CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005

PART I DUE MARCH 6, 2006
PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) 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 is 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:

o   Title I, Part A - *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
o   Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 - *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
o   Title I, Part C - *Education of Migratory Children*
o   Title I, Part D - *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
o   Title I, Part F - *Comprehensive School Reform*
o   Title II, Part A - *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants* (*Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
o   Title II, Part D - *Enhancing Education through Technology*
o   Title III, Part A - *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
o   Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
o   Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
o   Title IV, Part B - *21stCentury Community Learning Centers*
o   Title V, Part A - *Innovative Programs*
o   Title VI, Section 6111 - *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
o   Title VI, Part B - *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by March 6, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by April 14, 2006.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **March 6, 2006** , 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

o   **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

o **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.

o **Performance goal 3** : By 2004-2005, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

o **Performance goal 4** : All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

o **Performance Goal 5** : All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2004-2005 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2004-2005 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2004-2005 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **March 6, 2006** . Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 14, 2006**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2004-2005 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2004-2005 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 2004-2005 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN website (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
   ___Part I, 2004-2005   __X__Part II, 2004-2005

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

Address:
1560 Broadway
Suite 1450

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): Dr. William Moloney

_____   ____4/14/2006 4:49 PM EST_____
    Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2004-2005

PART II DUE APRIL 14, 2006

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

2.1.1   Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

2.1.1.1 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. ___

2.1.1.2 Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2004-2005 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year. ___

An increase in the "number of students" is arbitrary information as an increase or decrease could simply be due to changes in student enrollment, or more tests. Thus, Colorado will not be taking the staff time to do an analysis on meaningless data.

2.1.2   Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following:

2.1.2.1 Total Number of Title I schools in the State   __601__

2.1.2.2 Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State   __252__

2.1.2.3 Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State   __349__

2.1.3   Title I, Part A Student Participation

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2004-2005 school year.Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

2.1.3.1.1   Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	17348
Limited English Proficient	41354
Homeless	3086
Migrant	4401

2.1.3.1.2   Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2004-2005 School Year

	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2213
Asian/Pacific Islander	2768
Black, non-Hispanic	13006
Hispanic	81835
White, non-Hispanic	45726

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

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

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2004-2005 School Year					
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	0	384	0	0	384	0.3
Age 3-5	157	4258	0	1	4416	3.2
K	972	16068	210	4	17254	12.4
1	1957	16833	253	4	19047	13.7
2	1975	15465	221	7	17668	12.7
3	1658	15096	215	11	16980	12.2
4	1273	14728	219	22	16242	11.7
5	1101	14422	222	28	15773	11.3
6	1245	7314	130	47	8736	6.3
7	1214	5600	24	62	6900	5.0
8	1188	5610	29	53	6880	5.0
9	139	3336	31	86	3592	2.6
10	46	1903	28	76	2053	1.5
11	49	1557	24	60	1690	1.2
12	30	1363	16	24	1433	1.0
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
TOTALS	13004	123937	1622	485	139048	100.0

2.1.3.3 **Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services - 2004-2005 School Year**

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year.

Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	6696
Reading/Language Arts	13360
Science	3542
Social Studies	3542
Vocational/Career	12
Other (specify)	0
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	77
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	75
Other (specify)	0

2.1.4 **Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs - 2004-2005 School Year**

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2004-2005 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	37
Teachers	290
Teacher Aides	97
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	17
Other (specify)	0

2.2   WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

2.2.1   Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the 2004-2005 school year, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1   Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

      1. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State   _13_

2.2.1.2   Even Start Families Participating During the Year
("Participating" means participating in all required core services and following any period of preparation.)
    1. Total number of families participating   _422_
    2. Total number of adults participating
    ("Adults" includes teen parents.)   _416_
    3. Total number of adults participating who are limited English proficient   _281_
    4. Total number of children participating   _657_

2.2.1.3   Characteristics of newly enrolled families <u>at the time of enrollment</u>
(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)
    1. Number of newly enrolled families   _268_
    2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants   _274_
    3. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal poverty level   ____
    4. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED   ____
    5. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade   ____

Data not available.

2.2.1.4   Percent of families that have remained in the program

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

1. From 0 to 3 months	12.0
2. From 4 to 6 months	17.0
3. From 7 to 12 months	43.0
4. More than 12 months	28.0

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indictors listed for Even Start participants in your State. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

Indicator	**Measure** *Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator*	**Cohort** Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	**Result** *Number of participants who met the achievement goal*	**Explanation of Progress**
1. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	TABE: Data is not broken down by TABE or CASAS. These numbers indicate the total for both assessments.	TABE: 96.0	TABE: 82.0	TABE: Of the 96 adults working on ABE or ASE skills, 82 progressed through one or more learning level as measured by the TABE or the CASAS.
	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:
2. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition	TABE: Data is not broken down by TABE or CASAS. These numbers indicate the total for both assessments.	TABE: 281.0	TABE: 220.0	TABE: Of the 281 LEP adults served, 220 progressed through one or more learning level as measured by the CASAS or Oral BEST.
	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:	CASAS:
3. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	High School Diploma	16.0	14.0	Of the 16 high school students eligible for graduation, 14 received a diploma.
	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED
4. Percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	GED	40.0	17.0	Of the 40 adults enrolled in adult secondary education programs, 17 passed the GED exam.
	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED	*Please Indicate diploma or GED
5. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive: One Colorado Even Start program (also an ERF site) uses the PPVT assessment. However, this year it had no Even Start children who would be entering Kindergarten. PPVT data will be available for 2005-2006.
6. The average number of letters children can identify measured by the PALS Pre-K Uppercase Letter Naming Subtask	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask:	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask:	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask	PAL Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask One Colorado Even Start program (also an ERF site) uses the PALS Pre-K assessment. However, this year it had no Even Start children who would be entering Kindergarten. PALS data will be available for 2005-2006
7. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level	Reading level based on classroom teacher report determined by student grades and assessments	167.0	127.0	Of the 167 school-age children served, 127 were reading on grade level or made one year's progress in one year according to their classroom teachers.
	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source. Reading level based on classroom teacher report determined by student grades and assessments	Please indicate source. Reading level based on classroom teacher report determined by student grades and assessments	Please indicate source.
8. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP) Colorado piloted the PEP in 2004-2005. However, because programs

support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities				were inconsistent in determining baseline ratings, the pilot data are not being reported. PEP data will be available for 2005-2006.

