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 2014-15

COLORADO

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016

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) 2014-15 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 2014-15, 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 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, 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 2014-15 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 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0724
	Expiration Date: 5/31/2018

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, 2014-15   _X_ Part II, 2014-15

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

	Wednesday, March 30, 2016, 11:48:46 AM
Signature	Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2014-15

⊠

PART II DUE FEBRUARY 11, 2016
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	23,251	5,213	22.42
4	22,799	3,845	16.86
5	21,659	3,665	16.92
6	12,727	2,038	16.01
7	11,111	1,427	12.84
8	10,999	1,802	16.38
High School	9,546	1,178	12.34
Total	112,092	19,168	17.10
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	22,229	5,325	23.96
4	22,763	5,900	25.92
5	21,664	5,318	24.55
6	12,818	2,871	22.40
7	11,134	2,525	22.68
8	11,046	2,634	23.85
High School	9,624	2,303	23.93
Total	111,278	26,876	24.15
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	4,815	1,613	33.50
4	4,579	1,197	26.14
5	4,536	1,164	25.66
6	1,711	451	26.36
7	1,056	148	14.02
8	1,096	186	16.97
High School	999	151	15.12
Total	18,792	4,910	26.13
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	4,750	1,664	35.03
4	4,562	1,715	37.59
5	4,542	1,683	37.05
6	1,706	582	34.11
7	1,069	275	25.72
8	1,104	294	26.63
High School	1,006	273	27.14
Total	18,739	6,486	34.61
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*)	30,869
Limited English proficient students	70,197
Students who are homeless	9,766
Migratory students	1,779
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the underlined 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	2,520
Asian	5,329
Black or African American	18,913
Hispanic or Latino	137,495
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	729
White	67,071
Two or more races	7,362
Total	239,419
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 Birth through 2					
Age 3- through 5 (not Kindergarten)	84				84
K	1,033	27,914	77	2	29,026
1	1,371	29,413	94	13	30,891
2	1,299	28,316	57	10	29,682
3	1,275	27,183	59	18	28,535
4	1,089	26,406	44	17	27,556
5	969	24,986	46	31	26,032
6	276	15,155	17	42	15,490
7	234	12,520	23	66	12,843
8	211	12,476	17	105	12,809
9	87	7,007	11	141	7,246
10	87	6,329	9	172	6,597
11	65	5,819	13	149	6,046
12	65	7,750	4	82	7,901
Ungraded					
TOTALS	8,145	231,274	471	848	240,738

Comments:

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	3,009
Reading/language arts	8,066
Science	634
Social studies	614
Vocational/career	1
Other instructional services	4
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	2
Supporting guidance/advocacy	11
Other support services	32
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	181.66	
Paraprofessionals[1]	33.11	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	0.88	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.00	
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]	3,613.00	55.00
Comments: The FTE above varies dramatically from what was submitted in 2013-14 due to earlier misunderstanding of the data reported. In 2013-14, Colorado reported the FTE in SWP paid with Title I funds. This current number reflects the FTE in SWP, regardless of whether or not they were paid from Title I funds.		

[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 2014 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) 2014 (School Year 2014-15) Title I, Part A Allocation of $500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2014 (School Year 2014-15) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than $500,000
Number of LEAs[*]	141	39
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	0	1,275,000
Sum of LEA's FY 2014 Title I, Part A allocations	16,128,740	127,500,103
Percentage of LEA's FY 2014 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	0.00	1.00

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2014 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 2014−2015.

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
Drop-out 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.
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.
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.
Provide parents with the opportunity to engage in their child's education by attending workshops, educating parents on grade-level expectations and teaching them specific skills to work on at home with their child.
Family literacy engagement opportunities are provided that address learning strategies for parenting for student success and advocacy for a parent's child.
Schools will provide training opportunities to parents at Title I schools, on strategies that they can successfully implement at home that will contribute to the academic success of their child.
School Bus to transport parents to parental conferences.
Title 1 parent engagement funds for supplies for parent meetings (notebooks, pencils, folders) and food to serve to families for evening events
Engage parents and families in the educational process and budget decision-making. Develop and strengthen community partnerships and engagement in the educational process.
Continuum of Services-Parent Communication- Parent newsletter will be sent out bi-monthly to inform parents of relevant school and district information provided by Communication Coordinator (consultant).
Supplies for monthly meeting to provide training to parents to support learning of their children and also to gain feedback from parents on improvement of educational systems
Move-up Monday - a program where staff provides parents and family members knowledge and materials designed to disrupt and/or halt summer learning regression. Contest held for summer reading program, raffle, prizes and food provided for families.
Provide teacher stipends to organize and facilitate parent activities, including outreach to ELL families on READ Act Information, Conference Sign Ups, support students at home and how to get involved in volunteering.
Materials and childcare for Back-to-School/Curriculum Night.
Set up a parent resource station in the lobby for parents who come in to wait for students from after school/summer school events. Subscriptions will be

loaded on the computers with parenting information, homework help, and parent involvement literature.

