. All users are required to modify the student's record to correspond with SEA's consolidation of that student's record. A delete flag is transmitted to MSIX to remove the duplicate state student record.

Students in grades PK-12 are tracked by their unique state student ID number (SASID). Each student's SASID is run against the State's Student Record Integration System in order to ensure accuracy.

Multiple database search methods are utilized to validate mobility and attendance including: district (LOA), state (NGS) and national student information systems (MSIX).

A final validation is run against the department's Student End of Year Report to confirm accuracy for students in grades PK-12. Any discrepancies are removed and not reported on the state's child counts.

Residency Only students are verified utilizing a Residency Verification Form which includes a parent's signature attesting to the child's residency. Residency only students who's Residency Verification Form does not include a parent's signature are not counted in the state's child counts.

Category 2 counts are verified against school district or MEP literacy attendance rosters. Any discrepancies are removed and not reported on the state's category 2 child counts.

Each EDEN file is validated against state reports to ensure counts are accurate. Any discrepancies found are addressed and the issue resolved prior to submitting to ED*Facts*.

**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?	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each state to state move is validated against MSIX. If the student was identified as a migrant student in MSIX, a move notification is sent to the previous state indicating the student is now residing in our state. If a move notification is received from the previous state indicating the student has moved to our state, a request is sent to the previous state to retrieve a copy of the COE or student qualifying information, thereby allowing us to validate mobility and continuation of migrant services.

**2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	Yes
Do the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	Yes
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	Yes
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	Yes
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	Yes
Does the SEA review student attendance at summer/inter-session projects?	Yes
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	Yes
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	Yes
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	Yes

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.	123
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	76
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	66

Describe any reasons children were determined ineligible in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

10 children were found ineligible.

The outcomes are as follows:

COE/Family ID CO977877773 is ineligible for Title I, Part C per §200.81, D. because the family did not seek qualifying work, and did not make a qualifying move. (1- student ineligible)  
Description: Family ID CO977877773

COE/Family ID CO666833046 is ineligible for Title I, Part C: § 200.81 (i) F. because the family did not seek qualifying work. (2-students ineligible)  
Description: Family ID CO666833046

COE/Family ID: CO555583773 is ineligible for Title I, Part C: § 200.81 D. because they did not make a qualifying move or seek qualifying work. (1-student ineligible)  
Description: Family ID: CO555583773

COE/Family ID CO458897769 is ineligible for Title I, Part C: § 200.81 D. & F. because the family did not make a qualifying move nor did the family seek qualifying work. (2-students ineligible)  
Description: Family ID: CO458897769

COE/Family ID CO350506752 is ineligible for Title I, Part C: § 200.81 D. & F. because the family did not make a qualifying move nor did the family seek qualifying work. (4-students ineligible)  
Description: Family ID: CO350506752

Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes

Was the sampling statewide? Yes

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Starting September 1st, CDE generates a list of newly identified migrant students on a monthly basis. Each month's list is added to the prior month's lists so that on August 31st there is a master list of newly identified migrant students from the past year. This resulted in a list of 349 unique students. The list was not organized by any variable. Every 8th case was selected to be included in the sample. This resulted in a sample of 43 random students. Each of these students was verified to not be duplicated across families. A second sample was generated by starting with case #9 and selecting every subsequent 8th case. A third sample was generated by starting with case #11 since case #10 was a duplicate family. From case #11, every 8th case was selected, unless it was a duplicate family, at which point the next unduplicated case was selected.

<b>Obtaining Data From Families</b>		
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted		
Face-to-face re-interviews	<u>Face-to-face re-interviews</u>	
Phone Interviews		
Both		
<b>Obtaining Data From Families</b>		<b>Yes/No</b>
Was there a standard instrument used?	<u>Yes</u>	
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	<u>Yes</u>	
Were re-interviewers trained and provided instruments?	<u>Yes</u>	
Did the recruitment personnel who made the initial eligibility determinations also conduct the re-interviews with the same families?	<u>No</u>	
When were the most recent independent re-interviews completed (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LOA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	(MM/YY) 10/2012	

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this performance period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

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 migrant 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Colorado SEA sampled 43 COEs (not including the Northwest Region) out of the total annual count of 349 COEs that were submitted to the SEA for the 2012-2013 reporting period. Due to concerns with the Northwest regions identification and recruitment process, the SEA pulled 17 COEs (the total amount in NGS during sample period) that had been submitted by the Northwest Region which had not been included in the initial statewide sample. This gave the SEA a total of 60 COEs to be re-interviewed, 36 COE re-interviews were completed, and of those 36 COE re-interviews completed; 5-COEs were found to be ineligible, totaling 10 students. There were 24 COE re-interviews that we were unable to complete due to statewide flooding, impassable roads, closed roads, addresses we could not locate, and families becoming misplaced, homeless or having to relocate.