2.3   EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

Please complete the following tables for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program.

General Data Reporting Information

1.   The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the **Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2004-2005.**

2.   Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

Table 2.3.1.1   Population Data

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.I (on the next page) requires you to report the statewide unduplicated number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 - 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

2.3.1.1 Population Data

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
1. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	1912	1519	1036	1246	1266	1191	1190	1049	1054	1019	887	883	739	468	507	0	3265	19231
2. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"																		
3. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP																		
4. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATON																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education																		
5. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	471	546	243	267	239	221	222	181	192	190	167	159	126	67	46	0	719	4056
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 - 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	323	679	289	352	357	298	319	286	278	262	221	235	178	120	123	0	892	5212
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 - 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	133	702	282	349	391	380	369	369	334	352	289	299	257	168	241	0	877	5792
4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	588	1375	574	677	688	623	641	581	528	524	458	462	416	254	309	0	1772	10470

For #2, #3 and #4 data not available at this time. Information will be forthcoming.

2.3.1.2   Academic Status

Instructions: Table 2.3.1.2 asks for the statewide *unduplicated* <u>number</u> of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
1. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. ***Dropped out of school***																		
2. Obtained GED																		
2. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- *(Note:* The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.)																		
1. Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - Reading/Language Arts)						1015	1015	907	916	876	790	710	541	361	283	0		7414
2. Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State Assessment)						72	235	235	246	222	176	174	125	63	7	0		1555
3. Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment - Mathematics)						1034	1015	907	916	876	790	710	541	361	283	0		7433
4. Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)						81	254	241	253	233	174	172	126	64	7	0		1605

Data not available. Data requested for Table II-FI and 2 is not repoted to the State by Districts until August of 2006 for the 04-05 SY.

2.3.1.3.1   MEP Participation - Regular School Year

Table 2.3.1.3.1 (on the next page) asks for the statewide, unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2004-2005 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through a <u>schoolwide</u> program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in <u>any</u> row of this table.*

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

<u>Served in a Regular School Year Project</u>. Enter the number of *children who p*articipated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

<u>Continuation of Services</u>.   In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

<u>Instructional Services</u>.   For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

<u>Support Services</u> . For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

<u>Referred Services</u> . Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.3.1   MEP Participation - Regular School Year

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
PARTICIPATION - REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR																		
1. Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	1455	1870	1044	1284	1317	1263	1228	1104	1131	1093	944	925	783	508	538	0	2287	18774
2. Priority for Service																		
3. Continuation of Service		2	5	2	3	6	2	2	0	6	5	2	3	4	3	0	1	46
4. Any Instructional Service	4	414	954	1194	1185	1133	1122	1024	1060	995	860	886	718	468	473	0	0	12490
5. Reading Instruction	0	232	806	1011	1028	937	936	827	890	808	727	736	580	396	391	0	0	10315
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	335	779	955	982	900	903	789	862	795	715	709	568	387	373	0	0	10052
7. High School Credit Accrual												98	185	145	136	0	123	687
8. Any Support Service	1455	1870	1021	1257	1301	1245	1213	1088	1113	1077	935	912	776	506	534	0	2287	18590
9. Counseling Service	98	390	131	181	214	228	182	184	208	177	134	178	181	117	101	0	425	3129
10. Any Referred Service	337	767	54	37	30	36	30	29	34	39	43	41	33	11	19	0	664	2204

Data for Priority of Service are not available at this time. Information will be forthcoming.

2.3.1.3.2   **MEP Participation -Summer/Intersession Term**

Instructions Table 2.3.1.3.2 (on the next page) asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of *children who p*articipated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a "referred" service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services .   In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) - (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services.   For each listed instructional service, enter the number of *children who* participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services . For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services . Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (i.e., do not count the number of service interventions per child).

2.3.1.3.2 MEP Participation-Summer/Intersession Term

	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
PARTICIPATION-SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																		
1. Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	369	683	197	224	243	219	213	176	107	79	65	61	49	37	9	0	4454	7185
2. Priority for Service																		
3. Continuation of Service		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
4. Any Instructional Service	0	138	181	213	228	197	199	164	102	73	65	58	48	35	8	0	0	1709
5. Reading Instruction	0	81	137	183	195	164	170	145	93	69	61	46	44	21	4	0	0	1413
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	103	137	183	195	164	170	145	93	69	61	46	44	21	4	0	0	1436
7. High School Credit Accrual												18	29	21	3	0	173	244
8. Any Support Service	369	683	197	224	243	219	213	176	107	79	65	61	49	37	9	0	4454	7185
9. Counseling Service	1	8	23	27	24	45	24	24	21	17	12	13	8	3	0	0	120	370
10. Any Referred Service	9	14	8	4	5	5	4	3	3	3	2	3	1	1	0	0	19	84

Data for Priority of Service are not available at this time. Information will be forthcoming.

2.3.1.4   SCHOOL DATA

Table 2.3.1.4 asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table 2.3.1.4, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide

2.3.1.4. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 1063	b. 27855
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 30	b. 1355

2.3.1.5   MEP Project Data

2.3.1.5.1   Type Of MEP Project

Enter 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 (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

2.3.1.5.1. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a.	b.
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a.	b.
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 169	b. 7045
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 1033	b. 26500

2.3.1.5.2   KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For <u>actual</u> numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the <u>FTE</u> number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (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, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year .)**Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.**

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

2.3.1.5.2. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR (a)	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = ___ Days (b)	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION (c)	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = ___ Days (d)
1. State Director				
2. Teachers				
3. Counselors				
4. All Paraprofessionals				
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals				
6. Recruiters				
7. Records Transfer Staff				

Data not available at this time. Information will be forthcoming.

