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 2013-14

COLORADO

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2014
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2015

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) 2013-14 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 EDFacts 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 2013-14 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 18, 2014**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2013-14, 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 2013-14 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 2013-14 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: 7/31/2015

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
___Part I, 2013-14   _X__Part II, 2013-14

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

_____	__Friday, April 3, 2015, 11:26:50 AM__
Signature	Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2013-14

☒

**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 13, 2015
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.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	23,147	13,542	58.50
4	22,453	12,886	57.39
5	21,796	10,640	48.82
6	13,165	5,541	42.09
7	11,921	3,830	32.13
8	11,148	3,444	30.89
High School	10,410	1,741	16.72
Total	114,040	51,624	45.27
Comments:			

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.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	23,070	13,253	57.45
4	22,418	11,285	50.34
5	21,774	11,905	54.68
6	13,148	6,948	52.84
7	11,901	5,652	47.49
8	11,128	4,727	42.48
High School	10,377	4,724	45.52
Total	113,816	58,494	51.39
Comments:			

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.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,639	3,450	74.37
4	4,693	3,360	71.60
5	4,617	2,940	63.68
6	1,401	823	58.74
7	898	342	38.08
8	978	374	38.24
High School	839	203	24.20
Total	18,065	11,492	63.61
Comments:			

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.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,621	3,456	74.79
4	4,692	3,212	68.46
5	4,612	3,244	70.34
6	1,396	959	68.70
7	898	508	56.57
8	979	533	54.44
High School	814	492	60.44
Total	18,012	12,404	68.87
Comments:			

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 (*IDEA*)	28,082
Limited English proficient students	66,589
Students who are homeless	8,564
Migratory students	1,329
Comments:	

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	2,314
Asian	4,867
Black or African American	16,889
Hispanic or Latino	126,459
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	583
White	59,848
Two or more races	6,098
Total	217,058
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	89	1,489	0	0	1,578
K	945	28,410	70	0	29,425
1	1,350	27,809	81	2	29,242
2	1,298	26,678	69	7	28,052
3	1,274	25,907	52	14	27,247
4	1,107	24,982	36	25	26,150
5	1,039	24,092	35	26	25,192
6	300	14,714	24	38	15,076
7	169	12,610	21	68	12,868
8	209	12,115	13	71	12,408
9	144	6,202	58	100	6,504
10	121	6,100	19	118	6,358
11	100	5,260	10	83	5,453
12	85	7,466	5	37	7,593
Ungraded					
TOTALS	8,230	223,834	493	589	233,146

Comments: Blanks indicate no students served. Colorado does not have ungraded students--everyone is assigned to a grade. There is a great deal of variability between numbers of students served with Title I money in 2012-13 and 2013-14, some of which is due to rising numbers of students being served. However, much of this variability is due to the way data were collected beginning in 2013-14, when Colorado instituted a new, single-source, student-based system within its data pipeline for tracking public school students served by Title I and the specific educational services they received. Therefore, the 2013-14 numbers are more accurate. The private and neglected student numbers also are more accurate in 2013-14; some of the local neglected facilities that served students in 2012-13 did not in 2013-14.

The number of public students served with Title I money by program and grade exceeds the data in table 2.1.2.2 on the previous page because of high student mobility rates, which resulted in some students being served in both a TA and SW program in the same year.

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.

TAS instructional service	# Students Served
Mathematics	1,832
Reading/language arts	6,994
Science	112
Social studies	108
Vocational/career	26
Other instructional services	137
Comments:	

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.