Utilizing an established community outreach organization (The Valley Settlement Project), parents of at-risk students will receive training in how best to support their student's academic success, particularly with respect to literacy. This training will occur through a combination of home visits and parent mentor programs. Parent mentor programs bring parents together in a group setting for workshops on how best to support their students. Once parents have demonstrated proficiency, they work to train other parents.

Funds will be used to pay classified staff to support monthly targeted Kindergarten Family Focus Groups that feature training for parents on how to support their child and learn how to navigate the school community.

Reading Backpacks for each classroom for students to take home backpacks filled with books and reading materials. Backpacks will be leveled by grade and will include books that students can read independently as well as books that parents can read aloud to students

Homeroom teachers will conduct home visits to discover information about students and their families for background driven instruction, to share classroom expectations, and to answer questions and concerns.

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. 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, 2013 - August 31, 2014), youth who are working on a HSED 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 HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED 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: Colorado does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported child counts or underlying eligibility determinations.

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	507
K	307
1	332
2	355
3	315
4	318
5	292
6	272
7	296
8	271

9	327
10	262
11	217
12	270
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	218
Total	4,559

Comments: Colorado shows an increase in its child counts for Category 1 for SY 2014-15. As a result of improved ID & R practices, the SEA experienced an increase in the total number of eligible children ages 3-21 years who were identified compared to the prior year. Increased resources to the area of ID&R, such as training all MEP-funded staff in ID&R practices and hiring of additional recruiters during peak times, resulted in an increase in the number of new migrant families quickly identified.

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 shows an increase in its child counts for Category 1 for SY 2014-15. The number of students identified increased by 16% (618 students). As a result of improved ID & R practices, the SEA experienced an increase in the total number of eligible children ages 3-21 years who were identified compared to the prior year. Increased resources to the area of ID&R, such as training all MEP-funded staff in ID&R practices and hiring of additional recruiters during peak times, resulted in an increase in the number of new migrant families quickly identified. Colorado has also experienced a shift in the demographics, with new families moving in from Central and South America, Africa and Asia to seek qualifying work. Colorado continues to see a growth in temporary, qualifying jobs, particularly in the meat packing and dairy industries, with subsequent growth in the numbers of families moving to the State from diverse countries such as Guatemala, El Salvador, Peru, Kenya and Thailand, in addition to more traditional family moves between the US and Mexico.

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	312

Comments: Colorado shows an increase in its child counts for Age birth through 2. The number of students identified increased by 43% (94 students). As a result of improved ID&R practices, the SEA experienced an increase in the total number of eligible children ages 3-21 years who were identified compared to the prior year. Increased resources to the area of ID&R, such as training all MEP-funded staff in ID&R practices and hiring of additional recruiters, resulted in an increase in the number of new migrant students ages birth through two being quickly identified. Augmented communication and awareness of MEP with Migrant Seasonal Head Start, provided referrals of identified eligible migrant children within this age group.

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015. 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)	7
K	21
1	29
2	35
3	34
4	28
5	20
6	18
7	25
8	15
9	20
10	23
11	30
12	26
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	332
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 shows an increase in its child counts for Category 2 for SY 2015. The number of students identified increased by 29% (74 students). MEP Regional Programs hosted various summer programs. The increased counts of students served by MEP-facilitated programs were those students who participated in summer reading tutoring assignments. MEP covered the institutional/instructional fees for eligible students to attend school-based summer programs.

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015. 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: NA	

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
COEStar	No
MAPS	No
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	No
NA	

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.

NA

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.

The procedures Colorado 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 2014-15 reporting period.

Furthermore, each new enrollment was validated against the state's Record Integration Tracking System (RITS), NGS and MSIX to verify the accuracy of moves from a previous State or district.