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)

2.4.1   General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 1

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

General Instructions for Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year.

Instructions: State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all State Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including neglected programs, detention facilities, juvenile correction facilities, and adult correction centers.

In the second column, indicate the underlined duplicated number of neglected or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students *more than o*nce if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program more than once during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the underlined unduplicated number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. 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.

Note: Throughout Table I, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 3. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.1.1   State Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of N or D students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. Neglected Programs				
2. Delinquent (Total)			NA	
2.1. Juvenile Detention				
2.2. Juvenile Corrections	6		200	2534
2.3. Adult Corrections	1	152	1095	152
3. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: __4__				

Colorado only runs Adult Corrections facilities.

2.4.1.2   Student Demographics

Report demographic data on neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 1. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction	Number in adult correction
All Students			2534	152
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan			44	3
Asian or Pacific Islander			17	6
Black, non-Hispanic			440	27
Hispanic			781	81
White, non-Hispanic			1252	35
Gender				
Male			2220	144
Female			314	8
Age				
5-10 years old			1	0
11-15 years old			690	7
16-18 years old			1641	73
19 years and older			202	72

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent <u>unduplicated counts</u> of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, juvenile corrections and detention facilities, and adult correction facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected, Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention, or Adult Corrections).

2.4.1.3 Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Neglected Programs (a)	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities (b)	Number of Adult Corrections Facilities (c)
	Number of Facilities/Programs		
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)		6	1
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)		2	1
3. Awarded GED(s)		5	1
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention	Number in Adult Corrections
	Number of Students		
1. Academic			
While in the facility, the number of students who...			
1. Earned high school course credits		2517	140
2. Were enrolled in a GED program		368	12
While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...			
3. Enrolled in their local district school		521	0
4. Earned a GED		93	0
5. Obtained high school diploma		69	12
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education		123	31
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education		119	71
2. Vocational			
While in the facility, the number of students who...			
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		953	77
While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...			
2. Enrolled in external job training education		7	10
3. Obtained employment		56	49

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of <u>long-term</u> Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 students in neglected programs, juvenile corrections/detention, or adult corrections who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. <u>Long-term</u> refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004 , to June 30, 2005

The reported numbers should represent <u>unduplicated counts</u> of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)**, students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**, and students in adult corrections **(AC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for <u>both</u> the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more the one of these change categories

2.4.1.4   Academic Performance in Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)		318	11		105	15		317	120
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.		252	8		82	10		211	102
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams		132	0		59	3		307	113
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams		2			4	0		27	44
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams		17			1	1		14	1
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams		61			21	0		21	9
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams		26			11	0		22	8
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams		26			22	1		223	37

2.4.1.5   Academic Performance in Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days			In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days			In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days		
	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC	N	JC	AC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)		318	11		105	15		318	120
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.		248	8		76	14		230	112
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams		173	0		71	1		201	41
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams		4			7	0		22	3
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change</u> in grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams		15			1	0		3	3
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams		83			13	0		17	13
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams		22			13	0		19	12
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams		49			37	2		140	34

End Subpart 1 Reporting Form

2.4.2 General Data Reporting Form - Subpart 2

The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, N or D Education Program for school year 2004-2005, **defined as July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.**

General Instructions For Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 Tables:

Specific instructions are provided before each table.

For items that request information on the **number of facilities/programs**, report **only** on facilities or programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year.

For items that request information on the **number of students**, report **only** on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year.

At-risk students are reported only in the facility/program and demographic counts. They are **not** reported in the outcome or academic performance tables.

Instructions: Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities And Students

Include the aggregate number of facilities/programs and/or students for all Local Education Agencies that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds.

In the first column, report the number of facilities/programs that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding. Indicate the total number of facilities/programs by type, including at-risk programs, neglected programs, detention facilities, and juvenile correction facilities.

In the second column, indicate the <u>duplicated</u> number of at-risk, neglected, or delinquent students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. A duplicated count is one that counts students more than once if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times in the reporting year.

In the third column, enter the average length of stay (in days) for students in each type of facility/program. The average should include multiple visits for students who entered a facility or program *more than once* during the reporting year.

In the fourth column, indicate the <u>unduplicated</u> number of students who were admitted to each type of facility/program. 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.

Note: Throughout this table, count facilities based on how the facility/program was classified for funding purposes. If a facility served as a multipurpose institution (e.g., a facility that served as both a corrections and a neglected facility) and received funding for both areas, then count the facility under both categories in Table I and enter how many facilities were double-counted in item 4. If a facility was multipurpose, but received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds for only one area, count it only once.

2.4.2.1   Local Education Agency Title I, Part D, Facilities and Students

Facility/Program type	Number of facilities/ programs	Number of at-risk or N or D Students (Duplicated)	Average length of stay (days)	Number of at-risk or N or D students (Unduplicated)
1. At-Risk Programs	12	2	NA	2
2. Neglected Programs	19	2406		2019
3. Delinquent (Total)	11	1314	NA	1575
4. Juvenile Detention	2	34		34
5. Juvenile Corrections	7	8		2535
6. Number of facilities that served more than one purpose: ___				

Average length of stay for the state cannot be calculated from data submitted from facilties.

Instructions: Student Demographics

Report demographic data on at-risk, neglected or delinquent students who were served under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2. Report the number of students by race/ethnicity, gender, and age.

