

**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 2016-17**

**COLORADO**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017**  
**PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018**

**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) 2016-17 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 2016-17, 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 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2016-17 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2016-17		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Colorado Department of Education		
Address: 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, CO 80202		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Patrick Chapman		
Telephone: 303-866-6780		
Fax: 303-866-6637		
e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Patrick Chapman		
		<u>Thursday, May 10, 2018, 1:21:47 PM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART II**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2016-17**



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 15, 2018  
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	25,344	6,578	25.95
4	25,154	4,991	19.84
5	23,808	4,621	19.41
6	13,114	1,923	14.66
7	12,069	1,572	13.03
8	12,110	2,028	16.75
High School	5,619	891	15.86
Total	117,218	22,604	19.28
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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	25,298	6,646	26.27
4	25,111	7,204	28.69
5	23,747	7,314	30.80
6	13,061	3,221	24.66
7	12,059	3,232	26.80
8	12,087	3,414	28.25
High School	5,511	1,388	25.19
Total	116,874	32,419	27.74
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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	4,720	1,762	37.33
4	4,578	1,489	32.53
5	4,579	1,433	31.30
6	1,717	512	29.82
7	1,161	202	17.40
8	1,033	224	21.68
High School	593	110	18.55
Total	18,381	5,732	31.18

**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	4,712	1,759	37.33
4	4,581	1,934	42.22
5	4,573	2,057	44.98
6	1,713	638	37.24
7	1,166	361	30.96
8	1,032	322	31.20
High School	586	153	26.11
Total	18,363	7,224	39.34

**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.

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	34,006
Limited English proficient students	69,978
Students who are homeless	9,229
Migratory students	2,178
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,573
Asian	5,447
Black or African American	18,529
Hispanic or Latino	142,342
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	849
White	72,314
Two or more races	8,341
Total	250,395
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2					
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	86	751	3		840
K	1,089	27,463	63	2	28,617
1	1,375	28,102	84	4	29,565
2	1,413	28,292	79	11	29,795
3	1,223	28,871	75	11	30,180
4	1,104	28,386	73	15	29,578
5	952	26,921	61	26	27,960
6	280	15,307	23	44	15,654
7	213	13,631	17	62	13,923
8	154	13,670	9	58	13,891
9	118	7,667	10	108	7,903
10	70	7,317	23	91	7,501
11	73	6,817	14	97	7,001
12	64	8,986	6	75	9,131
Ungraded					
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>8,214</b>	<b>242,181</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>604</b>	<b>251,539</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

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

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

<b>TAS Instructional Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Mathematics	2,848
Reading/language arts	7,387
Science	58
Social studies	84
Vocational/career	6
Other instructional services	57
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>TAS Support Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Health, dental, and eye care	22
Supporting guidance/advocacy	148
Other support services	262
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	145.25	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	16.15	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	0.00	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.00	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**FAQs on staff information**

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
- (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>

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

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

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

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals <sup>3</sup>	5,300.18	100.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2016 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

<b>Parental Involvement Reservation</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000</b>
Number of LEAs*	141	38
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	0	1,254,949
Sum of LEAs' FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocations	16,273,898	125,495,295
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2016 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 2016 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 2016-17.**

