

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2015-16 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2014-15, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2015-16 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Colorado Department of Education		
Address: 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, CO 80202		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Patrick Chapman		
Telephone: 303-866-6780		
Fax: 303-866-6637		
e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Patrick Chapman		
Signature _____		Date _____

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 09, 2017
5PM EST**

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	24,613	6,023	24.47
4	23,648	4,527	19.14
5	22,221	4,344	19.55
6	13,198	1,873	14.19
7	12,028	1,613	13.41
8	11,454	1,842	16.08
High School	5,852	958	16.37
Total	113,014	21,180	18.74
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	24,557	5,844	23.80
4	23,628	6,763	28.62
5	22,138	5,864	26.49
6	13,040	2,775	21.28
7	11,991	2,948	24.59
8	11,443	3,068	26.81
High School	5,792	1,445	24.95
Total	112,589	28,707	25.50
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,493	1,770	39.39
4	4,508	1,485	32.94
5	4,379	1,355	30.94
6	2,040	465	22.79
7	1,325	203	15.32
8	1,280	231	18.05
High School	704	98	13.92
Total	18,729	5,607	29.94

Comments:

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,474	1,673	37.39
4	4,500	1,918	42.62
5	4,362	1,673	38.35
6	2,024	696	34.39
7	1,322	382	28.90
8	1,264	419	33.15
High School	703	180	25.60
Total	18,649	6,941	37.22

Comments:

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	32,095
Limited English proficient students	70,930
Students who are homeless	10,017
Migratory students	1,753
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,577
Asian	5,384
Black or African American	18,609
Hispanic or Latino	140,374
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	730
White	68,985
Two or more races	7,795
Total	244,454
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2					
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		80			80
K	931	26,816	62	1	27,810
1	1,285	28,610	63	1	29,959
2	1,291	28,694	81	5	30,071
3	1,175	28,083	56	9	29,323
4	989	26,923	45	13	27,970
5	873	25,615	52	30	26,570
6	374	15,218	15	20	15,627
7	327	13,484	11	20	13,842
8	260	12,970	17	41	13,288
9	71	7,138	15	47	7,271
10	104	7,075	8	59	7,246
11	79	6,542	7	47	6,675
12	67	9,380	10	57	9,514
Ungraded					
TOTALS	7,826	236,628	442	350	245,246

Comments: Colorado does not have ungraded students; every student is assigned a grade level.

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

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

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

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

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	2,777
Reading/language arts	7,007
Science	156
Social studies	83
Vocational/career	2
Other instructional services	133
Comments:	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	2
Supporting guidance/advocacy	18
Other support services	56
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	144.98	
Paraprofessionals ¹	28.93	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0.00	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.00	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

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

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

² Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	5,312.74	100.00
Comments:		

³ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2015 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	141	39
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	0	1,254,633
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	15,619,627	125,463,103
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.00	1.00