2.4.2.2   STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

	Number in at-risk programs	Number in neglected programs	Number in juvenile detention	Number in juvenile correction
All Students	59	1987	3043	688
Race/ethnicity				
American Indian or Native Alaskan	0	36	56	9
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	54	26	8
Black, non-Hispanic	0	481	506	161
Hispanic	1	591	992	254
White, non-Hispanic	1	1755	1434	255
Gender				
Male	2	1318	2577	683
Female	0	1172	466	5
Age				
5-10 years old	0	232	1	0
11-15 years old	1	1013	872	232
16-18 years old	1	730	1896	381
19 years and older	0	444	240	75

Instructions: Academic/Vocational Outcomes

The number of facilities or programs with specific academic offerings, and the numbers of students who attained specific academic or vocational outcomes. The reported numbers should represent <u>unduplicated counts</u> of students; report only information on a student's most recent enrollment (e.g. do not double-count a student that earned credits on two separate enrollments). However, students may be counted in more than one outcome category within the same enrollment period (e.g., returned to school and earned high school credits). As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For Section 1 of this table, items 1-3, report the number of neglected programs, and juvenile corrections and detention facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year.

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 1 and 2, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *during their time in the facility/program*: earned high school course credits and/or were enrolled in a GED program. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.1 of this table, items 3-7, enter the number of students who attained the following academic outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in a district school, earned a GED, obtained a high school diploma, were accepted into postsecondary education, and/or enrolled in post-secondary education. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, item 1, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcome *during their time in a facility/program*: enrolled in elective job training courses. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

For Section 2.2 of this table, items 2 and 3, enter the number of students who attained the following vocational outcomes *while in a facility/program OR within 30 days after exit*: enrolled in external job training education, and/or obtained employment. Report the numbers by program type (e.g., Neglected Programs or Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention).

2.4.2.3   Academic/Vocational Outcomes

1. Facility Academic Offerings	Number of Facilities	
	Number of Neglected Programs	Number of Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention Facilities
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)	38	186
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)	8	7
3. Awarded GED(s)	9	10
2. Academic & Vocational Outcomes	Number of Students	
	Number in Neglected Programs	Number in Juvenile Corrections and/or Detention
1. Academic		
While in the facility, the number of students who...		
1. Earned high school course credits	861	3363
2. Were enrolled in a GED program	210	512
While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...		
3. Enrolled in their local district school	277	971
4. Earned a GED	138	194
5. Obtained high school diploma	40	177
6. Were accepted into post-secondary education	11	153
7. Enrolled in post-secondary education	11	148
2. Vocational		
While in the facility, the number of students who...		
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	27	1788
While in the facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, the number of students who...		
2. Enrolled in external job training education	137	521
3. Obtained employment	69	537

Instructions: Academic Performance Tables

Report the number of <u>long-term</u> Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 students in neglected programs or juvenile corrections/detention who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading and math. <u>Long-term</u> refers to students who were incarcerated for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005.

The reported numbers should represent <u>unduplicated counts</u> of students; report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Count each student in only one length of stay category. For each length of stay category, report the data by the following facility or program type: students in neglected programs **(N)** and students in juvenile corrections or detention **(JC)**. As the table indicates, combine reporting numbers for juvenile corrections and detention facilities.

For item 1, enter the number of students who were in placement during the reporting year for either 90-179 days, 180-270 days, or more than 270 days, by type of facility/ program.

For item 2, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who tested below grade level when they entered the facility or program.

For item 3, enter the number of students reported in item 1 who have data available for <u>both</u> the pre and the post test exams.

For items 4-8, indicate the number of students reported in item 3 who showed either negative change, no change, up to 1/2 grade level change, up to one grade level change, or more than one grade level change on the pre-post test exam. Students reported in item 3 should not appear in more the one of these change categories.

2.4.2.4   Academic Performance In Reading

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	526	407	201	458	420	882
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	321	353	118	350	148	349
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test reading exams	244	180	129	315	166	434
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test reading exams	8	8	12	42	29	44
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change in</u> grade level from the pre- to post-test reading exams	40	20	10	25	12	17
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	107	62	21	66	39	35
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	51	39	64	42	29	41
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test reading exams	34	51	25	140	53	262

Number of long-term students

2.4.2.5 Academic Performance In Math

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Number of long-term students					
	In placement for 90-179 consecutive calendar days		In placement for 180-270 consecutive calendar days		In placement for more than 270 consecutive calendar days	
	N	JC	N	JC	N	JC
1. # students who were in placement from July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005 (in each length-of-stay category)	526	407	201	458	420	883
2. # students from row 1 who tested below grade level upon entry.	283	345	118	340	183	356
3. # students from row 1 who took both the pre- and post-test math exams	200	218	121	294	165	318
4. # students from row 3 who showed <u>negative</u> grade level change from the pre- to post-test math exams	18	9	11	33	24	37
5. # students from row 3 who showed <u>no change in</u> grade level from the pre- to post-test math exams	24	19	10	37	21	11
6. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to 1/2 grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	61	88	25	40	49	35
7. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>up to one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	58	31	32	65	20	32
8. # students from row 3 who showed improvement of <u>more than one full grade level</u> from the pre- to post-test math exams	27	71	42	119	51	206

END Subpart 2 Reporting Form

2.5   COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (TITLE I, PART F)

2.5.1   Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.   __62.0__

2.5.2   Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2004-2005 school year.   __69.0__

2.5.3   How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998?   __81__

2.6   ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (TITLE II, PART D)

Funding Year: FY 2003
School Years: 2003-2004 AND 2004-2005

2.6.1   FY 2003 Program Information

State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO)	Yes _X_ No __ (circle one)
Year last updated:	__2001__ (year)
Date of State Approval:	__00/00/01__ MM/DD/YY
Web Site Location/URL: http://www.cde.state.co.us/edtech/plng-state.asp	

State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how your State defines the following:

2.6.2.1.1   Curriculum Integration

The following is the current working definition for Colorado. While Colorado school districts operate under local control, the Colorado Department of Education is working with school districts to develop working definitions based upon local needs and requirements. These district definitions are a required part of their consolidated applications, beginning in 2005-2006. These final district definitions will also include the philosophies of the Colorado Educational Technology/Information Literacy (ET/IL) planning process.

This working definition is adapted from the International Society for Technology in Education, ISTE.