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Training opportunities for parents on strategies they can implement at home to contribute to the academic success of their child.  
 Materials and supplies to effectively implement parent engagement efforts throughout school year, support adult ESL, parenting, and skills-based classes.  
 Stipends and benefits for parent liaisons to work with parent involvement or receive PD.  
 Materials for parent engagement meetings or training supplies (notebooks, pens, pencils, folders, or training texts).  
 Supplies, materials and refreshments for parent training/meetings, family literacy and math nights, parent conferences, and academic support meetings.  
 English language curriculum books for parent English class to better help parents support their students at home with reading and homework.  
 Family nights to support positive school/family partnerships, with presentations and information on school systems, expectations, attendance, instructional support at home, and needs identified through parent surveys.  
 Support staff to assist families and provide guidance during registration, family nights, and other family outreach opportunities.  
 Information to limited English proficient parents through interpreters and translation of report cards and other documents.  
 Meetings to increase parents' knowledge of activities to support students, data, understanding of college-readiness, and information about college or post-secondary options.  
 Training to offer parents tools that support their children's academic achievement and enhance student learning at home.  
 Opportunities for students, parents and families to participate in various evening educational activities at school; Literacy and Math nights.  
 Parent liaisons to connect with families about Title I activities and student learning, activities including literacy/math strategies, community nights, parent coffees, teacher conferences.  
 Translators for events and parent teacher conferences to enable full inclusion of non-English speaking parents. Materials for meetings with parents to discuss chronic absenteeism, college and career readiness, resiliency and power skills, college visits, career exploration, ICAP, SEL resources, MAPS assessment data, academic intensity in literacy and numeracy.  
 Stipends to teachers for parent engagement activities. Activities to improve home support for student achievement including Common Sense parenting classes, and extended parent-teacher conferences to enable full inclusion of families of TA students.  
 Supplies focused on strategies for home support: how to navigate the school and district, how child can be successful, support services available, etc.  
 Translation of parent newsletters, take-home materials, curriculum, and articles on ways to increase home support for students to increase full inclusion of non-English-speaking families.  
 Stipends for teachers to coordinate special parent and family events aimed at improving parenting skills, home support for education, college and career readiness, and other issues of concern.  
 Speaker fees for parent and family events aimed at improving parenting skills, home support for education, college-and-career readiness.  
 Childcare for parents attending parent-family events and PT conferences to promote full-inclusion of low-income families.  
 Informational materials, supplies and consumables for monthly "cafecito" and periodic "Saturday School" parent events, focused on the needs of dual-language learners.  
 Extra time for teachers to meet with parents of struggling students in grade-level team P-T conferences. Release time for teachers to participate in "RTI Summits" - meetings between classroom teachers, special education staff, principal, and parents when a child is identified as needing additional support.  
 Translators for events including back-to-school nights, literacy/math nights and student/teacher conferences to allow full inclusion of non-English speaking parents.  
 Creation of videos focused on parent access to school resources and monitoring their child's results, and how to provide home help with challenges in reading and math.  
 Instructors and supplies for Literacy Night, targeting underrepresented demographics (low income, fathers, Hispanics, American Indian, African-American, immigrant) with creative, easy-access strategies to support oral English language, reading, and writing at home.  
 Interpreters for parent conferences and written translation; snacks for Parent Events including "Donuts with Dads" and "Muffins with Moms" activities.  
 Interpreters for parent/teacher conferences and other meetings; Translator for parent newsletter and other documents.  
 Volunteer appreciation supplies for parents.  
 Copies and paper for a weekly parent newsletter.  
 Stipend for teacher to maintain and update parent website, informing parents of recent activities, literacy tips.  
 Promote and develop effective parent and community involvement by providing meals for family visits.  
 Events to involve parents and families and build the capacity of parents to support our students.  
 General supplies for parent/family events: food, flyers and parent training materials, etc.  
 Postage to mail parent communications to encourage parents to be more engaged in their children's education by keeping them more consistently informed of school functions, events, meetings, and student performance.  
 School App for parents to follow school events, announcements, and news  
 Parent handbooks to inform and engage parents in the school mission, goals, culture, and expectations and provide information on opportunities to get involved in student learning and the school community.  
 Printed information for parents regarding school performance, school rules, and regulations.  
 Family toolkits with books in English and Spanish and other materials for use at home (tubs, whiteboards, magnetic letters, folders, tip sheets).  
 Supplies for math games, giveaways, paper goods, food, appreciation incentives for parents.  
 Catering for parent involvement events. Dinners, donuts, muffins, and snacks.

Supplies for make and take events and parent trainings including whiteboard markers, plastic bags, erasers, pencils, copier paper, card stock to print certificates, and medals for parents who attend multiple trainings.

Consultants to include APTT which is a structured model for family engagement to help produce academic gains in high poverty and high English language learner schools.

Provide parents with effective parenting strategies to build positive relationships with their children, use effective discipline tactics, and help their children be successful in school (Incredible Years Class). Speakers/presenters, food, at parent events.

Funds for a Science learning experience slated for the Family Innovations Night.

Beginning-of-the-year Open House and Ice Cream Social and orientation to the school and Title I.

Parent breakfast, parent night to learn more about ELA standards, math, IB, curriculum, and strategies parents can use to support their students.

Host a Love and Logic Night for families.

Supplies for parent/community ELD and Citizenship classes.

A computer for parents to help with the registration process, or check student grades, attendance, etc.

Recognition activities and tokens of appreciation.

Parent activities, food, supplies, books and materials will help families gain a better understanding of how parents can assist their students at home

Printed materials: forms, surveys, and information.