Of the 17 COEs submitted by the Northwest region, we were able to conduct 6 COE re-interviews, representing 11 children. The 5 ineligible COEs indicated above, were the 5 COEs submitted by the Northwest region. Since all but 1 of the re-interviews in the Northwest region were found to be ineligible, and because of the questionable ID&R practices in the Northwest, the first step of corrective action was to close the Northwest region down, effective September 28, 2013. The second step of corrective action was to remove the ineligible students from our statewide migrant counts. Even though we believe that the questionable ID&R practice in the Northwest Region was not a training issue, the third step was to extend the training requirements for new recruiters. The recruiters and coordinator who were responsible for these ineligibility determinations are no longer with the program however we still believe that changing the training requirements is a great opportunity to improve our quality control processes. All MEP staff will still be required to maintain 16 hours of additional training, each year, in addition to their hours at the State ID&R Conference. The fourth corrective action implemented on December 20, 2013 was to move some of the



webinars provided during the year to a one on one conference call with each individual recruiter and ID&R Coordinator. This activity will provide technical assistance in the Identification and Recruitment process, specifically around child eligibility.

## 2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

### 2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant 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)	0
K	29
1	45
2	46
3	40
4	47
5	33
6	37
7	36
8	34
9	31
10	39
11	30
12	32
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	74
Total	553
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### FAQ on priority for services:

*Who is classified as having "priority for service?"* Migratory children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

**2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	93
1	189
2	212
3	190
4	176
5	202
6	182
7	170
8	155
9	170
10	145
11	116
12	161
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
Total	2,174
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	9
1	19
2	19
3	16
4	20
5	21
6	14
7	22
8	16
9	22
10	14
11	7
12	11
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	4
Total	217
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2013 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period</b>
Age birth through 2	108
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	118
K	70
1	73
2	86
3	70
4	73
5	61
6	60
7	70
8	60
9	65
10	59
11	43
12	43
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	108
Total	1,167
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose most recent qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2012-13 regular school year) The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year</b>
Age birth through 2	153
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	243
K	158
1	150
2	162
3	152
4	123
5	141
6	123
7	137
8	116
9	127
10	103
11	104
12	154
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	111
Total	2,257
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado used the definition in the EDEN 121 file to "report children who had a qualifying move that occurred during the regular school year within the previous 36 months".	

**2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referrals During the Regular School Year</b>
Age birth through 2	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	185
K	88
1	78
2	86
3	85
4	75
5	82
6	82
7	76
8	75
9	71
10	83
11	59
12	91
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	137
Total	1,367

**Comments:** There were a number of reasons why referrals decreased by 33 % during the regular year. Additional MEP staff members was hired to provide direct academic services to students; therefore a decrease was expected in this area. Over the prior year, migrant families were taught how to access community services on their own. Resource directories and lists/locations of community agencies were distributed to migrant families. For this reason, many referrals were not needed because our migrant families had the capacity to access services on their own. Additionally, more community agencies have stepped up to outreach to families in our larger communities.

**2.3.2.7 Referrals — During the Summer/ Intersession Term**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referrals</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14
K	8
1	8
2	8
3	8
4	5
5	8
6	4
7	3
8	2
9	1
10	0
11	1
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	71
<b>Comments:</b>	



**2.3.2.8 Academic Status**

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

**2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts**

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	0
8	2
9	5
10	5
11	9
12	18
Ungraded	
Total	39

**Comments:** Colorado had [ZERO] students that were ungraded.

**FAQ on Dropouts:**

*How is "drop outs of school" defined?* The term used for students, who, during the performance period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2011-12 performance period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

**2.3.2.8.2 GED**

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your State.