"Curriculum integration with the use of technology involves the infusion of technology as a tool to enhance the learning in a content area or multidisciplinary setting... Effective integration of technology is achieved when students are able to select technology tools to help them obtain information in a timely manner, analyze and synthesize the information, and present it professionally. The technology should become an integral part of how the classroom functions — as accessible as all other classroom tools. The focus in each lesson or unit is the curriculum outcome, not the technology. "

2.6.2.1.2   Technology literacy

The following is the current working definition for Colorado. The Colorado Department of Education is currently working with school districts to develop working definitions upon local needs and requirements. These district definitions have been incorporated into the Consolidated Application process for 2005-2006. These final district definitions will also include the philosophies of the Colorado Educational Technology/Information Literacy (ET/IL) planning process.

This working definition is adapted from the State Educational Technology Directors Association, SETDA.

"Technology literacy is the ability to responsibly use appropriate technology to communicate, solve problems, and access, manage, integrate, evaluate, and create information to improve learning in all subject areas and to acquire lifelong knowledge and skills in the 21st century."

2.6.2.2   Goals, Objectives, Targets

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Original:1. All Colorado teachers and administrators will be able to use student achievement data to make informed instructional decisions regarding curricula and instruction. (Part III, page 17) Modified: Colorado teachers and administrators will be able to use student achievement data to make informed instructional decisions regarding curricula and instruction.
Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.	1,2,3
Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)	Original: a.Colorado teachers and administrators, especially those in high-need school districts, will participate in local, regional and statewide information-based decision making programs. b.Colorado teachers and administrators, especially those in high-need school districts, will use classroom, district and state student achievement data to make appropriate instructional decisions to improve student learning. (Part III, page 17) Modified: a. Colorado districts especially, high-need school districts, will participate in the Colorado Consortium for Data Driven Decisions (C2D3). b. Colorado teachers and administrators participating in C2D3 will use classroom, district and state student achievement data to make appropriate instructional decisions to improve student learning.
Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)	Original: Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers – Standard Seven: Knowledge of Technology, 7.4 Apply technology to data-driven assessments of learning. (Part III, page 17) Modified: 1.Colorado will have a central organization, Colorado Consortium for Data Driven Decisions (C2D3) in place to support districts in information based educational practice. 2.The number of school districts participating in the Colorado Consortium for Data Driven Decisions (C2D3) programs and activities.
Target *Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).* **BASELINE DATA**	1. Establish the Colorado Consortium for Data Driven Decisions (C2D3) as a result of competitive Title IId funding. Baseline data begins in 2003-04.
Target *Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year*	1. Over 1/3 of the C2D3 participating districts will be represented by high-need school districts. (BASELINE data shows 48% of participating districts are high-need) 2. Information based educational practice standards for teachers and administrators with rubric for district implementation established. BASELINE
Target *Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.*	1. Over 1/3 of the C2D3 participating districts will be represented by high-need school districts. (BASELINE data shows 48% of participating districts are high-need) 2. Participating districts are rated by implementation rubric for information based educational practice.

Target *Target for 2005-06 school year*	1. Over 1/3 of the C2D3 participating districts will be represented by high-need school districts. 2. 15% of participating districts show a category growth on the implementation rubric for information based educational practice. 3. New licensure standards in data driven decisions are established for principals. Teacher data standards are already in place.
Target *Target for 2006-07 school year.*	1. Over 1/3 of the C2D3 participating districts will be represented by high-need school districts. 2. 15% of participating districts show a category growth on the implementation rubric for information based educational practice. 3. Both principal and teacher licenses include data driven decision making standards.
Target *Target for 2007-08 school*	1. Over 1/3 of the C2D3 participating districts will be represented by high-need school districts. 2. 15% of participating districts show a category growth on the implementation rubric for information based educational practice. 3. Renewals for principal and teacher licenses include data driven decision making standards.
Assessment of Progress *Status of progress on indicator* *(1) Target met* *(2) Target not met*	1. Targets related to C2D3 met.
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	C2D3 Data reports- www.cde.state.co.us/edtech/cspr

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	**Original:** 2. All Colorado students will have access to the high-quality standards based instructional programs they need to succeed in school and life. (Your zip code should not dictate the quality of your education.) (Part III, page 18) **Modified:Colorado students will have access to high-quality, standards based online courses through state funded online school programs.**
Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.	1,2,3
Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)	Original: a. Colorado Online Learning will be implemented to provide students in Colorado's highest need school districts with access to high-quality standards-based courses. b. COL will implement an effective quality assurance program to ensure that the courses developed and brokered are of the highest quality. c. A blue ribbon task force will analyze online education in Colorado and nationally to make recommendations to the State General Assembly for the development of a Colorado online learning program.(Part III, page 18) Modified: a) Student enrollment in Colorado online courses will increase each year. b) A quality assurance program will be designed and implemented for Colorado online courses. c) Rural/low populated school districts will utilize online learning as a supplement to their district developed courses.
Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)	Original: a. Colorado will have a central organization, Colorado Online Learning (COL), in place for e-Learning. This group will provide online courses for students enrolled in Colorado's high-need brick and mortar schools and will be a clearinghouse for courses for this program and Colorado's cyber schools. b. High-quality online courses will be available to students in Colorado high need school districts. c. A quality assurance system will be implemented to ensure availability of high-quality online courses. d. High-quality standards-based courses will be available to students whose learning needs have been underserved in brick and mortar schools. e. Colorado will have a state sanctioned online learning program in place by October 1, 2003. (Part III, page 18) Modified: a. Enrollment in full time and supplemental online programs. b. Utilization of a quality assurance program for Colorado online courses. c. Enrollment in online supplemental courses by rural, low population districts
Target *Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).* ***BASELINE DATA***	a. Establish Colorado Online Learning as a result of competitive Title IId funding. b. Baseline data begins in 2003-2004 .
Target *Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year*	a. Enrollment. Full-time online enrollment is 1,032 students (BASELINE). Registrations for supplemental courses is 1,224 (BASELINE) b. Develop a quality assurance program for Colorado online courses. c. Enrollment in online supplemental courses by rural, low population districts will be at least 50% of total.(Data

	shows 70% of online courses were taken by students in districts with populations under 1,200.)