### 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, 2016 through August 31, 2017. 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

Report a child in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule. The first exception to this rule is a child who turns 3 during the performance period would be reported as "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)," **only if the child's residency in the state was verified after the child turned three.** The second exception to this rule may be a child who turns 22 years of age during the performance period, who would be reported at the appropriate age/grade category for 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, 2016 through August 31, 2017. 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 implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls 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 disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions 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 State has taken action to ensure that 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, 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, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness).
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, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	599
K	262
1	328
2	350
3	385
4	346
5	360
6	338
7	317
8	342
9	334
10	334
11	280
12	372



Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	344
Total	5,291
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** The increase in the number of eligible migrant children ages 3-21 years was due to: 1) Increased and improved SEA provided training related to MEP eligibility and ID & R strategies; 2) all regional staff have become ID & R certified; 3) refocusing ID & R efforts as our #1 priority; 4) improved communication and relationships with school districts and community agencies which resulted in more referrals; 5) continuous number of eligible families moving into the region from Africa and Asia (new immigrants and refugee families found eligible), especially after secondary moves; 7) change in ESSA MEP eligibility criteria resulted in families qualifying who did not qualify under NCLB; 8) a focus on re-interviewing families who have ended eligibility and who re-qualify for the MEP; and (9) additional recruiters were hired during peak recruitment times (increased FTE = increased results).

**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, 2016 through August 31, 2017.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	326
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado MEP continues to participate in the Preschool Initiative which has been invaluable in identifying students for the program.	

**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, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, 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 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)	432
K	166
1	245
2	247
3	270
4	266
5	272
6	253
7	222
8	237
9	255
10	245
11	211
12	166
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	271
Total	3,758
<b>Comments:</b> There were a number of reasons why the child count increased during the Summer/Intersession Term. Those reasons are provided below.	

**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:** The increased number of Eligible Migrant Children Served during the S/I was due to: 1) SEA requirement to provide summer supplemental services to all eligible students; 2) Shift in MEP staff schedules to move work days from the regular year into the summer to increase service delivery; 3) Re-focusing efforts to meet our MPOs related to literacy, specifically during summer months; and 4) feedback from our Regional PAC related to a need for family literacy programs during the summer, and 5) improved collaboration and coordination with community agencies; 6) additional recruiters were hired during peak recruitment times (increased FTE = increased results).

**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, 2016 through August 31, 2017. 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
<b>Comments:</b> N/A	

**2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System**

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A
-----

**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, ages 3-21, 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, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- | Children who-in the case of Category 2-were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- | Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- | Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migrant student database.

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 or 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 and youth ages 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 2016-17 given the child's 36 month period of eligibility, the qualifying arrival date can be as early as Sep 2, 2013 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 are flagged in migrant SIS with the HSED attainment date. Students who attained their HSED during the 2016-17 performance period are not included in subsequent child counts. A student who attained their graduation diploma are flagged in migrant SIS with the graduation attainment date. Students who attained their diploma during the 2016-17 performance period 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) migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all migrant children it reports to the Office of Migrant Education by validating each child count reported. Each child enrolled in the system is assigned a unique student identification number. 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's record is included the state's child count.

The SEA utilizes several data sources to ensure duplicate records are not generated. 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). 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. SEA ensures that its system includes a check of residency for each child who is included in the child count. The State uses a Residency Verification Form by capturing a parent/guardian/self-signature to verify children birth through Age 5 and Out of School Youth who are not attending school. Two year olds turning three are verified by capturing a parent/guardian/self-signature on or after the child turns three years old. If a signature is not captured, these children/youth are not included in the state's child count. Lastly, School Record is used to verify children and youth ages 3-21 who are attending school.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Each MEP funded staff member is required to utilize MSIX to conduct mobility searches for State-to-State moves. 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.

The State Data and User Administrator runs random MSIX data quality reports to ensure the data submitted is valid, accurate and reliable and to report leading practices regarding data collection and reporting. Modifications are made in the State system addressing any data validity or logic discrepancies. Likewise, periodically the MSIX Child Count Report is run to identify child counts for funding purposes and reconcile student counts in MSIX with State data systems.

**2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

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

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	50
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	31
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	31

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were 28 non-responses. There were 15 attempts where addresses were found vacant, two home visit attempts and phone calls but the reviewer was unable to reach the family, 10 where the reviewer verified families had moved by manager/landlord, family member, and or neighbor and finally one address that the reviewer was unable to locate.

Procedures For Independent Prospective Re-Interviews	
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)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	SY 2014-15
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	No Response
Was the sampling statewide?	No Response

**Comment:**

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

**FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:**

- 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. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	
Phone Interviews	

Both	Both
<b>Obtaining Data From Families</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	No Response
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	No Response

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17 .

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

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

### 2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

#### 2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	151
K	87
1	133
2	132
3	157
4	111
5	126
6	119
7	105
8	130
9	129
10	125
11	95
12	106
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	199
Total	1,905

**Comments:** The increase in the number of students Eligible PFS during the performance period was due to: 1) An overall increase in the number of eligible students identified who met the state's PFS criteria (recently revised); 2) SEA training, monitoring, and focus on prioritizing service delivery for children and youth with PFS status; 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16
K	59
1	231
2	231
3	270
4	253
5	246
6	240
7	213
8	224
9	222
10	223
11	165
12	207
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	24
Total	2,824

**Comments:** Colorado's Limited English Proficient child count during the Performance Period increase was reflective in the number of student determined eligible. Districts reported an increase in the number of migrant students reported as Limited English Proficient. Each district determines the Language Proficiency on all students.