TAS Suport Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	55
Supporting guidance/advocacy	56
Other support services	68
Comments:	

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	153.16	
Paraprofessionals[1]	28.84	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	0.00	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	2.35	
Comments:		

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:
   1. 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;
   2. Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
   3. Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
   4. Conducting parental involvement activities;
   5. Providing support in a library or media center;
   6. Acting as a translator; or
   7. 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

[1] Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

[2] 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[3]	220.10	100.00
Comments:		

3 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 2013 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) 2013 (School Year 2013-14) Title I, Part A Allocation of $500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2013 (School Year 2013-14) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than $500,000
Number of LEAs[*]	138	40
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	5,541	1,170,656
Sum of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations	14,398,620	117,139,885
Percentage of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	0.04	1.00

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2013 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 2013−2014.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Work with parents/guardians to determine the cause of and provide solutions for students experiencing serious attendance, academic or discipline problems, to promote positive educational development.
Supplies for Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) Parent Folders and activities.
Develop strong parent and community relationships and provide literacy and math training to families.
Provide better oversight and supports to families and parent liaisons at schools, particularly families with limited English proficiency.
Transportation for parents to attend parent conferences and meetings or parent/teacher conferences, to increase parent involvement and remove barriers for high poverty families
GED classes for parents of ELL/ immigrant students to increase education of parents and their ability to help their children in school.
Information, services and support for families of English learners.
Provide K-12 books in English and Spanish at district parent meetings to promote Parent and Child Together Time
Dropout prevention strategies for working with students and parents individually and in groups.
Parent Involvement Registration: Colorado statewide parent leadership conference
ESL Parent Involvement and Parenting Partners programs
Supplies for 4-week after-school programs for K-5 students and their parents
Educational enrichment for parent involvement project/family literacy class participants and families; AESL registration fees for family activities, conference registration for Parent Involvement project; conference registration for summer family literacy project
Gather parent input data at beginning of year for use of Parent Involvement funds; organizes Reading is Fundamental parent involvement program at Title I schools; provide math and literacy nights and assist teachers at Title I schools to plan parent activities.
Spanish speaker assists with parent communications--both interpreting and translating for Title I parent involvement activities
To produce the Title I parent newsletter and secure translation, coordinate parent involvement opportunities, translate parent events/information and provide general support for parents, attend parent events at the school, print fliers, hand-outs, etc., provide travel for parents to attend local and state parent conferences.
Ensure all ELs will have access to RtI with ELD accommodations.
Engage families in supporting mastery of content skills, through monthly workshops, seminars and learning opportunities focused on supporting student achievement at home.
Train staff with Rosetta Stone to increase their ability to communicate with parents.
Purchase materials for Title I parent night (Love and Logic Training).
Hire a parent liaison to coordinate parent involvement activities and resources.
Arrange parent involvement activities and educational classes to support communication and learning between non-English speaking parents and school staff to support the success of their student/child in school including written notifications, parent-teacher conferences, back-to-school night, and other school related matters.
Support Title I schools with a Parent Involvement Facilitator to improve parent involvement activities and run parent education and ELL classes throughout the school year, designed in conjunction with parent surveys to meet the needs at each Title school.
Provide opportunities for district staff to meet the community where the population is greatly made up of newcomer families, to increase awareness of school programs and activities. Three teachers will meet with newcomer families 8 times throughout the year for 2 hours.
Engage parents and families in meaningful activities to promote student learning, home-school partnerships in planning and supporting students' education, and promoting literacy and math learning events, such as parent meetings and conferences, family literacy and math nights, parent conferences, and instructional incentives for at-home reading
Select speaker(s) to offer research-based content pertaining to the achievement of English Learners offered to ELA staff, general educators and parents.

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. This section is composed of the following subsections:

ᴵ Population data of eligible migrant children
ᴵ Academic data of eligible migrant students
ᴵ Data of migrant children served during the performance period
ᴵ School data
ᴵ Project data
ᴵ 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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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, 2012 - August 31, 2013), 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: N/A

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the underlined 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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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:

ᴵ Children age birth through 2 years
ᴵ 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
ᴵ 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)	448
K	254
1	276
2	291
3	278
4	260
5	235
6	264
7	260
8	253

9	264
10	234
11	211
12	253
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	160
Total	3,941

Comments:

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: Colorado's child count shows a slight increase in the number of students identified as migrant by 1% (63) students. The SEA has moved to a mandatory State certification in ID&R for all MEP Funded Staff. This requirement emphasizes we are all responsible for the timely identification and recruitment of all eligible migrant children, students, youth and families.