Obtained GED	#
Obtained a GED in your State During the Performance Period	17

**Comments:** In anticipation of the New GED 2014, many students wanted to complete their GED using the old assessment. Students who were dropouts and out-of-school youth were re-engaged in receiving their GED.

### 2.3.3 MEP Participation Data – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant children in MEP-funded services during the regular school year.

Participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Eligible migrant children and children who continued to receive MEP-funded services: (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation [e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e) (1–3)].

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

#### 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 migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant 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. 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 migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

#### 2.3.3.1 MEP Children Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. 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 Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	167
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	355
K	244
1	241
2	266
3	243
4	214
5	250
6	232
7	232
8	198
9	221
10	201
11	169
12	249
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	180
Total	3,662
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Regular School Year</b>
Age 3 through 5	0
K	21
1	40
2	41
3	39
4	43
5	30
6	32
7	36
8	33
9	27
10	37
11	28
12	29
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	59
Total	495
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.3.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year under the continuation of services authority Sections 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Continuation of Services During the Regular School Year</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.3.4 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Regular School Year</b>
Age birth through 2	29
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	141
K	152
1	161
2	184
3	162
4	129
5	161
6	152
7	149
8	125
9	141
10	145
11	118
12	187
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	53
Total	2,189
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.3.4.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Reading Instruction During the Regular School Year</b>	<b>Mathematics Instruction During the Regular School Year</b>	<b>High School Credit Accrual During the Regular School Year</b>
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10	50	
K	83	101	
1	121	122	
2	137	139	
3	116	117	
4	102	103	
5	114	115	
6	118	120	
7	104	109	
8	94	95	
9	102	105	52
10	113	117	123
11	76	80	103
12	128	131	150
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	5	6	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,423</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>435</b>
<b>Comments:</b>			

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction 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. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.3.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. 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 Regular School Year	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	164	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	321	3
K	200	7
1	191	4
2	206	1
3	199	8
4	182	4
5	210	7
6	197	15
7	195	22
8	167	17
9	184	36
10	170	33
11	146	37
12	210	36
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	177	9
Total	3,119	239
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. 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, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

### 2.3.4 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the **summer/intersession term** instead of the regular school year.

#### 2.3.4.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. 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 Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	18
K	21
1	31
2	24
3	34
4	16
5	25
6	20
7	24
8	21
9	26
10	18
11	13
12	20
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	311
<b>Comments:</b>	



**2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age 3 through 5	0
K	4
1	8
2	3
3	7
4	7
5	6
6	5
7	8
8	4
9	4
10	4
11	3
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	67
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.4.4 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	20
1	30
2	24
3	28
4	13
5	24
6	19
7	21
8	18
9	21
10	13
11	10
12	19
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	277
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.4.4.1 Type of Instructional Service**

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Reading Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term</b>	<b>Mathematics Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term</b>	<b>High School Credit Accrual During the Summer/ Intersession Term</b>
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1	1	
K	10	9	
1	20	20	
2	22	20	
3	20	19	
4	12	11	
5	21	22	
6	12	16	
7	17	15	
8	12	12	
9	8	9	8
10	6	8	13
11	2	3	10
12	6	4	18
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	169	169	49
<b>Comments:</b>			

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction 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. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.4.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. 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 Summer/Intersession Term	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16	0
K	10	0
1	12	0
2	10	0
3	18	1
4	8	0
5	10	0
6	8	0
7	8	1
8	6	2
9	11	1
10	8	2
11	5	2
12	4	1
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	134	10

**Comments:** There were a number of reasons why support services during the summer increased by 35%. Additional MEP staff was hired to work directly with OSY students. This enabled high school and middle school advocates to provide more direct individual counseling services to students. More schools are enforcing uniform requirements, but because there is a lack of resources within the community and schools to provide the uniforms, the migrant program supplemented this service for migrant students. Many schools start school during the summer months (August) and therefore, the increase of providing support service for school uniforms indicated an increase during the summer term, based on the date the service was provided. There was an increase in the number of migrant families requesting school supplies. A competitive Summer Grant was awarded which expanded service delivery for increased numbers of migrant families during the summer months in addition to an increased focus on enrolling and serving PFS families first. By definition, PFS families have greater needs and therefore we focused on addressing a higher number of needs in a larger summer population.