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

Children ages 3 to 21 are counted through two methods. School records are collected and used to verify those students who are attending a PK-12 educational program/institution. Children ages 3-5 or non-attending youth outside of a K-12 school are verified with a verification form and a parent signature is collected to document residency.

Colorado's category 1 child counts are unduplicated statewide totals for children eligible to be counted for funding purposes. The count consists of all migrant children ages 3-21 who, within 36 months of their last qualifying move, resided in the state for one or more days during the Sep 1-Aug 31 performance period. Migrant children included in our state's child counts meet the definition in section 1309 of the statute and section 200.81 of the MEP regulations.

Eligible migrant children ages 3-21 served during the summer/intercession by the MEP are also included in the state's summer/intercession child counts and are a subset of the larger category 1 count and are unduplicated statewide totals for children who are eligible to be counted for category 2. Children whose 36 month eligibility for the MEP expired prior to the beginning of the summer/intercession program may receive services, but are not included in the state's category 2 child count.

The SEA continues to serve children and youth for the duration of their 36-month eligibility period starting with their last qualifying move. MEP eligibility is determined at the time of the interview and is based on the workers stated intention at the time of the move. For example: If the State is reporting for SY 2014-15, given the child's 36 month period of eligibility, the qualifying arrival date can be as early as Sep 2, 2011 and be included in the state's child count. If we are qualifying on a previous move, the child's eligibility period will be for the remainder of the 36 months.

Students who have attained their HSED are reported by the district and verified as completers by the State's End of Year Reporting. If a migrant student attained their HSED, the migrant student is flagged in migrant SIS along with the attainment date the student attained their HSED. Students who have attained their HSED in the prior year are not included in the state's subsequent child counts.

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 state's child count.

2. Residency Verification Forms are completed by capturing a parent/guardian 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 state's 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 state's 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 state's 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 state's 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 for State-to-State moves.

When a migrant student moves to our State, a student search is completed in MSIX in order to determine eligibility and mobility verificaiton. A move notification is completed and sent 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 Colorado's student information system and the district is notified of the move. Upon request, a copy of the State's COE is shared with the receiving state.

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.	200
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	49
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	45

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were (43) non-responses. There were (3) attempts where addresses were found vacant, (21) home visit attempts and phone calls but the reviewer was unable to reach the family, (17) where the reviewer verified families had moved by manager/landlord, family member, and or neighbor and finally (2) addresses that the reviewer was unable to locate.

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)?	SY2014-15
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.

NA

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 SPSS (a statistics software program) 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 1,245 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 1,245 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 that were selected were then deleted from the original list of 1,245, creating a list of 1,195 unique students, and the above steps were repeated, selecting exactly 50 random students from the remaining 1,195 students. This second 50-student sample was copied and pasted to the second tab in the Random Sample List file. The second round of 50 students was then deleted from the list and the above steps were repeated, selecting exactly 50 random students from the remaining 1,145 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 1,095 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	Both
Obtaining Data From Families	**Yes/No**
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	Yes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Three independent reviewers from other states were contracted to conduct the independent re-interviews for the state of Colorado. Two were from Kansas and one was from Nebraska. None of the three reviewers had any part of the original process or determination of eligibility.

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.

During the 2015-16 school year, the SEA carried out Independent Re-Interviews with 45 migrant families whose children were determined to be MEP eligible during the 2014-15 reporting period. These families were selected using a simple random sampling of children enrolled during the year, with an over sample drawn to allow for replacement of families who could not be found or located. A total of 43 migrant families who could not be found or located were replaced using the over sample. Out of the 49 migrant families interviewed four migrant families did not qualify. The first family went to Mexico for a short period of time and did not make a qualifying move. Parents indicated they go to Mexico every year for vacation not for work; The second family, the worker moved in May 2013 and the children moved 18-months later to join, the to join move was not due to migrant lifestyle; The third family, the children moved 17-months after the worker moved and was not due to migrant lifestyle; the fourth family did not make a qualifying move across school district boundaries within the past three years. As a result, each child within that family were removed from our 2014-15 child counts. ID&R training will be provided for all recruiters statewide on "to join moves". The SEA will implement a quality control process for all regional offices for the 15-16 school year. The SEA will require regions complete a sample of re-interviews on COE's completed within their region. The sooner the re-interview is scheduled by the region, the faster they can identify and fix potential problems and require the recruiter to complete further ID&R training.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	94
K	73
1	101
2	106
3	100
4	98
5	88
6	92
7	94
8	97
9	110
10	72
11	68
12	101
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	105
Total	1,399