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	218

Comments:

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 underlined 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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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)	8
K	11
1	22
2	30
3	23
4	27
5	10
6	19
7	13
8	15
9	17
10	27
11	22
12	14
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	258
Comments:	

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: Colorado's Category 2 count shows a decrease in the number of students identified as migrant by (17%) 53 students. Students who attended a MEP Literacy Program decreased in the Southeast Regional Migrant Education Program due to a relocation during the summer and consequently was unable to hold a summer MEP Literacy Program as in previous years.

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

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

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

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.

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	Yes
MIS 2000	No Response
COEStar	No Response
MAPS	No Response
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	No Response

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

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.

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:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, 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 <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u>
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado's 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"

Secondly, 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.

Thirdly, home visits were conducted for students who completed 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 2013-14 reporting period. Therefore, 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.

Furthermore, each student is included once based upon a unique student ID even if the student has multiple enrollment records within the same reporting period.

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 (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

The SEA ensures the migrant data transmitted to the Department accurately accounts for all migrant children by running monthly data quality reports.

The data quality reports include the following:

1. If a duplicate record is located in the state's student information system the duplicate records are consolidated into one record. All associated users receive an automated email notification informing the user a consolidation has taken place. Finally, a delete flag is transmitted to MSIX to remove the duplicate record. Therefore, only one student record is included the states' child count.

2. Residency Verifications Forms are completed by capturing a parents/guardians signature after the child who was two years old turned three. Children who were not verified on or after their third birthday are not included in the states child count.

3. Mobility and attendance records are used to validate students in grades PK-12. The State uses multiple database search methods to validate a student's mobility and attendance. These databases include; a district's (LOA) student information systems, the state student information system (NGS) and national student information systems (MSIX). Finally, a validation check against the Department's Student End of Year Report is completed to confirm accuracy. Any discrepancies are not included in the states child count.

4. A Residency Verification Form is utilized to verify residency for children ages 3-5 and out of school youth by capturing a parent/guardian/self-signature. If a parent/guardian/self-signature is not captured, these children/youth are not included in the states child count.

5. Attendance records are used to validate students who attend a district held summer school or the MEP Literacy Project. Any discrepancies are not included in the states Category 2 child count.

Finally, each EDEN file is validated against state reports to ensure child counts are accurate. Any discrepancies found, are addressed immediately and the issue resolved prior to submitting to EDFacts.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each MEP funded staff member is required to utilize MSIX to conduct mobility searches on State-to-State moves. When the migrant student who resides in our State is identified in MSIX, a move notification is completed to the sending state indicating the student now resides in our State. Consequently, an email to retrieve a copy of the previous State's COE or qualifying information is sent to validate mobility and continuation of services.

Finally, when a move notification is received from a receiving state, the student is withdrawn from the State's student information system and the district is notified of the move. When requested, a copy of the State's COE is shared.

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
Does 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 records at summer/inter-session projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	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.	50
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	23
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	23

Describe any reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado used a "sampling with replacement" methodology. In the course of this process, there were 81 attempts to complete home visits. Out of 73 of these attempts, the auditor was able to verify that 23 families (not the 23 re-interviewed above, had moved; an apartment/trailer park manager, family member or neighbor confirmed these moves. Of 16 attempts to complete a home visit, the auditor was unable to find anyone home but verified that the family still in fact lived at the address indicated on the COE. On one attempt the auditor was told that "there was no one by that name at that address" by another tenant who was unable to determine how long ago the family had moved. Auditors were unable to locate six addresses. On four attempts to complete a home visit the auditor was unable to confirm that the family had in fact moved.