#### FAQs on Support Services:

- What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- 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, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

**2.3.5 MEP Participation – Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	167
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	356
K	244
1	241
2	268
3	243
4	215
5	250
6	232
7	232
8	198
9	222
10	201
11	169
12	249
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	180
Total	3,667
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

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

#### 2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant 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** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	602
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,782
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in School Wide Programs (SWP) – 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** migrant 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 migrant 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 migrant children enrolled in those schools	
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado had [ZERO] schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a Schoolwide Program.	

### 2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **participating** in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	586	3,155
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	68
Year round	52	1,926
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

### 2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

#### 2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

<b>State Director FTE</b>	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the performance period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a Statewide basis.



**2.3.8.2 MEP Staff**

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	10	1	39	2
Counselors	40	27	16	6
All paraprofessionals	12	7	22	4
Recruiters	25	21	15	9
Records transfer staff	11	11	3	3
Administrators	9	6	3	1
<b>Comments:</b>				

**Note:** The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPP as 9.

**FAQs on MEP staff:**

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
  1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.
- g. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

### 2.3.8.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	6	3.00	13	3.30
<b>Comments:</b>				

#### FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
  1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
  
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of *ESEA*).

## 2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.
- 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, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, 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 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, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

**2.4.1 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.

**2.4.1.1 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	
Juvenile detention	0	
Juvenile corrections	6	139
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	
Total	7	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

**2.4.1.1.1 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	6
Adult Corrections	1
Other	0
Total	7
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.1.2 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 limited English proficiency (LEP), 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			1,331	40	
Total Long Term Students Served			538	40	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			539	11	
LEP Students			3	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			16	0	
Asian			13	0	
Black or African American			275	14	
Hispanic or Latino			466	16	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			7	0	
White			541	10	
Two or more races			13	0	
Total			1,331	40	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,180	40	
Female			151	0	
Total			1,331	40	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			0	0	
13			14	0	
14			55	0	
15			108	0	
16			211	0	
17			314	0	
18			299	10	
19			211	8	
20			108	17	
21			11	5	
Total			1,331	40	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

**2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1**

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?			No	Yes	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			1,084	40	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Colorado's Adult Corrections facility only can track students for one year, during which they are on community supervision status. Juvenile Corrections facilities do not have the ability to track students after program release.

**2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational 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 counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school					238		0	0		
Earned high school course credits					1,318		40	0		
Enrolled in a GED program					145		17	0		
Earned a GED					93		16	0		
Obtained high school diploma					52		7	0		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					28		14	0		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					581		40	0		
Obtained employment					22		0	6		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

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

**2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1**

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, 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 tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			277	28	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			288	40	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			24	30	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			35	4	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			158	6	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			71	0	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.



**2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1**

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			297	38	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			288	40	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			24	32	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			29	4	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			170	4	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			65	0	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**2.4.2 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.

**2.4.2.1 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 (# days)
At-risk programs	2	154
Neglected programs	0	
Juvenile detention	1	21
Juvenile corrections	12	230
Other	1	180
Total	16	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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.

**2.4.2.1.1 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	2
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	1
Juvenile corrections	12
Other	1
Total	16
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.2.2 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 limited English proficiency (LEP), 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	116		740	1,651	19
Total Long Term Students Served	82		28	1,238	19

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	46		281	668	10
LEP Students	4		148	72	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			5	60	
Asian	1		13	14	1
Black or African American	2		249	236	2
Hispanic or Latino	20		347	521	6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	14			4	
White	71		122	739	10
Two or more races	8		4	77	
Total	116		740	1,651	19

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	116		585	1,118	19
Female			155	533	
Total	116		740	1,651	19

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7	1				
8	11				
9	7				
10	13		1		
11	5		9	17	
12	16		23	44	
13	11		49	82	
14	4		92	154	1
15	20		143	253	2
16	11		191	369	8
17	13		232	413	2
18	3			244	5
19	1			64	1
20				11	
21					

Total	116	740	1,651	19
-------	-----	-----	-------	----

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado funds its Neglected programs through Title I, Part A.