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocation.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2015-16.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Train parents on home strategies that contribute to academic success.
 Attended Colorado Statewide Parent Coalition Academy to learn parenting strategies and network.
 Materials and supplies to implement parent engagement efforts and activities: Literacy Night, Math Night, Celebration of Learning, Parent Engagement Nights, Parent Orientation, Author night, ELL Parents Literacy Night, Grandparents Day, parent writing, reading intervention and college fair events, goal-setting conferences, and fun family activity nights.
 Materials in English and Spanish to support literacy development.
 Math and literacy supplies, food and refreshments for after-hours and evening events, instruction, resources and materials to support student learning at home, notebooks, pencils, folders.
 How to advocate for your child's changing academic needs.
 Family Liaison to run community, parent/family events, activities around literacy/math strategies, parent coffees, teacher conference attendance, meet-your-teacher events, etc. Training and support for family liaisons
 Books for each student at literacy night.
 Educate parents on healthy habits at home.
 Production of Family Night fliers, parent resources (games, literature), and brochures/information from teachers and school counselor; supplies for Parent Resource Room (literature, curriculum for parents supporting their children, books, pamphlets, etc.).
 Salary and benefits for childcare and related activities to increase parent participation. Literacy and Math supplies for daycare children to keep them at grade level,
 Parenting skills classes, materials and supplies. Community events like Winter Read-In Pancake Breakfast. Outside speakers and services for parent activities.
 Build parent capacity to support student literacy and math at home during Coffee and Conversations, PTO, and whole-school curriculum nights. Parent nights to discuss progress of students and inform parents of school support programs in math.
 Books for summer reading program.
 Translation services so non-English speaking parents can participate fully in parental involvement activities, parent-teacher conferences, back-to-school night, PTO meetings, etc.
 English language books for parent English class to better support students at home.
 Communication to/from parents to increase their involvement and student achievement.
 Monthly parent meetings to increase understanding of activities to support students, data, college-readiness, college or post-secondary options.
 Before/after school and summer programs. Parent engagement and technology nights. Math, Literacy and STEM nights; materials and strategies to support learning at home. Supplies for parent activities that increase participation, leadership, support reading and math achievement.
 Outreach to families on READ Act Information, parent-teacher conference sign-ups, supporting students at home, and increasing volunteerism.
 Supplies for a parent presentation on math strategies: smart board, APEX learning tools, other programs.
 Teacher outreach to families on literacy and math, supporting students at home, and participating in the Family Learning Center.
 Teach parents about the math and literacy curricula and technology at school.
 Stipends to support parent events and videos that engage parents of low-performing students.
 Translators for events, parent-teacher conferences, back-to-school night and PTO meetings for full inclusion of non-English speaking parents and improved home support for academic achievement.
 Coordinator of classroom and event volunteers.
 Compensation for purchased services to coordinate volunteers.
 Parent orientation for math program; purchase of sample lessons, activities.
 Bulldog Learning Centers supplies.
 Nonfiction books for Science Night; books for Literacy Nights. Parent education on GoMath.
 Food for Team & Family Nights and Saturdays, parent organizing meetings.
 U Prep staff train families to engage in their child's academic growth; questions to ask during a read-aloud, how to ensure students write with descriptive details. Dinner provided, encouraging attendance and providing chance to engage teachers.
 Printing services, postage, and other services to maintain communication with parents. Copier usage for parent communications. Producing brochures, Title I newsletters, Family and Student Handbook.
 Contracted services to produce innovative and effective parent engagement events.
 Mentorships developed through Be Well Health Initiatives.
 Conference training, Data, Montessori Training.
 SOAR Family Engagement Coordinator and Parent Ambassadors. Parent Involvement Activities include a family Welcome event, resource fair, picnic and community outing.
 Meeting with parents to review student goals. Parents of SES students attend orientation and meetings to learn how to support their children through questioning, reading together, physical play, and nutrition. Parents provided at-home materials to support the program and their child. Student agendas for parent communication and reading log tracking, paper for newsletters and labels for parent communication.
 Supplies for parent involvement; math games, event décor, giveaways, and paper goods.

Individual Student-Staff-Teacher Learning Plan development and review quarterly, when team discusses interventions and student progress with parents.
Parent Involvement program evaluation.
Teach effective parenting strategies and discipline tactics (Incredible Years Class).
Pay teachers to attend/present at parent events.
Title I Family Nights with opportunities to enrich family reading, math and writing; beginning-of-year Open House and Ice Cream Social to orient parents to school and Title I, and answer questions; parent breakfast, when parents ask questions and visit classrooms; parent night to teach them about ELA standards, IB, curriculum, and strategies for supporting students; encourage home/school involvement and communication through daily planners and homework folders.
Train parents to support their at-risk student academically, particularly in literacy, through home visits and parent mentor workshop programs. Parents who demonstrate proficiency train others.
Boot Straps for Parents Academy.
Speakers/presenters for Title I Parent Nights, parenting classes
Parent-learning sessions at all-family learning nights and Kindergarten Family Meetings.
Childcare for parents attending Love & Logic trainings.
Family Center Support.
Home visits to learn about students and families for background-driven instruction, share classroom expectations, answer questions, address concerns.
School shirts for students following Summer School, to encourage reading.
Parent trainings/meetings to accompany the Conscious Discipline program.
Parent book study to improve the home-school connection, decrease discipline issues and raise academic results.
Books for parents who attend Parent Reading, Writing, and Math Nights.
Take-home folders for K-2, student planners for 3-5, to increase home/school communication connection on homework, parent information and student progress.
Uniform vouchers for parents who attend Title 1 Nights to incentivize participation.
Home/School Communication planners to encourage communication between staff, students and families.
Printing brochures, flyers, surveys and newsletters around parent night activities and Title I Initiatives.
School supplies/backpacks.
Small libraries for winter and summer breaks, with 3-4 fiction and non-fiction books targeted to the K-6 grade students' levels.
Adult GED coursework.
Train parents to read MAP/Dibels/APPL data and understand academic needs of ELs.
Supplies, materials: home/school instructional support in all content areas: bags, family activity sheet, printed packets, manipulatives, reading logs, math games/flash cards, books (audio, print).
Information about ACT training.