Procedures	Yes/No
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	SY2013-14
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes
Was the sampling statewide?	Yes

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The list of students eligible for funding was opened in a statistics software program called Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and checked for duplicates by selecting 'Data' on the top tab and selecting 'Identify Duplicate Cases'. Matching cases were defined by USID and no duplicate cases were identified. This original list consisted of 678 unique students. In SPSS, 'Data' was selected on the top tab, then 'Select Cases' was selected from the drop down. 'Random sample of cases' was then selected, and a random sample of exactly 50 students from all 678 students was created. The resulting 50-student sample was copied and pasted to the first tab in a blank Excel file (the Random Sample List file). Those 50 students selected were then deleted fromh the original list of 678, creating a list of 628 unique students, and the above steps were repeated, selecting exactly 50 random students from the remaining 628 students. This second 50-student sample was copied and pasted to the second tab in the Random Sample List file. The second cohort of 50 students was then deleted from the list and the above steps were repeated, selecting exactly 50 random students from the remaining 578 students. This third 50-student sample was copied and pasted to the third tab in the Random Sample List file. The above process was repeated to create a 4th tab in the Random Sample List file of 50 randomly selected students from the original list, from the remaining 528 students. This was done just in case the first 3 samples of 50 were not enough. This resulted in 4 random samples of 50 students each for a total of 200 unique students.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	
Phone Interviews	
Both	Face-to-face re-interviews
Obtaining Data From Families	**Yes/No**
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	Yes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 SEA did not identify any ineligible students in its re-interview process.

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

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	Yes

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)	97
K	61
1	105
2	98
3	105
4	93
5	83
6	76
7	70
8	88
9	90
10	75
11	88
12	75
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	67
Total	1,271

Comments: Colorado's Priority for Services child count during the Performance Period shows an increase of (56%) 718 students. In an effort to meet the need of all of our state's identified migrant students who could qualify for Priority for Services (PFS), the Colorado MEP has revised the PFS criteria to expand eligibility. A body of evidence is used to ensure students are identified as PFS within the first 30 days of enrollment in the MEP. SEA mandatory PFS training was required for all MEP Funded Staff.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	78
1	170
2	185
3	188
4	170
5	154
6	172
7	164
8	148
9	153
10	143
11	120
12	138
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5
Total	1,991
Comments: Colorado's Limited English Proficient child count reported by the districts during the Performance Period shows a decrease of (8%) 183 students.	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16
K	17
1	22
2	23
3	24
4	20
5	28
6	24
7	19
8	20
9	23
10	8
11	15
12	13
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5
Total	277
Comments: Colorado's Children with Disabilities child count during the performance period increased by (21%) 60 students. The districts reported an increase in the number of migrant children with disabilities.	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2014 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	119
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	122
K	73
1	85
2	78
3	80
4	75
5	71
6	82
7	75
8	87
9	91
10	73
11	66
12	44
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	76
Total	1,297

Comments: Colorado's eligible migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period increased by (10%) 130 students. The increase is representative in the percentage of migrant children identified and determined eligible during the 2013-14 SY.

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2013-14 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41
K	70
1	79
2	78
3	76
4	72
5	65
6	79
7	69
8	80
9	80
10	68
11	54
12	39
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	953
Comments: In the previous year, Colorado reported children who had a qualifying move that occurred during the regular school year (previous 36 months).Therefore, the decrease of (57%) 1304 students from this year's to last year count; includes an unduplicated count of eligible migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period regular school year only.	

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, 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. <u>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</u>. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	118
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	199
K	107
1	116
2	130
3	126
4	111
5	98
6	113
7	102
8	113
9	118
10	105
11	100
12	106
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	93
Total	1,855

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received a referral during the performance period increased by (26%) 488 students. Improved networking with community agencies and community outreach efforts. Increased partnerships affected referrals for holiday gifts, clothing, ESL materials, housing and food.

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	
8	4
9	9
10	9
11	10
12	25
Ungraded	
Total	57
Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant students who were reported by the districts as dropped out increased by (32%) 18 students.	

FAQ on Dropouts:
How is "drop outs" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting 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 2012-13 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	3
Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant students who were reported by the districts as having obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) decreased by (82%)14 students.	

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds <u>were</u> consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs
- Children who were 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)).

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 <u>not</u> considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would <u>not</u> 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.