Comments: Colorado shows an increase in its child counts for PFS for SY 2014-15. The number of students identified increased by 10% (128 students). This demographic has increased in the State due PFS eligibility guidelines and increased communication with schools regarding potential risk factors for newly eligible students. Dedicated resources identified more younger children who met the PFS criteria then in the past. As a result of the oil and gas boom in certain parts of our state, there continues to be a dearth of available, affordable housing. Unfortunately, many more migrant families are experiencing homelessness for an extended period of time. In addition to increased poverty and an influx of newcomer/refugee families moving into the state, have resulted in an increase in the different risk factors impacting highly mobile families who meet the PFS criteria.

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, <u>and</u> 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)	6
K	86
1	214
2	243
3	194
4	216
5	174
6	182
7	187
8	176
9	196
10	150
11	134
12	178
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	14
Total	2,350

Comments: Colorado's Limited English Proficient child count during the Performance Period shows a increase of 18% (359 students). The districts reported an increase in the number of migrant students reported as Limited English Proficient. The reported increase is reflective of Colorado's increase in child counts.

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)	13
K	20
1	19
2	20
3	17
4	26
5	24
6	27
7	13
8	21
9	21
10	15
11	11
12	20
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	4
Total	271
Comments: Colorado's Children with Disabilities child count during the performance period decrease by 2% (6 students). The districts reported an decrease in the number of migrant children with disabilities.	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the underlined number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2015 (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	205
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	188
K	95
1	111
2	105
3	101
4	90
5	96
6	84
7	99
8	86
9	84
10	89
11	47
12	48
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	119
Total	1,647
Comments: Colorado's eligible migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period increased by 27% (350 students). Effective SEA-sponsored training and monitoring increased the number of COEs approved by the SEA.	

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 2014-15 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	148
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	141
K	65
1	73
2	74
3	62
4	58
5	63
6	52
7	66
8	57
9	52
10	52
11	28
12	31
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	73
Total	1,095

Comments: Colorado's eligible migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year increased by 15% (142 students). Effective SEA-sponsored training and monitoring increased the number of COEs approved by the SEA is reflective of the increase during the performance period.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the underlined 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. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	180
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	213
K	91
1	89
2	102
3	100
4	97
5	77
6	85
7	64
8	71
9	89
10	82
11	72
12	83
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	126
Total	1,621

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received a referral during the performance period decreased by 13% (234 students). The decrease in child counts is due to increased capacity within the regions, more migrant families were provided direct services through the MEP and less were referred to other agencies. Additionally, many local agencies experienced decreased funding and subsequently, a reduction in the number of services they were able to provide. With the Affordable Care Act, more families qualified for Non-MEP funded health services and were able to access these type of services on their own, versus through MEP referrals.

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 underlined number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	2
8	
9	9
10	14
11	12
12	27
Ungraded	
Total	64
Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant students who were reported by the districts as having dropped out of school increased by 12% (7 student). As a result the SEA experienced an increase in the total number of eligible children ages 3-21 years who were identified as dropped out compared to the prior year.	

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 2014-15 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 underlined 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	2
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 34% (1 student).	

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 were 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)(2-3)

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/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to 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 underlined 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 (not Kindergarten)	92
K	73
1	96
2	105
3	99
4	97
5	88
6	92
7	92
8	91
9	108
10	72
11	67
12	100
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	101
Total	1,373

Comments: Colorado's Priority for Services child count during the regular year shows an increase of 15% (178 students). The increase is representative of the number of students identified as Priority for Services (PFS) during the performance period. Consequently, the State identified an increased number of migratory students ages 3-21 years of age whose education was interrupted and who were failing, or at risk of failing, to meet the state's academic standards during the Regular Year.

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 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	7
1	11
2	13
3	10
4	11
5	5
6	9
7	8
8	5
9	7
10	9
11	7
12	12
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	120
Comments: Colorado's Priority for Services child count during the summer term shows an decrease of 7% (9 students).	

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	252
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	460
K	290
1	314
2	335
3	300
4	302
5	283
6	256
7	277
8	247
9	310
10	252
11	210
12	261
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	201
Total	4,550

Comments: Colorado's number of students who received an MEP-Funded Instructional or Support Service shows an increase of 19% (739 students). This is a reflection of efforts to meet the State's goal of identifying and serving all eligible migrant families. With an increase of new families identified during the performance period, we were successful in meeting the needs of an increased number of students compared to the prior year.