**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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

**2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2**

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?	No		No	Yes	Yes
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	4		244	1,022	19

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Most Juvenile Corrections facilities are able to collect enrolment in local school district data for those exiting the facility, but nothing beyond that. Savio House tracks behavior outcomes, but not academic outcomes. Remington Center was able to report that one student had obtained employment, but stated the students often leave with little notice and typically they get very little information about how they are doing educationally. Griffith Center and S.L.V. Youthtrack, both At-Risk programs, and Gilliam School, a juvenile detention facility, do not collect data on student outcomes after exit.

**2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational 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 counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school	32	0			740		941	208	0	0
Earned high school course credits	51	0			707		1,370	209	19	5
Enrolled in a GED program	2	0			61		58	12	3	0
Earned a GED	1	0			18		116	1	1	0
Obtained high school diploma	4	0			0		32	0	6	0
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	1	0			0		28	0	4	3
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	1	0			0		51	8	0	0
Obtained employment	0	0			0		70	9	4	3

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

### 2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

#### 2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories in the second table below. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the tables below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, 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 tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	38		28	820	15
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	29		28	962	19

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	4		0	298	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	8		0	97	2
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7		17	374	16
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	10		11	193	1
<b>Comments:</b>					

#### **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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

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

**2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2**

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	43		28	1,074	12
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	31		28	967	19

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	5		0	353	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7		0	119	2
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	6		17	306	16
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	13		11	189	1
<b>Comments:</b>					

**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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

*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.

**2.7 SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)**

This section collects data on student behaviors under the *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act*.

**2.7.1 Performance Measures**

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11:	2010-11:		
				2011-12:	2011-12:		
				2012-13:	2012-13:		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.							



## 2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

### 2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

<b>Incident Type</b>	<b>State Definition</b>
Alcohol related	
Illicit drug related	
Violent incident without physical injury	
Violent incident with physical injury	
Weapons possession	
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.	

**2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury**

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

**2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury**

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

**2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury**

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

### 2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

#### 2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

#### 2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

**2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession**

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

**2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession**

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Suspensions for Weapons Possession</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

**2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession**

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Expulsion for Weapons Possession</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

### 2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

#### 2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

#### 2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

### 2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

#### 2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

#### 2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

### 2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
<u>No Response</u>	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
<u>No Response</u>	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
<u>No Response</u>	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
<u>No Response</u>	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
<u>No Response</u>	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
<u>No Response</u>	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
<u>No Response</u>	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
<u>No Response</u>	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
<u>No Response</u>	Other Specify 1
<u>No Response</u>	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.
---

**2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)**

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

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

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

<b>Purpose</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	1
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	5
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	5
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	13
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.	



### 2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

13 districts were eligible for the RLIS program in 2012-13; of the 3 Accredited, 1 had moved up from the prior year; of the 6 Accredited-Improvement Plan, 1 had moved up from the prior year; of the 4 Accredited-Priority Improvement Plan, 1 had decreased from the prior year.

0100-Alamosa: ELL, SPED and economically disadvantaged students were not making one year's growth in one year's time. These subgroups did not make AMOs in all grades in reading, math and writing. Instruction that integrates multi-media has been proven to increase understanding and achievement in ELL, SPED and economically disadvantaged students. Teachers received PD in these strategies and had WestEd's "Teach for Success" model of instruction.

0550 North Conejos brought Promethean boards with Active Inspire into the classroom and trained staff how to use them—a goal the district had been working on for years.

0870-Delta's Title VI-B funds contributed to the salary of a new Curriculum and Instruction Coordinator, who created a mentor program for new teachers and determined PD needs. Some funding provided substitutes so new teachers could observe master teachers in classroom management, curriculum implementation, and differentiation—three critical areas of need. The Coordinator also conducted PD for teachers through Early Release Days in Tier I best practices and led sessions to share research-based methodology to Title schools.

1140-Canon City's VI-B funding helped align and map new standards; enhance the teacher evaluation tool; streamline programs/services of Title, SPED and Rtl, and high school programs with PD to support systematic resources for Sped and Rtl and G/T. Title VI-B funded substitutes to allow staff PD time to collaborate to assure district-wide fidelity to the alignment process and pay for secondary math coaches from outside the district.

1390-Huerfano's UIP process documented a need for PD on instruction. Title VI-B funds paid for stipends for staff to collaborate on assessments aligned with curriculum, standards based instruction, and enhancements to address student success in math, reading, and writing and math.