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** 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.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5	92
K	59
1	100
2	96
3	100
4	92
5	79
6	73
7	69
8	83
9	79
10	70
11	85
12	71
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	47
Total	1,195
Comments: Colorado's Priority for Services child count during the regular year shows an increase of (58%) 700 students. The increase is representative of the number of students identified as Priority for Services (PFS) and number of those that received a service.	

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** 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.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5	7
K	5
1	14
2	12
3	9
4	11
5	6
6	6
7	5
8	8
9	11
10	15
11	12
12	8
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	129

Comments: Colorado's Priority for Services child count during the summer term shows an increase of (48%) 62 students. The increase is representative of the number of students identified as Priority for Services (PFS) and number of those that received a service.

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	178
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	398
K	230
1	252
2	271
3	258
4	248
5	224
6	249
7	241
8	238
9	241
10	219
11	196
12	241
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	127
Total	3,811

Comments: Colorado's number of students who received an MEP-Funded Instructional or Support Service shows an increase of (3%) 144 students.

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5	92
K	59
1	100
2	96
3	100
4	92
5	80
6	73
7	69
8	84
9	81
10	70
11	85
12	71
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	47
Total	1,199
Comments: N/A	

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period 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.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the performance period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: Colorado's number of children who received Continuation of Services during the performance period is zero. Zero's are not displayed.	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	38
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	180
K	131
1	150
2	165
3	143
4	145
5	123
6	149
7	127
8	148
9	128
10	137
11	126
12	134
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	93
Total	2,117

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service decreased by (3%) 72 students.

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	2	0	///////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	59	30	///////////////////////////////////////
K	98	46	///////////////////////////////////////
1	122	73	///////////////////////////////////////
2	130	75	///////////////////////////////////////
3	125	70	///////////////////////////////////////
4	119	72	///////////////////////////////////////
5	106	54	///////////////////////////////////////
6	121	69	///////////////////////////////////////
7	96	56	///////////////////////////////////////
8	112	63	///////////////////////////////////////
9	107	54	29
10	106	64	103
11	100	61	102
12	105	59	110
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	5	3	12
Total	1,513	849	356

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received reading instruction during the performance period increased by (5%) 90 students.

Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received mathematics instruction during the performance period decreased by (43%) 661 students.

Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received High school credit accrual during the performance period decrease (38%) 225 students. The decrease in collecting and entering credit accrued has been difficult. High school credit is not reported to the Department and, therefore, Regional Migrant Education Programs must reach out to districts to collect high school credit accrual. Consequently, Districts are often over burden with the data collection request and provide the data when they can. Collaborating with the district to address this issue is a high priority. Subsequently, establishing relationships with the district is vital to ensure we continue to receive secondary credit accrual on migrant students to support them in being academically successful. Finally, plans include identifying district contacts to support with the data collection of credit accrual as well as gain access to local district student information systems, in order for our migrant data specialist to gather accrued credit at the local level without burdening the districts.

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.

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	172	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	360	42
K	213	82
1	240	92
2	259	108
3	248	108
4	240	100
5	217	91
6	237	96
7	232	110
8	226	99
9	230	123
10	207	118
11	187	118
12	235	142
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	123	12
Total	3,626	1,441

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received any MEP funded Support Service increased by (13%) 507 students. Due to the continued networking with community agencies, more students received services with clothing, food, housing, health education and career exploration.

Colorado's number of eligible migrant students who received a Counseling Service during the performance period increased by (83%) 1202 students. An increased number of Migrant Education Graduates MEGA'S) provided counseling services to students enrolled within their district.

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.

2.3.6 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	590
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,787
Comments: N/A	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide 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	
Comments: Colorado's number of Schools where MEP Funds were consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) during the performance period is zero.	