Target
Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.
	a. Enrollment
	
	     Full-time online enrollment will increase by 200 students (Data shows enrollment at 3248)
	
	    Registrations for supplemental courses increase by 300 students (Data shows enrollment at 1637)
	
	b. Implement a quality assurance program for Colorado online courses.
	
	c . Enrollment in online supplemental courses by rural, low population districts will be at least 50% of total.(Data shows 68% of online courses were taken by students in districts with populations under 1,200.)

Target *Target for 2005-06 school year*	a. Enrollment . Full-time online enrollment will increase by 200 students . Registrations for supplemental courses increase by 300 students b. Continue to utilize a quality assurance program for Colorado online courses. (Target no longer applies) c. Enrollment in online supplemental courses by rural, low population districts will be at least 50% of total.
Target *Target for 2006-07 school year.*	a. Enrollment . Full-time online enrollment will increase by 200 students . Registrations for supplemental courses increase by 300 students b. Continue to utilize a quality assurance program for Colorado online courses. (Target no longer applies) c. Enrollment in online supplemental courses by rural, low population districts will be at least 50% of total.
Target *Target for 2007-08 school*	a. Enrollment . Full-time online enrollment will increase by 200 students . Registrations for supplemental courses increase by 300 students b. Continue to utilize a quality assurance program for Colorado online courses. (Target no longer applies) c. Enrollment in online supplemental courses by rural, low population districts will be at least 50% of total.
Assessment of Progress *Status of progress on indicator* *(1) Target met* *(2) Target not met*	Targets are being met or exceeded.
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	a. Reported student enrollment in full time and supplemental online schools. b. Use of quality assurance instrument. c. Reported coursework registrations in supplemental online classes by population of district.

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
Program Goal (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	**Original included 2 goals:** 3. All Colorado teachers will be able to successfully incorporate technology into their standards-based curricula and instruction to meet the needs of their diverse students, including improving student technology and information literacy skills. (Part III, page 18) 4. All Colorado schools will have access to the technology tools they need to provide their teachers, students, administrators and other staff with the tools they need, when and where they are needed. (Part III, page 19) **Modified to be 1 goal:** **Colorado districts will implement ET-IL plans integrating technology into instruction, ensuring student technology literacy, and providing access to adequate technology tools and resources.**
Statutory Goal Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.	1,2,3
Program Objective (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)	Original Objectives from Goal 3: a. All teachers, especially those in Colorado's neediest schools will be able to effectively use technology to delivery standards –based curricula. b. All teachers, especially those in Colorado's neediest schools will be able to effectively use technology to increase student learning. c. A working committee comprising Colorado educators will develop student technology literacy guidelines for dissemination to all Colorado school districts and charter schools in September 2003. (Part III, page 18) Original Objectives from Goal 4: a. Colorado school districts and charter schools will develop educational technology and information literacy plans to incorporate technology into their standards-based curricula and instruction, by June 30, 2003. b. CDE, through the e2t2 grant program will provide: c. Planning resources and funds to LEAs for identifying needs and program implementation models. d. Grant funds to the neediest LEAs to meet local needs. e. Grant funds for large consortia to provide technical assistance and other resources to LEAs for information-based decision making and professional development. (Part III, page 19) **Modified to Make one combined set of objectives:** a. Colorado school districts will develop and implement Education Technology-Information Literacy (ET-IL) plans aligned to Title IId, Colorado Accreditation, and e-Rate guidelines. b. Competitive and formula Title IId grant programs will be developed to support ET-IL philosophies and implementation. c. Colorado school districts will increase capacity via E-Rate funding.
Indicator (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)	**Original from Goal 3:** a. Performance-Based Standards for Colorado Teachers – Standard Seven: Knowledge of Technology, 7.1 Apply technology to the delivery of standards- based instruction. 7.2 Use technology to increase student achievement. b. Colorado will have student technology skills guidelines in place no later than September 2003. (Part III, page 18)

	Original from Goal 4: All Colorado school districts, especially Colorado's highest need school districts, will have: a. Broadband access to the Internet. b. No more than 5 students to each instructional, multimedia computer. c. Computers, PDA's, graphing calculators, AlphaSmart-like tools, Internet access, and other technologies available when and where needed for research, accessing and/or creating information, and engaging students in the learning process. d. Professional development programs in Colorado schools will incorporate technology and standards-based instruction. e. School district strategic and accreditation plans will include the incorporation of technology into their instructional content areas. (Part III, page 19) Modified to combine indicators from Goals 3 and 4: a. Number of school district ET-IL plans completed. b. Aligned competitive and formula Title IId grant programs. c. Participation rate in e-Rate Telecommunications, Internet, and Internal Connections categories.
Target *Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).* ***BASELINE DATA***	a. ET-IL plan guidelines developed and disseminated to school districts. b. Competitive grant programs for Colorado Online Learning (COL) and Colorado Consortium for Data Driven Decisions (C2D3) established.E-rate participation by Telecommunications ($7.971 million/224 participants) Internet ($1.195 million/153 participants), and Internal Connections ($14.645 million/12 participants)
Target *Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year*	a. 50% of school districts develop and submit ET-IL plans to the Colorado Department of Education for review. b. COL and C2D3 competitive grant projects implemented for 1st year. c. E-Rate participation for Telecommunications, Internet, and Internal Connections increases by 5% Telecommunications ($9.03 million/246 participants) Internet ($1.615 million/176 participants), and Internal Connections ($5.240 million/36 participants)
Target *Indicate status of data in 2004-05 school year.*	a. 75% of school districts develop and submit ET-IL plans to the Colorado Department of Education for review. b. COL and C2D3 competitive grant projects implemented for 2nd year. c. Competitive Title IId grant program of Power Educators developed and awarded. (35 grants awarded) d. Formula Title IId grants aligned to district ET-IL plans. e. E-Rate participation for Telecommunications, Internet, and Internal Connections increases by 5% Telecommunications ($8.431 million/243 participants) Internet ($1.958 million/171 participants), and Internal Connections ($13.267 million/24 participants)
Target *Target for 2005-06 school year*	a. 85% of school districts develop and submit ET-IL plans to the Colorado Department of Education for review. b. COL and C2D3 competitive grant projects implemented for 3rd year. c. Competitive Title IId grant program of Power Results developed and awarded. d. 95% of formula competitive grants aligned to district ET-IL plans. e. E-Rate participation for Telecommunications, Internet, and Internal Connections increases by 5%.
Target *Target for 2006-07 school year.*	a. 95% of school districts develop and submit ET-IL plans to the Colorado Department of Education for review. b. C2D3 competitive grant project implemented for 4th year. c. 95% of formula competitive grants aligned to district ET-IL plans. d. E-Rate participation for Telecommunications, Internet, and Internal Connections increases by 5%