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2014 - August 31, 2015), youth who are working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Colorado does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported child counts or underlying eligibility determinations.

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	526
K	312
1	323
2	349
3	386
4	342
5	338
6	324
7	287
8	338
9	317

10	323
11	280
12	352
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	270
Total	5,067

Comments: Colorado continues to show an increase in its child counts for Category 1 for SY 2015-16.

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: We believe the increase in the number of eligible migrant children ages 3-21 years was due to: 1)SEA continues to provided value added training related to MEP eligibility and ID&R strategies; 2)refocusing its ID&R efforts as priority. Additionally, all MEP funded staff are ID&R certified 3) improved communication and relationships with school districts, growers and meatpacking plants, and community agencies and organizations that support refugees and immigrants, which resulted in more referrals; 4)a growing number of eligible families moving into the State from Africa and Asia (new immigrants and refugee families found eligible).

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	331

Comments: In 2015-2016, we continue to strengthen our connections with early childhood care providers in the State and are able to identify and enroll additional children ages birth to two. Additional staff was hired with considerable experience working for Headstart. Colorado continues to strengthen its collaboration with ECE providers within the state through its work with the Migrant student System of Support.

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	308
K	163
1	190
2	221
3	253
4	218
5	216
6	193
7	181
8	202
9	170
10	214
11	183
12	164
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	141
Total	3,017
Comments: In 2015-16, SEA increased in the number of students it reported in Category 2 child counts. Colorado intensifies its efforts to ensure every eligible child enrolled received a supplemental service during the summer.	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: SEA shifted its refocus to serve eligible migrant children with issues related to limited English proficient, undocumented, who have disabilities and who were out of school youth. Additional instructional time was offered during the summer, in the evening and during the day and help support secondary students to receive credit for those courses needed to graduate. Supplemental services were provided to those students who traditionally are not in a school setting for example family literacy programs.

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

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

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

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

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children are accounted for in the performance period . In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- | The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- | Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity).
- | Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- | Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were serviced for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- | Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- | Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children are counted using two methods. School records are collected to verify students attending PK-12 programs/institutions. Children ages 3-5 or non-attending youth outside a K-12 school are verified with a parent signature documenting residency. Category 1 counts are unduplicated statewide totals of children eligible for funding: all migrant children 3-21 who, within 36 months of last qualifying move, resided in Colorado for 1 more days during the Sep 1-Aug 31 performance period. Children included meet the definition in section 1309 of the statute and section 200.81 of the MEP regulations. Eligible migrant children 3-21 served are included in the summer/intersession counts and are a subset of the category 1 count and are unduplicated statewide totals for children eligible to be counted for category 2. Children whose 36 month eligibility for MEP expired prior to the start of summer/intersession may receive services, but are not included in the category 2 count. The SEA continues to serve children/youth for the duration of their 36-month eligibility period starting with their last qualifying move. MEP eligibility is determined at the time of the interview and is based on workers' stated intention at the time of move. For example: If the State is reporting for SY 2015-16 given the child's 36 month period of eligibility, the qualifying arrival date can be as early as Sep 2, 2012 to be included in the child count. If we are qualifying on a previous move, the child's eligibility period will be for the remainder of the 36 months. Students who have attained their HSED are reported by the district and verified as completers in End of Year Reporting. A student who attained their HSED is flagged in migrant SIS with the HSED attainment date. Students who attained their HSED in the prior year are not included in subsequent child counts.