1510 Lake County's DPF data and needs assessment showed they needed to spend more time implementing research-based strategies. Their VI-B allocation funded a 0.5 FTE coach to work with teachers on identified research-based strategies, with two grade levels, where the data indicated significant need, to ensure that research-based instructional strategies were understood and implemented by teachers.

2035 Montezuma Cortez's Title VI-B funds provided additional targeted skill instruction--after school at Battle Rock Charter and during a zero hour for secondary students.

2180 Montrose County's Title VI funds provided additional support to Johnson, their only school on Priority Improvement. JES combined Title VI and general funds to implement free full-day kindergarten for all students as an early intervention.

2405 Fort Morgan used Title VI-B funds to pay for translators, instructional coaches and interventionists, supporting Title I activities to provide supplemental instruction for needy students at Pioneer, with high proportions of poverty students and English learners. Title VI-B funded 0.1 FTE of the Baker instructional coach, 0.2 FTE of the Pioneer interventionist and 0.6 of translator FTE.

2520-East Otero created a virtual, on-demand training resource center for teachers to use Interactive Whiteboards, technology-based projects and data analysis tools to improve student achievement in Reading and Math. Technology and teaching staff created the training videos and documentation, and were paid a stipend. Funds purchased training software and hardware supplies.

2530-Rocky Ford committed to a comprehensive climate & culture program that included expectations, consequences and a character education component. The district used VI-B funds to buy 10 computers to help deliver the curriculum, an iPad for data collection during classroom observations, and Data Walk software to tabulate and create graphical displays of data from observations.

2660-Lamar, in need of computers used for NWEA assessments and classroom instruction, purchased one lab of HP desktop computers at \$13,439.72, replaced 10 computers in a lab for students with special needs and part of a third lab (\$13,439.72) and purchased Microsoft Office for 46 computers (\$2,990). The remainder of the Title VI budget (\$9504) provided teachers opportunities for research-based technology training.

2740 Monte Vista continued to use Title VI-B funds to address the needs identified by a CADI review in May 2010 and those uncovered through the Unified Improvement Plan regarding student achievement and learning environment. Title VI-B funds were used to meet the needs of students identified as at-risk through direct, systematic and explicit instruction provided by HQ teachers that received PD to deliver research-based programs. Students received services delivered through extended day learning opportunities.

**2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)****2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

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

<b>State Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2012-13?	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds**

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

<b>LEA Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	6
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	5	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	1	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	1	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		5

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2012 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	185,222.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	262.00	10,064.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	292.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		175,712.00
Total	185,776.00	185,776.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*

## 2.11 GRADUATION RATES <sup>4</sup>

This section collects graduation rates.

### 2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2012-13). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	76.93
American Indian or Alaska Native	61.41
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.15
<i>Asian</i>	85.93
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	75.47
Black or African American	69.51
Hispanic or Latino	65.38
White	82.83
Two or more races	78.96
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	53.80
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58.54
Economically disadvantaged students	63.69

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

*What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate?* For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<sup>4</sup> The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

## 2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved ESEA Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to ED Facts and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

### 2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

#### 2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

**Instructions for States that identified reward schools<sup>6</sup> under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 :** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to reward (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the school was identified as a high progress or high performing reward school
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward Schools" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts 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 EDEN030 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 PDF.

<sup>6</sup> The definition of reward schools is provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

### 2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

**Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools<sup>8</sup> under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 :** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Status for SY 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). 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 EDEN031 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 PDF.

<sup>8</sup> The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

### 2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

**Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools<sup>9</sup> with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 :** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific designation (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN032 "List of Other Identified Schools" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts 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 EDEN032 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 PDF.

<sup>9</sup> The definitions of reward, priority, and focus schools are provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>.

## 2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

### 2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Status for SY 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>10</sup>
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts 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 EDEN033 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 PDF.

<sup>10</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

## 2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States

### 2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA Flexibility for SY 2013-14: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- State-specific status for SY 2013-14 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN034 "List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuse's report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). 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 EDEN034 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 PDF.



## 2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

### 2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action<sup>11</sup> under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2013-14 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts 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 EDEN035 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 PDF.

<sup>11</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.