Target *Target for 2007-08 school*	a. 95% of school districts develop and submit ET-IL plans to the Colorado Department of Education for review. b. E-Rate participation for Telecommunications, Internet, and Internal Connections increases by 5%
Assessment of Progress *Status of progress on indicator* *(1) Target met* *(2) Target not met*	1. Targets being met
Measurement tool(s) used to assess progress of indicators.	ET-IL plans, reports, grant rfps, E-Rate, and evaluation reports- www.cde.state.co.us/edtech/cspr

If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.

Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Modification or Additions
1. All Colorado teachers and administrators will be able to use student achievement data to make informed instructional decisions regarding curricula and instruction. (Part III, page 17)	Colorado teachers and administrators will be able to use student achievement data to make informed instructional decisions regarding curricula and instruction. Objectives, indicators and targets modified in previous section.
2. All Colorado students will have access to the high-quality standards based instructional programs they need to succeed in school and life. (Your zip code should not dictate the quality of your education.) (Part III, page 18)	Colorado students will have access to high-quality, standards based online courses through both supplemental and full-time state funded online school programs. Objectives, indicators and targets modified in previous section.
3. All Colorado teachers will be able to successfully incorporate technology into their standards-based curricula and instruction to meet the needs of their diverse students, including improving student technology and information literacy skills. (Part III, page 18)	Colorado districts will implement ET-IL plans integrating technology into instruction, ensuring student technology literacy, and providing access to adequate technology tools and resources. Objectives, indicators and targets modified in previous section.
4. All Colorado schools will have access to the technology tools they need to provide their teachers, students, administrators and other staff with the tools they need, when and where they are needed. (Part III, page 19)	Colorado districts will implement ET-IL plans integrating technology into instruction, ensuring student technology literacy, and providing access to adequate technology tools and resources (combined previous goals 3 and 4 into new goal 3). Objectives, indicators and targets modified in previous section.

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

2.7.1   Performance Measures

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:
› Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
› The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
› The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
› The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
› Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

2.7.1   Performance Measures

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of districts showing a reduction in weapons incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __2004-2005__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__29%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__
% of districts showing a reduction in assaults/fights incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __04-05__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__43%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__
% of districts showing a reduction in drug incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __04-05__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__36%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__
% of districts showing a reduction in alcohol incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __04-05__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__36%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__
% of districts showing a reduction in tobacco incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __04-05__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__37%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__
% of districts showing a reduction in robbery incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __04-05__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__22%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__
% of districts showing a reduction in other felonies incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __04-05__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__14%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__
% of districts showing a reduction in other code of conduct violations incidence.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Frequency: __Annually__ Year of most recent collection: __04-05__	2003-2004__15%__ 2004-2005__20%__ 2005-2006__25%__ 2006-2007___ 2007-2008___	2003-2004__43%__ 2004-2005___ Baseline:__02-03__ Year established: __02-03__

| % of schools decreasing truancy rates. | Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange. | Frequency:
__Annually__

Year of most recent collection:
__04-05__ | 2003-2004___
2004-2005___
2005-2006__5%__
2006-2007__10%__
2007-2008__15%__ | 2003-2004___
2004-2005___

Baseline:__04-05__
Year established:
__04-05__ |

2.7.2   Suspension and Expulsion Data

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State's definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State's definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary School	Schools that cover grades 1 through 5 or grades 1-6.
Middle School	Schools that cover grades 6 through 8, or 7 through 9.
High School	Schools that cover grades 9-12 or 10 through 12.

2.7.2.2   The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.

State definition of physical fighting: Student behavior on school grounds that if committed by an adult would be considered criminal assault. This category includes acts considered first and second degree assault, as defined by state statutes or municipal ordinances, but does not include acts considered third degree assault.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	300	181
Middle	776	181
High School	890	181

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	0	181
Middle	15	181
High School	41	181

2.7.2.3   The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession

State definition of <u>weapons</u>:   This could be a firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, or a firearm facsimile that could reasonably be mistaken for an actual firearm; - Any pellet or BB gun or other device, whether operational or not designed to propel projectiles by spring action or compressed air; - It also includes a fixed blade knife with a blade that measures longer than three inches in length or a spring-loaded knife or a pocket knife with a blade longer than three and one-half inches; or, - That could be any object, device, instrument, material, or substance that could be used or intended to be used to inflict death or serious bodily injury.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	230	181
Middle	302	181
High School	238	181

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	50	181
Middle	167	181
High School	297	181

2.7.2.4   The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of <u>alcohol-related</u>:   Use, possession or sale of alcohol on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	37	181
Middle	198	181
High School	1057	181

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	4	181
Middle	22	181
High School	51	181

2.7.2.5   The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

State definition of illicit-drug related: Use, possession or sale of drugs on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events.

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	52	181
Middle	872	181
High School	2391	181

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2004-2005 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	14	181
Middle	162	181
High School	414	181

2.7.3   Parent Involvement

Instructions: Section 4116 of ESEA requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State's efforts to include parents in these activities.