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

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

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

The SEA ensures the data system it uses to transmit (NGS), accurately accounts for all migrant children it reports to the Office of Migrant Education by ensuring an unduplicated counts is by assigning a unique student identification number to each child enrolled in the system. If a duplicate record is located in the state's student information system, the duplicate records are consolidated into one record. All associated users receive an automated email notification informing the user a consolidation has taken place. Finally, a delete flag is transmitted to MSIX to remove the duplicate record. Therefore, only one student record is included the state's child count. Mobility and attendance records are used to validate students in grades PK-12. The SEA utilizes several data sources to ensure a single child does not generate duplicate records. These databases include: a district's (LOA) student information systems, the State Migrant Student Information System (NGS), National Student Information Exchange Systems (MSIX), and the State Student Information Tracking System (RITS), which likewise assigns a unique student State ID. A final validation check is completed against the Department's Data Pipeline to confirm accuracy. Any discrepancies are not included in the state's child count. Additionally, SEA ensures that only eligible migrant children who are resident in the State are included in its child counts. Lastly, A Residency Verification Form is utilized to verify residency for children ages 3-5 and out of school youth, and two year olds turning three by capturing a parent/guardian/self-signature during the performance period. If a parent/guardian/self-signature is not captured, these children/youth are not included in the state's child count.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each MEP funded staff member is required to utilize MSIX to conduct mobility searches for State-to-State moves. A move notification is completed and sent to the sending state indicating the student now resides in our State. Consequently, an email to retrieve qualifying information is sent to validate mobility and continuation of services. Similarly, when the SEA receives a move notification, a search is completed in the States Student Information Tracking System (RITS) to validate mobility for those students attending school. Additionally, for students who are not attending school a homevisit is completed to determine eligibility. Finally, when a move notification is received from a receiving State the student is now residing in their state, the student is withdrawn from the Colorado's State Student Information System (NGS) and the district is notified of the move. Upon request, qualifying information is shared with the receiving State. MEP takes seriously its obligation to protect the privacy of those whose data is collected, used, shared. Therefore, MEP enforces additional guidelines and strict processes to protect the privacy of every student and to ensure their confidentiality and security.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	<u>Yes</u>
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/intersession projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	<u>Yes</u>

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	63
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	29
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	29

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 34 non-responses, there were 22 attempts where they found that the families had moved. There were 10 COEs where three attempts were made to visit the family but did not find the family home. There were 2 COEs for which no attempt or home visit was completed.

Procedures	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	SY 2014-15
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of eligible children in each region, the percentage of the total for each region, and the corresponding number of families needed to be sampled from each region to have a total of 21 families (for each of the three random samples throughout the year) were calculated. For example, in the Northern region, there were 1,932 migrant children (42% of the 4,555 in the state). Therefore, for each of the random samples of 21, we would pull 8 families from the Northern region (42% of 21 rounds to 8). This calculation was repeated for each of the regions so that the final random sample would be representative of the total population in each of the regions.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following procedure was completed three times throughout the 2015-2016 school year; 21 families were sampled each time, with a total list of 63 families sampled.

The list of eligible families was opened in Excel and duplicate families were removed by keeping the most recent. For the second and third random sample pulls, families who had previously been re-interviewed during 2015-2016 were removed from the list. The final list consisted of 332 eligible families in the first random sample pull, 565 in the third random sample pull, and 865 in the third random sample pull. The list was then imported into SPSS (a statistics software program). In SPSS, "Data" was selected on the top tab, then "Select Cases" was selected from the drop down to create a new dataset for each region. For each region, "Data" on the top tab was selected, and then "Select Cases" was chosen from the drop down menu. "Random sample of cases" was selected.

The number of eligible children in each region, the percentage of the total for each region, and the corresponding number of families needed to be sampled from each region to have a total of 21 families were calculated (as described in the box above). The number of families needed to be sampled from each region, out of the total number of families in the re-interviewing list, was inputted into SPSS. The resulting sample was copied and pasted into the first tab in

a blank Excel file (called the Random Sample List file). The above steps were repeated for each region, until the random sample list (21 families) was complete.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	117
K	84
1	111
2	123
3	139
4	104
5	111
6	108
7	92
8	116
9	113
10	102
11	87
12	72
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	155
Total	1,634

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children increase was due to: 1)An overall increase in the number of eligible students identified during the Performance Period and who also met the state's PFS criteria; and 2)SEA training, monitoring, and focus on prioritizing service delivery for children and youth with PFS status; and 3)Improved communication and relationships with school districts which resulted in more accurate reporting on identifying students who met PFS criteria (failing or at risk of failing academically).

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	61
1	180
2	200
3	233
4	221
5	215
6	213
7	174
8	212
9	196
10	221
11	141
12	221
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	4
Total	2,497

Comments: Colorado's Limited English Proficient child count during the Performance Period shows a increase of 6%. The districts reported an increase in the number of migrant students reported as Limited English Proficient. The reported increase is reflective of Colorado's increase in its child counts.

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	11
1	19
2	19
3	18
4	21
5	17
6	30
7	20
8	16
9	24
10	11
11	15
12	23
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	251

Comments: Colorado's Children with Disabilities child count during the performance period decreased by 20 students. Districts reported a decrease in the number of migrant children with disabilities.