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 **served** 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 Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	579	3,281
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	49
Year round	54	1,916
Comments: N/A		

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 (<u>regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds</u>) during the performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments: N/A	

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 reporting 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		Performance Period
	Headcount	**FTE**	**Headcount**	**FTE**	**Headcount**
Teachers	7	1.78	29	2.66	
Counselors	34	22.18	13	1.82	
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	4	3.30	3	3.00	4
Qualified paraprofessionals	5	4.90	3	3.00	5
Recruiters	24	22.03	22	15.85	
Records transfer staff	11	10.24	11	8.45	
Administrators	10	6.25	8	5.45	

Comments: There was an increase in the number of counselors during regular due to the hiring of Migrant Education Graduation Advocates (MEGAs) for improved retention of high school students on-track for graduation.

The SEA has moved to a mandatory State certification in ID&R. This requirement emphasizes we are all responsible for the timely identification and recruitment of all eligible migrant children, students, youth and families. Therefore, additional recruiters were hired to ensure we are identifying all eligible migrant children and youth within the State.

Additional teachers were hired during the summer to provided educational support to families and their children in reading.

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 CSPR 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 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) (Section 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).

f. *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.

g. *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.

h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.
- 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	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	6	142
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	0
Total	7	/////////////////////////////
Comments:		

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
Comments:	

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			1,479	23	
Total Long Term Students Served			638	23	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			584	4	
LEP Students			0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			19	0	
Asian			10	0	
Black or African American			321	8	
Hispanic or Latino			575	12	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			5	0	
White			546	3	
Two or more races			3	0	
Total			1,479	23	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,307	22	
Female			172	1	
Total			1,479	23	

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			1	0	
12			3	0	
13			26	0	
14			60	0	
15			196	0	
16			283	0	
17			426	1	
18			321	2	
19			114	11	
20			49	6	
21			0	3	
Total			1,479	23	

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

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 legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)			No	Yes	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			1,370	23	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Most of Colorado's facilities do not have the ability to track students after they are released. A few would not be allowed to do so if they had the ability; many have policies that prevent them from having contact with students within five years of release.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:
If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

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 underlined number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next provide the underlined 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 as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	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
Enrolled in their local district school	////////////////////////		////////////////////////		////////////////////////		////////////////////////		////////////////////////	
Earned high school course credits					1,396		10	0		
Enrolled in a GED program					176		13	0		
Earned a GED					55		4			
Obtained high school diploma					64		1			
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					67		5			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					432		23			
Obtained employment					7		0	2		

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2013, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			0	18	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			75	2	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			31	3	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			169	0	
Comments:					

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

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.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			0	21	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			29	0	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			23	2	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			223	0	
Comments:					

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	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	16	122
Other	0	0
Total	16	/////////////////////////////
Comments:		

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	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	16
Other	0
Total	16
Comments:	

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 <u>only</u> students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the <u>unduplicated</u> 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				2,781	
Total Long Term Students Served				1,181	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)				1,009	
LEP Students				120	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native				68	
Asian				27	
Black or African American				686	
Hispanic or Latino				999	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander				6	
White				847	
Two or more races				148	
Total				2,781	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				1,870	
Female				911	
Total				2,781	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9				3	
10				5	
11				43	
12				125	
13				240	
14				400	
15				577	
16				684	
17				524	
18				140	
19				25	
20				11	
21				4	
Total				2,781	

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

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

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 legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)				Yes	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.				1,977	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Most Colorado facilities didn't have the capability to tracking students, others were not allowed to do so, or were not allowed to have contact with students within five years of exit.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:
If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

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 underlined number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next provide the underlined 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 as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	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
Enrolled in their local district school	/////////////////////////		/////////////////////////		/////////////////////////		/////////////////////////	189	/////////////////////////	
Earned high school course credits							1,494	180		
Enrolled in a GED program							126	30		
Earned a GED							114	12		
Obtained high school diploma							57	3		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education							25	44		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs							279	9		
Obtained employment							35	146		

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2013, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				94	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				58	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				197	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				299	
Comments:					

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, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

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.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				99	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				57	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				248	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				303	
Comments:					

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, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

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.

2.9 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.

Purpose	# LEAs
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	10
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	11
Parental involvement activities	5
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	13
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3
Comments:	

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.