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 (not Kindergarten)	92
K	73
1	97
2	105
3	99
4	97
5	88
6	92
7	92
8	91
9	108
10	72
11	67
12	100
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	101
Total	1,374
Comments: Colorado's 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 shows an increase of 15% (175 students). The increase is reflective of the number of children who were identified as PFS during the performance period.	

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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
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	67
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	246
K	205
1	206
2	213
3	196
4	201
5	179
6	157
7	164
8	133
9	178
10	149
11	137
12	156
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	47
Total	2,634

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period shows an increase by 24% (115 students). Colorado MEP made it a priority to target services to improve academic achievement. Increased educational services were provided for high school students through Migrant-STEM Academy, Summer Migrant Youth Leadership Institute (SMYLI) and Close-up. Alternatively, increased tutoring services were provided to regular school students and there was increased summer enrollment.

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)	15	1	///
K	55	9	///
1	94	12	///
2	109	10	///
3	108	21	///
4	110	11	///
5	79	10	///
6	76	9	///
7	93	12	///
8	65	6	///
9	93	7	48
10	80	8	105
11	92	8	114
12	99	6	140
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	7	0	4
Total	1,177	130	411

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received reading instruction during the performance period shows a decrease by 22% (336 students). During the 14-15 school year, regions changed the reporting designation from reading to literacy. The consequence for this change is reflected in a decrease in the number of students who received a reading instruction by a teacher, since they reported this service as literacy. An increase was also reflected in tutoring support in literacy. Additionally, school districts provided more non-MEP funded reading resources for students with Non-MEP funds.

Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received mathematics instruction during the performance period decrease by 85% (719 students). In summer 2015 (unlike summer 2014) Regions did not offer a math credit recuperation course. This reflects the decline in math instructional services for the 2014-2015 performance period. Summer courses were selected based on identified gaps in credits for high school students as they near graduation. Therefore, the documented services for 2014-2015 reflect our continued tutoring support services for students struggling with math. Serving students is a core area, therefore, advocates have been referring migrant students to obtain additional instructional services as needed within their home district. More urban school districts offer quality tutoring or additional services to struggling students not funded by the MEP. Math is an area of focus and referral to those additional supports have been successful. The SEA will require additional strategies to meet Measurable Program Outcomes for math from all regions for the 2016-2017 school year.

Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received High School Credit Accrual during the performance period shows an increase by 15% (55 students). Due to improved methods used for collecting data from high schools, regions have been able to more effectively and efficiently collect and report credit accrual information. Additionally, the state has developed improved communication and data transfer systems with high schools with subsequent improvement in the quantity and quality of credit accrual data reported.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children who received <u>any</u> MEP-funded support service during the performace period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	234	149
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	364	193
K	230	79
1	248	63
2	273	78
3	247	84
4	239	83
5	229	74
6	222	81
7	207	81
8	208	89
9	251	120
10	206	96
11	162	88
12	213	131
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	196	113
Total	3,729	1,602

Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children who received any MEP funded Support Service increased by 3% (103 students). The increase is due to the number of students who were provided services with clothing, food, health education, parent education, student workshops aimed at developing students ability to seek and secure timely attention and appropriate interventions regarding non-academically related issues the students may face and referrals to those community agencies.

Colorado's number of eligible migrant students who received a counseling Service during the performance period increased by 11% (161 students). The increase in counseling services is due to advocates connecting students with their school counselors who play an important role in their academic life. Graduation Advocates support/advise students as needed in their local schools; they provide support as needed to complete HS and continue their academic goals in college.

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	584
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	4,238
Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children at any time during the regular school year for schools who serve school age (grades K-12) children shows an increase by 12% (451 students). The increase is reflective in the number of students identified as eligible and attending school as reported by the district.	