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2016 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	192
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	196
K	88
1	93
2	102
3	112
4	94
5	99
6	97
7	89
8	102
9	100
10	88
11	69
12	57
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	166
Total	1,744

Comments: Colorado's eligible migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period increased by 6%. SEA continues to provide value added training related to MEP eligibility and refocusing its ID&R efforts as priority. Additionally, all MEP Funded staff are ID&R certified.

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2015-16 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	139
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	133
K	60
1	64
2	72
3	72
4	62
5	56
6	63
7	59
8	72
9	70
10	60
11	40
12	45
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	108
Total	1,175

Comments: Colorado's eligible migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year increased by 7%. SEA continues to provide value added training related to MEP eligibility and refocusing its ID&R efforts as priority. Additionally, all MEP Funded staff are ID&R certified. Additionally, the number of COEs approved by the SEA during the regular year is reflective of the increase in child count during the performance period.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	67
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	82
K	45
1	56
2	57
3	71
4	73
5	71
6	67
7	58
8	50
9	73
10	69
11	66
12	81
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	51
Total	1,037

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children who during the performance period received an educational or educationally related service funded by a Non-MEP program decreased. SEA believes the child count for referred services is underrepresented. SEA will provide more detailed training on how to report referred services in 2017.

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	1
8	2
9	6
10	9
11	14
12	23
Ungraded	
Total	55

Comments: The number of eligible migrant students who were reported by districts as having dropped out of school decreased. As a result, SEA continues to collaboratively work with districts to ensure alternative educational opportunities are available in order to reengage secondary students who have dropped out. Colorado does not have ungraded students; every student is assigned a grade.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2015-16 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	1

Comments: Only one Colorado's eligible migrant student was reported by the districts as having obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma(HSED), down from 2 students in 2014-15.

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

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

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs.
- Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)(2-3))).

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	97
K	77
1	105
2	118
3	133
4	95
5	104
6	98
7	87
8	107
9	111
10	91
11	77
12	70
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	133
Total	1,503

Comments: Colorado's Priority for Services child count during the regular year shows an increase of 9%. The increase is reflective on the number of students identified as Priority for Services (PFS) during the performance period. Additionally, the SEA continued to provide training on specific strategies for identifying migrant students as PFS in an effort to increase academic success.

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	73
K	45
1	70
2	81
3	94
4	62
5	78
6	60
7	58
8	76
9	62
10	77
11	59
12	36
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	85
Total	1,016

Comments: Colorado's Priority for Services child count during the summer term shows an increase in the number of students identified as PFS. The count is reflective on the number of students identified as Priority for Services (PFS) during the summer. Additionally, the SEA continued to provide training on specific strategies for identifying migrant students as PFS in an effort to increase academic success.

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	278
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	486
K	291
1	299
2	326
3	366
4	319
5	316
6	309
7	268
8	310
9	298
10	306
11	264
12	328
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	251
Total	5,015

Comments: The number of students who received a MEP-Funded Instructional or Support Service shows an increase of 10%. An increase in the number of children and youth served during the performance period is due to: 1)An overall increase in the number of Eligible Migrant Children identified 2)SEA requirements to identify and provide a service to all eligible migrant child based on needs, and 3)Improved data entry to document all supplemental services provided; 4)Increased participation of secondary migrant students attending Summer Migrant Youth Leadership Institute; 5)Coordinated efforts with tutors to provide one on one instruction; 5)Increased collaboration with educational agencies for students identified as PFS in an effort to increase academic success.

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	115
K	81
1	109
2	122
3	137
4	99
5	110
6	103
7	90
8	113
9	112
10	98
11	84
12	71
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	151
Total	1,595

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP-Funded instructional or support services during the performance period shows an increase of 16%. The number of students with PFS served during the performance period is due to: 1)An overall increase in the number of eligible migrant students identified; 2)SEA requirement to prioritize the delivery of supplemental services for PFS students; 3)Focusing efforts to meet our MPOs related to literacy, specifically to PFS students; and 4)SEA-provided training on PFS and requirements to meet PFS students' needs.

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: The number of migrant children who received a MEP-Funded instructional or support services during the performance period under continuation of services is zero. Students are referred to educational or educationally related Non-MEP funded agencies to support the academic success for students who are no longer eligible for migrant services.	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	53
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	370
K	216
1	206
2	219
3	259
4	229
5	250
6	193
7	168
8	186
9	195
10	190
11	189
12	218
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	141
Total	3,282

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children who received any type of MEP-Funded instructional service during the performance period shows an increase by 25%. The number of instructional services increase is due to: 1)An overall increase in the number of eligible students identified; 2)Increased awareness of school district staff related to migrant students' academic needs; 3)Improved communication and collaboration with school districts to support students' academic growth; 4)SEA increased focus on credit accrual for secondary students; 5)Graduate Advocate's work with students and staff in career exploration; and 6)Coordination with tutors in school districts to support academic success.