17 districts were eligible for the RLIS program in 2013-14; of the 3 Accredited, all stayed the same from the prior year, of the 7 Accredited-Improvement Plan, 1 had moved up from the prior year; of the 6 Accredited-Priority Improvement Plan, 1 had decreased from the prior year.

0100-Alamosa increased staffing using Title VI-B funds to include a technology paraprofessional to provide instruction in using newly purchased interventions (also funded with Title VI B) in reading and math.

0550-North Conejos used Title VI-B funds to purchase School Reach, a comprehensive notification system to improve communications between the district and parents.

0870-Delta's Title VI-B funds contributed to the purchase and implementation of Harry Wong Training, a classroom management tool. These funds also supported an increased ability to collaborate across grade levels and provide peer observations for all teachers.

1140-Canon City's VI-B funding brought coaching and mentoring to staff in need of improvement and support as determined through a needs assessment. Write Tools training was also purchased to ensure fidelity to the implementation of the writing program.

1150-Fremont will purchase and imbed a standards based math practice program for students in grades K-8 and those identified for Targeted Assistance in grades 9-11. Additionally, iPads were purchased using VI-B for use in benchmarking and progress monitoring.

1220 Garfield used Title VI-B funds to update technology in their computer labs.

1390-Huerfano's Title VI-B allowed teacher leaders and math instructors to attend offsite training on math instruction. The district continues to use funds for stipends for coaching and 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 Title VI-B allocation continues to fund a 0.3 FTE coach to work with teachers on identified research-based strategies, where the data indicated significant need, to ensure that research-based instructional strategies were understood and implemented by teachers.

1580 Trinidad used Title VI-B funds to update their blended learning hardware, software and supplies to facilitate differentiated instruction.

2035 Montezuma Cortez's Title VI-B funds provided instructional coaches and supplies for elementary teachers to support effective Tier I reading instruction and progress monitoring.

2180 Montrose County's Title VI funds continues to provide additional support to their highest poverty schools, Northside and Johnson Elementary Schools, to implement free full-day kindergarten for all students as an early intervention.

2405 Fort Morgan used Title VI-B continues to use funds to pay for translators, and instructional coaches for job-embedded PD for all K-6 classrooms. A mobile lab was purchased for Baker Central School for math and reading interventions.

2520-East Otero continues to use Title VI-B funds to develop a virtual, on-demand training resource center for teachers to improve student achievement in reading and math.

2530-Rocky Ford used VI-B funds to buy 15 iPads to administer and collect benchmark assessments as an indicator of teachers' implementation of the curriculum. Renaissance Learning Math progress monitoring tools were also purchased with VI-B funds.

2660- Lamar purchased new computers to upgrade and facilitate progress monitoring for Alpine Achievement, PowerSchool, DIBELS and NWEA with Title VI-B funds.

2740 Monte Vista will use Title VI-B funds to implement Friday School to increase engagement and close achievement gaps for students identified as at-risk . Teachers received additional PD via use of technology for targeted interventions.

3200 Yuma' Title VI-B allocation provided additional instruction time in reading using interventionists and bilingual aides that were embedded in the classroom to support primary instruction.

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.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2013-14?	Yes
Comments:	

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.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	7
Comments:	

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.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	7	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		7

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2013 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	327,641.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		327,641.00
Total	327,641.00	327,641.00
Comments:		

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 [4]

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 2013-14). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	77.29
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.75
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.87
Asian	84.70
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	73.42
Black or African American	69.04
Hispanic or Latino	66.68
White	83.16
Two or more races	79.70
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	54.63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58.73
Economically disadvantaged students	64.21

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/hsrguidance.pdf.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

[4] 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[5] under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : 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 EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward SchoolsËœ 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 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.

---

[5] 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 [6] under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : 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 2014-15 (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.

[6] 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 [7] with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 :
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 EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN032 "List of Other Identified 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 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.

---

[7] 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 2014-15: 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 assessmentWhether 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 2014-15 (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)[8]
- 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 EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" 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 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.

---

[8] 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 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (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 EDEN030 "List of Reward 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 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.

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[9] under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (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 EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" 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 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.

---

[9] The district 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.