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 receive services 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	570	3,606
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	49
Year round	52	2,427
Comments: Colorado shows an increase in the number of migrant children served in an MEP project regular school year - school day 10% (325 students). This increase is reflected in the number of children identified eligible who received an instructional/support service during the performance period. Colorado shows an increase in the number of migrant children served in a MEP project Year Round by 27% (511 students). This increase is reflected in the number of children identified eligible who received an instructional/support service during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.

b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.

c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).

d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.

e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments: NA	

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 <u>funded by the MEP</u>. 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	19	2.87	5	2.70	23
Counselors	35	25.06	4	4.00	35
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	5	3.75	24	3.81	25
Qualified paraprofessionals	3	3.00	5	3.02	5
Recruiters	22	19.68	19	12.20	26
Records transfer staff	14	13.40	12	11.40	14
Administrators	11	8.58	7	5.35	11

Comments: Colorado had an increase in the number of Non-Qualified paraprofessionals reported for Summer/Intercession Term. The increase in the number of non-qualified paraprofessionals employed during the summer session was result of a change in the focus, scope and design of our summer program compared to the prior year. To address the unique needs of migrant families served in our summer program, we hired a larger number of Facilitators of Learning (job classification = non-qualified paraprofessional) to deliver family literacy-related services both in the home and school settings.

Colorado had a decrease in the number of Teachers and Counselors reported during Regular School Year and Summer/Intercession Term. There was a shift in the teachers position to an advocate position. Likewise, there was a change from counselors to advocate position.

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest <u>whole number</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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, 2014 through June 30, 2015.
- 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		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	6	114
Adult corrections		
Other		
Total	6	///////////////////////////////
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	
Juvenile Detention	
Juvenile Corrections	6
Adult Corrections	
Other	
Total	6
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 underlined 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			1,409		
Total Long Term Students Served			528		

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (*IDEA*)			523		
LEP Students			7		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			9		
Asian			3		
Black or African American			297		
Hispanic or Latino			619		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			3		
White			474		
Two or more races			4		
Total			1,409		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,249		
Female			160		
Total			1,409		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		
6			0		
7			0		
8			0		
9			0		
10			0		
11			0		
12			1		
13			12		
14			66		
15			165		
16			294		
17			397		
18			300		
19			126		
20			48		
21			0		
Total			1,409		

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, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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)	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			1,166		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Facilities are not allowed to have contact with students for 5 years after they are released or until after their 21st birthday.

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

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

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

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic 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 reported once in each column.

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

Outcomes (once per student)	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
Earned a GED					27					
Obtained high school diploma					38					

Outcomes (once per student per time period)	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
Earned high school course credits					1,196					
Enrolled in a GED program					61					
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					14					
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					327					
Obtained employment					10					

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Facilities are not allowed to have contact with students for 5 years after they are released or until after their 21st birthday.

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, 2014, 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			122		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			25		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			65		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			165		
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, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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			102		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			23		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			91		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			170		
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		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	16	148
Other		
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	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	16
Other	
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				2,496	
Total Long Term Students Served				1,248	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (*IDEA*)				890	
LEP Students				54	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native				60	
Asian				27	
Black or African American				573	
Hispanic or Latino				887	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander				1	
White				851	
Two or more races				97	
Total				2,496	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				1,644	
Female				852	
Total				2,496	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3- through 5					
6					
7				2	
8				2	
9				3	
10				15	
11				24	
12				69	
13				186	
14				301	
15				487	
16				591	
17				542	
18				231	
19				31	
20				11	
21				1	
Total				2,496	

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, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.				996	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Some facilities are permitted to track students after exit, but most do not have a system in place to do so; other facilities are not legally allowed to do so. State agency policy is no contact with students for five years after release or until their 21st birthday.

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student), only after exit	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit				154	

Outcomes (once per student)	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
Earned a GED							35	0		
Obtained high school diploma							54	0		

Outcomes (once per student per time period)	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
Earned high school course credits							1,556	211		
Enrolled in a GED program							295	1		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education							32	1		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs							480	13		
Obtained employment							37	10		

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, 2014, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	*Juvenile Detention*	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				35	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				74	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				212	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				222	
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, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

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				48	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				104	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				230	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				183	
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, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

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	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	9
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	4
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	14
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.