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0	1	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3	4	////////////////////////////////////
K	7	8	////////////////////////////////////
1	15	13	////////////////////////////////////
2	17	17	////////////////////////////////////
3	19	15	////////////////////////////////////
4	21	18	////////////////////////////////////
5	18	18	////////////////////////////////////
6	11	8	////////////////////////////////////
7	11	9	////////////////////////////////////
8	14	12	////////////////////////////////////
9	22	22	37
10	23	18	130
11	10	9	139
12	15	11	188
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	15
Total	206	183	509

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children who received reading instruction by Teacher during the performance period shows a decrease. The decrease in the number of students who received a reading instruction by a teacher decreased and is now being reported under Literacy to better reflect the needs of our migrant students and families.

The number of eligible migrant children who received mathematics instruction during the performance period decreased. The number of students who received Math Instruction by Teacher is due; 1)Re-focus on math MPOs and the delivery of supplemental math instruction, such as the STEM Academy and summer math classes, provided to children throughout the performance period; and 2)Instruction by district tutors and cooperation with school curriculum advisors.

The number of eligible migrant children who received a high school credit accrual service during the performance period increase due to extracurricular instructional opportunities such as Regional Migrant Youth Leadership Institute (MYLI), State Summer held events like Migrant Youth Leadership Institute (SMYLI) and CloseUp.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	278	43
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	471	57
K	287	14
1	298	17
2	326	11
3	365	20
4	318	22
5	315	9
6	309	28
7	268	28
8	309	40
9	298	56
10	306	97
11	261	42
12	327	90
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	250	40
Total	4,986	614

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children who received any MEP funded Support Service increased by 34%. The increase in the number of students who received a Support Service is due to: 1)An overall increase in the number of eligible students identified during the performance period; and 2)A change was recognized in reporting services as "Counseling" to Support Service. SEA will provide more detailed training in 2017 to all MEP funded staff in order to ensure the number of students reported as receiving a support service is reported accurately.

The number of eligible migrant students who received a counseling service during the performance period decreased. The decrease in the number of students who received a Counseling Service was due to: 1)The invalid classification for those who received a Counseling Service were reported; and 2)staff turnaround and staffing reassignment for advocates who provided counseling services.

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and students and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

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

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

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

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	618
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	4,706
Comments: Colorado's number of eligible migrant children at any time during the regular school year for schools who serve school age (grades K-12) children shows an increase by 6%. The increase is reflective in the number of students identified as eligible and attending school as reported by the district.	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: Colorado's had no schools where MEP Funds were consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) during 2015-16.	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	612	4,033
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	123
Year round	49	3,273

Comments: There was increase in the number of migrant children served in an MEP project regular school year - school day. This increase is reflective in the number of children identified eligible who received a service during the regular school year.

The number of students reported in Summer/Intersession only where all MEP services are provided by the MEP region during the summer term increased and is reflective in the number of eligible students serviced during the summer.

The number of students reported in Year Round projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school and summer term increased and is reflective in the number of eligible students who received a service in year round projects.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments: Colorado reports 1.0 FTE for the State Director who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.8.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	9	3.90	4	1.72	10
Counselors	37	27.55	8	8.00	37
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	5	4.25	19	4.55	20
Qualified paraprofessionals	3	3.00	9	3.22	9
Recruiters	26	23.65	24	22.90	26
Records transfer staff	11	10.40	12	10.90	12
Administrators	11	8.50	7	5.35	11

Comments: The decrease in the number of non-qualified paraprofessionals for performance period headcount was due to the hiring of fewer non-qualified paraprofessionals and more qualified paraprofessionals.

The increase in the number of qualified paraprofessionals during the performance period headcount was due to: 1)The hiring of more qualified paraprofessionals and fewer non-qualified paraprofessionals.

The increase in the number of counselors is due to: 1)Staff reassignment of FTE from recruiter to counselor was reported to better meet the needs of students within the district.

The increase in the number of recruiters is due to: 1)A Statewide priority initiative in ID&R. Additional recruiters were hired to identify and recruit migrant children throughout the state.