Like the 2003-04 school year, the Colorado Department of Education again utilized SDFSC funds to purchase consulting services from the Colorado Foundation for Family and Children's National Center for School Engagement." The consultant worked with individual schools' leaders to specifically increase parental involvement, especially in ways that impacted positive school climates. SDFSC consultants field numerous calls, e-mail messages and letters throughout the school year from parents concerned about school safety or disciplinary issues involving their children. Consultants follow up with the schools to suggest strategies that will address areas of concerns. In the cases of suspensions and expulsions, consultants assist parents with understanding due process and rights afforded to families with the goal of having the student modify his or her behavior and be successfully served with alternate educational strategies or re-enrolled in school. One of the Department SDFSC consultants works with other consultants within the Department to increase parental involvement across numerous program areas statewide. This consultant has collaborated with members of the Department's Positive Behavior Support team to develop a parent involvement component. The annual SDFSC Performance Report is posted at the Department's Website on the SDFSC pages. This report reiterates each funded LEA's data-based needs, performance indicators, strategies, and performance outcomes. When this report is posted, e-mail messages are sent to the Statewide Parent Organization Networks so they may alert their parent networks about the report's availability. The statewide Parent Involvement Organization Network includes community agencies and government consultants. This report serves to communicate local needs and efforts to parents within their community, along with the contact information of the LEA SDFSC program coordinator. The report may be found at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeprevention/pi_safedrugfree.htm (Note: At the time of submitting this Consolidated report, the 2004-05 report remains in draft form, undergoing edits, so is not quite yet posted to the Web. It may be posted, however, by the time the US ED staff person reviews this Title IV, Part A section of the Consolidated Report.)

2.8   INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS(TITLE V, PART A)

2.8.1   Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

Title V has been instrumental in enabling CDE to move ahead with a comprehensive implementation of NCLB. A measure of the effectiveness of Title V funding in supporting Colorado's efforts can be found in examining the progress of the State toward NCLB's goals. What follows, is a listing of the progress Colorado has made toward selected NCLB goals utilizing Title V staff and funds in support of these efforts:

- Colorado has incorporated nearly all of the required NCLB data elements into its Automated Data Exchange project
- Colorado has implemented all of the Title I accountability system provisions including adequate yearly progress determinations of schools and districts, school improvement identifications, school choice, and supplemental services
- Colorado has set its annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency
- Colorado is providing support to its schools identified for Improvement through School Support Teams and opportunities for high quality professional development
- Colorado has improved it's Consolidated Federal Programs application materials and procedures and technical assistance in support of the process
- Colorado has all required standards in place
- Colorado supports charter schools and increased school choice using federal funds
- Colorado continues working toward identifying the most effective instructional practices in reading and math and supports schools in implementing these effective practices
- Colorado fully supports the goals of Title V and utilizes Title V funding to increase public awareness of the status of education in Colorado and the status of education in Colorado relative to the NCLB goals.

We will continue to support the efforts above, but will also work closely with the LEAs so that they will continue to use their Title V funding to meet the challenging goals of NCLB to improve student achievement in Colorado.

2.8.2 The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20**% or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including**: **(1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2004-2005 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area [1]	Number of LEAs that used **20**% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: **Student Achievement in Reading and Math**	114	65	397625
Area 2: **Teacher Quality**	60	35	123292
Area 3: **Safe and Drug Free Schools**	47	28	12009
Area 4: **Increase Access for all Students**	52	25	128522
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

2.8.3 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2004-2005, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. __38__

2.8.4 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2004-2005. __22__

2.8.5 Indicate the percentage of Title V funds, including funds transferred from other programs into Title V that LEAs used for the four strategic priorities. __94.0__

---

[1] In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

2.8.6 Indicate the percentage of LEAs that completed needs assessments that the State determined to be meaningful and credible.
  50.0

2.8.7 Describe how decisions were made regarding the local uses of funds.

> Districts, through advisory committees, generally make decisions based on student achievement data and the needs of district schools. In most cases these advisory committees consist of parents, teachers, principals and community members. Districts also consult with private schools within the district to determine the needs of the individual schools.

2.9   RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B)

2.9.1   Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2004-2005 school year. __31__

2.9.2   Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

2.9.2.1   LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2004-2005 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	1
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	2
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	3
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2

2.9.2.2 Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The Colorado Department of Education's measurable goals for the Rural, Low-Income program are the <u>same five performance goals</u> detailed in Part 1 of the Consolidated State Plan of June 2002.

The Rural, Low-Income districts apply for their funds via the local Consolidated Federal Programs Application. The Rural, Low-Income districts' uses of funds are imbedded in the identical planning and accountability processes as the other formula programs included in the application. The alignment of these plans automatically makes them mutually supportive of each other's goals.

Data exists for each individual LEA and are only summarized below. For a one-page table listing all LEA data per goal, e-mail Janelle Krueger at Krueger_J@cde.state.co.us or call at 303.866.6660. **Goal 1:** By 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics. Four LEAs made AYP in Reading and Language Arts. Six did not. Two LEAs made AYP in Math. Eight did not. **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. This data is yet to be determined for the 2004-05 school-year. **Goal 3:** By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers. With the exception of one LEA at 86.15% HQT, the other nine districts are higher than 90% HQT. **Goal 4**: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning. None of these districts have schools determined to be persistently dangerous. **Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Graduation rates in the ten RLIS LEAs range from 54% to 94%.

2.10   FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1   State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2004-2005 school year?   No

2.10.2   Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

2.10.2.1   Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2004-2005 school year.   20

2.10.2.2   In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds **TO** eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred **TO** eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	3	263073
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	30250
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	5	58549
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	9	320776
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	7	230265

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds FROM eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred FROM eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	14	621403
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	2	198530
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	6	76702
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	2	6278

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

2.11   21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS(TITLE IV, PART B)

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.