16 districts were eligible in 2014-15: 4 Accredited, 10 Accredited-Improvement and 2 Accredited-Priority Improvement. Activities and resources funded included:
A para to support ELs and increase the intensity of services.
An MTSS coordinator to ensure a tiered system of supports for student academic and behavioral needs.
Standards-based resources to support intensive tiered instruction in reading and math.
A part-time teacher for daily push-in small group math instruction for Title I students.
Improved school-home communication with a District Calendar, sending parents/families monthly newsletters, and enhancing district/school websites.
Enhanced family-school partnerships by educating parents on academic programs used in the classroom.
Pay for substitutes to allow teachers team planning time for teaching the district's standard-based curriculum.
A literacy coach and curriculum coordinator to coordinate, facilitate and organize teacher PD activities.
Updated curriculum plans/maps.
Ensured that HQ paras are trained effectively through the CO Top program, including small group math intervention and instruction.
Trained principals through CDE and CASW to support their work with teachers around evaluations and new standards.
Meetings with intervention staff to support MTSS the district is providing as outlined in the UIP, focusing on data and interventions.
Train interventionists in SIPPS, Read Well, IXL, BURST, etc.
Organized and paid MTSS team members to meet and analyze student academic and behavior data to provide individualized instruction as measured by Dibels Next, STAR, Burst, and other assessments.
A coach to implement lessons with fidelity across all grade levels with instructional strategies.
Staff literacy and writing exemplar trainings related to new standards.
PD fair for teachers.
Stipends for new staff to attend core curriculum and instruction trainings.
Paid staff to attend job fairs to recruit teachers.
Purchased and embedded standards-based math practice program (IXL) in K-8.
New teacher orientation/induction and mentoring programs/resources.
Ongoing, job embedded, personalized PD to assist teachers, interventionists and HQ paras in implementing technology to enhance learning.
Supplies and workshop materials for PD on differentiated instructions, TS GOLD training, curriculum based measurement/progress monitoring and MTSS systems.
Improvement Support Specialist to facilitate differentiated PD to raise math achievement, other content areas, with high-yield instructional strategies.
A second Family Liaison to work with the EL Coordinator and administrative team to ensure that parent engagement strategies for Spanish speakers are aligned and effective.
Supplies for family engagement activities, such as bilingual signs and literacy supplies in multiple languages.
Targeted intervention services in reading and math.
PD to help teachers perform at a higher level on evaluations.
Supplemental instructional supplies to support literacy and math instruction and provide differentiated support for students identified by interim, benchmarking data.
Supplemental researched-based reading program to meet the needs of Tier III students that had not been successful with Tier I and Tier II interventions.
A community counselor to work with children of addicts, including those traumatized due to substance abuse issues and at risk of expulsion due to violent, physical behaviors.
Free full-day kindergarten in Title I schools to increase literacy and language development and reduce achievement gaps.
An interventionist to help teachers identify students' needs, set learning goals and targets, and intervene using small group, research-based strategies and resources.
Renewed site license for My Learning Plan, a web-based evaluation and professional learning management system.
New staff orientation and the tools and knowledge to ensure a successful start to the year.
Family Liaison to support school-home communication and collaboration, translation and interpretation.
Job-embedded PD for K-6 classrooms, tech integration PD for K-12 staff and administrators, ECAR and ECAW training to staff.
Paid teachers to receive PD in Kagan, Lindamood Bell, and PBIS to support effective instruction.
A classroom set of Chromebook computers (30) and charging station for reading and math intervention classes.
New multi-media projectors, to replace current ones starting to fail, used with Smart Boards, document cameras, and teachers' computers.
Purchased one-to-one technology devices (Kunos) and software (Curriculum Loft).
A stipend for One-to-One Implementation Coaches to support teachers implementing and utilizing technology for personalized and differentiated instruction; grades 4-12 teachers trained on using technology for instruction and implementation of Curriculum Loft.
Lindamood Bell training in best practices for early childhood reading intervention and instruction.
Pay for substitutes while eight staff members lead sessions at district PLC days.

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 2014-15?	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).	5
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)	5	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		5

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2014 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)	150,425.00	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		150,425.00
Total	150,425.00	150,425.00
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 2014-15). 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	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	61,790	47,784	77.33
American Indian or Alaska Native	506	324	64.03
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,121	1,846	87.03
Asian	1,960	1,726	88.06
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	161	120	74.53
Black or African American	3,041	2,124	69.85
Hispanic or Latino	18,670	12,617	67.58
White	35,494	29,312	82.58
Two or more races	1,958	1,561	79.72
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	6,105	3,283	53.78
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,981	4,266	61.11
Economically disadvantaged students	28,418	18,619	65.52

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 500 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 2015-16 : 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.

Comments:

---

[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 2015-16 :** 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 2015-16 (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.

Comments:

---

[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 2015-16 : 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.

Comments:

[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 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2015-16: 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 2015-16 (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.

Comments:

---

[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 2015-16: 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 2015-16 (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 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.

Comments:

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 2015-16: 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 2015-16 (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.

Comments:

[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.