The decrease in the number of teachers better reflects tutoring support staff hired to provide tutoring to eligible migrant students.

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- | Report data for the program year of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	6	110
Adult corrections		
Other		
Total	6	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	6
Adult corrections	
Other	
Total	6
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			1,327		
Total Long Term Students Served			526		

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			400		
LEP Students			54		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			8		
Asian			3		
Black or African American			259		
Hispanic or Latino			574		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			4		
White			447		
Two or more races			32		
Total			1,327		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,163		
Female			164		
Total			1,327		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		
6			0		
7			0		
8			0		
9			0		
10			0		
11			0		
12			4		
13			25		
14			98		
15			263		
16			340		
17			342		
18			182		
19			59		
20			14		
21			0		
Total			1,327		

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

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

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			1,327		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: All six Part 1 facilities reported not being legally permitted to have contact with students after exit, for five years or until their 21st birthday.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit										
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED					45					
Obtained high school diploma					78					
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					1,285					
Enrolled in a GED program					63					
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					2					
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					530					
Obtained employment					6					

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			77		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			4		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			24		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			110		
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			58		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			12		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			51		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			92		
Comments:					

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	17	123
Other		
Total	17	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	17
Other	
Total	17
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served				2,275	
Total Long Term Students Served				989	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)				945	
LEP Students				20	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native				61	
Asian				17	
Black or African American				528	
Hispanic or Latino				830	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander				3	
White				734	
Two or more races				102	
Total				2,275	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				1,586	
Female				689	
Total				2,275	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8				3	
9				9	
10				23	
11				25	
12				55	
13				108	
14				197	
15				365	
16				522	
17				576	
18				325	
19				49	
20				17	
21				1	
Total				2,275	

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

--

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

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

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.				897	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Of the 17 Title ID subpart 2 facilities, four cite HIPPA and confidentiality restrictions against tracking students once they leave the facility. Of the 13 who are legally permitted to collect data, three do not have a system in place to allow such tracking; one is permitted to collect data but not to initiate contact with former students (although students may initiate contact); one is allowed to do so with parental completion of an information release form.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student), only after exit	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit							169			
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned a GED	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Obtained high school diploma							79	3		
							54	3		
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned high school course credits	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in a GED program							1,094	229		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education							214	18		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs							19	31		
Obtained employment							329	23		
							55	149		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				61	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				79	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				130	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				221	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

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

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				51	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				99	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				126	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				215	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	9
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	8
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	0
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	13
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

16 districts were eligible in 2015-16: 4 Accredited, 10 Accredited-Improvement and 2 Accredited-Priority Improvement. Activities and resources funded included:

MTSS Coordinator at the secondary level to identify and prioritize students academically or behaviorally at-risk. Duties included parent communications, scheduling meetings, establishing leveled interventions, progress monitoring, and decision making based on results.

PD for MTSS coordinators on examining the district's implementation of MTSS, focusing on data use, systems for efficiency and effectiveness, and implementation science.

Literacy coordinator stipend and benefits.

Stipend for MTSS team members to meet and analyze individual and school-level academic and behavioral data to provide individualized and school-wide support based on local and state measures.

Subs for teachers to attend grade-level visits and collaboration to assure fidelity in implementation of building culture, vocabulary lessons, project-based learning, etc.

1 staff member per building attended the CCIRA conference with the focus on depth and the CAS. Teachers returned and trained staff.

Staff to oversee ongoing support for new teachers, conducting meetings periodically throughout the year.

Building Leadership teams met regularly to review systems, strategies, and data that affect intervention programs, and analyzed district data to adjust intervention groups, etc.

Travel expenses to state and local trainings such as the Federal Programs workshop.

Substitutes for PD activities such as curriculum instruction, writing trainings, and coaching opportunities for new staff.

Staff from 2 schools attended the Tointon Institute for UIP planning.

Schools trained staff and provided necessary materials to implement school culture initiatives building-wide PBIS, Discovery, Watch Dogs, and Leader in Me trainings, Rachel's Challenge, Choice Theory model and mediation trainings and school visits.

Consultant trained new and seasoned teachers on professional learning activities involving STEM curriculum pathways to increase teacher knowledge relative to state standards in science and math, project-based learning and instructional delivery with an emphasis on technical literacy, 21st century skills, and technology integration.

Consultants provided PD to staff in classroom behavior management and interventions, differentiated instruction and writing rubrics/calibrations for district writing prompts.

Six signing bonuses were offered in Science, Math and Special Education to recruit and retain highly qualified positions that are difficult to fill or sustain after the first year of employment.

A one-time signing bonus of \$2,500 per person was offered at the start of employment or to continue employment with the district for a 2nd year.

In conjunction with PD on CCSS and CAS, curriculum maps, rigorous lesson development and technology integration, a curriculum map software system (Rubicon Atlas) was purchased to help staff develop curriculum maps, rigorous lesson plans, technology integration, strategic team planning, formative assessment and vertical articulation among grade levels.

Extra pay/stipends to facilitate or participate in after-hours book study courses and PD that included differentiated instruction for students with different learning styles (Sped & GT), classroom behavioral management, Teach Like a Champion and effective lesson plan development.

Workshop materials for ongoing job-embedded, personalized development to assist teachers, interventionists and paraprofessionals in implementing technology integration in reading, math, writing and STEM pathways to enhance K-8 student learning and outcomes.

PD in literacy was provided by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt several times during the year to ensure solid green zone instruction in literacy.

Partially funded a district-wide ELD Coordinator to oversee ELD PD and instructional support.

Stipends for teachers to serve on building Instructional Leadership Teams in non-Title I school outside normal contract time.

Supplies for Family Liaisons for family engagement activities, such as food, bilingual signs, and literacy supplies in multiple languages for parent classroom volunteers.

Partially funded one person to oversee implementation of Title I strategies, ensure programs are operated with quality and fidelity, and coordinate support.

Hired paraprofessional to facilitate math and reading skills to 2nd grade students most at risk of not meeting state academic requirements and alleviate large class size.

Teacher/mentor instructional coach to establish a process to support new teachers in instructional practice, which the district embedded in its practice to support and retain teachers. The teacher/mentor instructional coach met regularly with 35 new teachers and supported their integration of rigorous academic grade level standards, formative assessments and using informative assessments to differentiate instruction.

Purchased Chromebooks for students.

Sent two new principals to the 4-day Principal Leadership Academy at the Tointon Institute for Educational Change, allowing them to team with teachers to implement practices learned throughout their building levels.

Recruited a math teacher and helped pay for alternative licensure.

Continued subscription with Denver Museum of Nature & Science to engage students in interactive distance learning through broadcasts and video conferencing.

Instructional Paraprofessionals worked under direction of the Interventionist to provide targeted interventions to small groups of students daily using research-based strategies and resources.

Funded a K-5 Curriculum Coordinator to study, evaluate, and implement research-based curriculum and instruction, help evaluate academic programs and their effect on student achievement, and lead and coordinate curriculum and instruction PD.

Continued to fund My Learning Plan, a web-based evaluation and professional learning management system used as part of the cycle of employee learning, reflection, appraisal, support and growth.

Provided PD on Schoolzilla, a data warehouse system to manage attendance, enrollment, behavior and assessment data, and build dashboards with reports for teachers for more efficient use of data to drive instruction. Schoolzilla team provided in-district training for C&I, followed by training for building administrators and leadership teams.

Funded ongoing training for secondary staff in Standards-Based Unit design.

Purchased 350 copies of Next Steps in Guided Reading for K-5 teachers and literacy paras, used in district book study of guided writing to support the reading process.

Continued to fund the Alpine Achievement site license as a tool for writing and maintaining individual student learning plans and pulling information for analysis, planning, goal setting, and progress monitoring.

Added two new computer labs, so students have better access to technology for testing and learning.

Reading and Math Intervention supplies.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

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

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2015-16?	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2015 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	176,868.00	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		176,868.00
Total	176,868.00	176,868.00
Comments:		

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES ⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2015-16). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	63,166	49,842	78.91
American Indian or Alaska Native	505	313	61.98
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,207	1,879	85.14
<i>Asian</i>	2,039	1,754	86.02
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	168	125	74.40
Black or African American	3,204	2,301	71.82
Hispanic or Latino	19,710	13,787	69.95
White	35,482	29,935	84.37
Two or more races	2,058	1,627	79.06
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,399	3,663	57.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,369	4,521	61.35
Economically disadvantaged students	30,004	20,340	67.79

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 500 characters.

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

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, *EDFacts* files C106, C107, C109, C111, and C130 (DGs 778 and 779) are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>.

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

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools ⁵ under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁵ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)⁶
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁶ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

2.12.3 List of Districts for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District name
- | District NCES ID code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | State-specific status for SY 2016-17 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN034 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses. The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action⁷ under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Improvement status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁷ The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.