**2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	17
1	22
2	35
3	40
4	36
5	31
6	43
7	29
8	20
9	21
10	22
11	15
12	21
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>368</b>

**Comments:** Colorado's Children with Disabilities child count during the performance period increase was reflective in the number of student determined eligible. Districts reported an increase in the number of migrant children with disabilities.

**2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

In the table below, provide the 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, 2017 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	167
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	177
K	77
1	99
2	106
3	132
4	81
5	95
6	88
7	81
8	107
9	95
10	92
11	70
12	59
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	175
Total	1,701

**Comments:** The decrease in the number of students with QAD during the performance period was due to: 1) the decrease in ESSA MEP eligibility criteria which resulted in families who do not qualify under NCLB.

**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 2016-17 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	131
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	122
K	49
1	66
2	68
3	82
4	59
5	69
6	64
7	49
8	67
9	56
10	65
11	44
12	49
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	144
Total	1,184

**Comments:** The slight increase in the number of students with QAD Regular Year was due to: 1) improved communication and relationships with school districts and community agencies which resulted in more referrals of new families in the community; 2) change in ESSA MEP eligibility criteria resulted in families qualifying who did not qualify under NCLB.

**FAQ on Regular School Year:**

*How is "regular school year" defined?* For schools that operate on a traditional calendar, the regular school year is the period from the beginning of school in the State in the fall to the end in the spring, generally from September to June. For schools that operate on a year-round schedule without a traditional long summer break, the regular school term is the aggregate of all those periods throughout the year when the school (or part of the school) is in session providing the annual amount of instruction analogous to the traditional school-year regular term.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referrals During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	24
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	51
K	5
1	11
2	12
3	15
4	9
5	16
6	14
7	18
8	14
9	15
10	13
11	10
12	16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	102
Total	345

**Comments:** The number of children and youth who received a Referred Service during the performance period led to a decrease in the numbers reported for Referred Services. SEA's training, ensured when documenting a Referred Service during the performance period, the child must actually receive the service in order for it to be counted as a referral. An eligible migrant child must be the direct recipient of the referred service. Therefore, you will see an increase in the number of students who received a Counseling Serviced by MEP-Funded personnel.

**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	2
8	1
9	7
10	7
11	25
12	36
Ungraded	
Total	78

**Comments:** The number of eligible migrant students who were reported by districts as having dropped out of school increased. 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.

**FAQ on Dropouts:**

*How is "dropouts" defined?* The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2016-17 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2017-18) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another school district, private school or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), (b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or (c) death. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2016-17 performance period should not be reported in this item.

**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:** Colorado's number of eligible migrant students who were reported by the districts as having obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma was reported is "1".

### 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.
- ▮ Migrant children who are not included in your State's Category I or Category II child counts because they did not reside in your State for at least one day during the performance period (e.g., interstate collaboration), but who were eligible in another State and received instructional services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds in your State. If you report such children, please provide an explanatory comment in the comment box for each relevant CSPR question.

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)	126
K	77
1	122
2	122
3	143
4	104
5	115
6	107
7	100
8	119
9	118
10	114
11	82
12	98
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	101
Total	1,648

**Comments:** The increase in the number of PFS students served during the Regular Year is due to: 1) An overall increase in the number of eligible students identified who met the state's PFS criteria (recently revised); 2) SEA training, monitoring, and focus on prioritizing service delivery year-round for children and youth with PFS status; 3) improved communication and relationships with school districts and community agencies which resulted in more accurate reporting on identifying students who met PFS criteria (failing or at risk of failing academically).

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	118
K	63
1	105
2	99
3	122
4	96
5	105
6	101
7	88
8	99
9	104
10	107
11	77
12	57
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	181
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,522</b>

**Comments:** The increase in the number of PFS identified in the Summer Term is due to: 1) An overall increase in the number of eligible students identified during the Summer Term who met the state's PFS criteria (recently revised); 2) A shift in MEP staff schedules to move work days from the regular year into the summer to provide summer supplemental services to PFS students; 3) Focusing efforts to meet our MPOs related to literacy, specifically to PFS students, during summer months; 4) Feedback from our PAC related to a need for family literacy services during the summer for their children; 5) additional recruiters were hired during summer months to identify families who qualify for the program which increased the number of students who were identified as PFS.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	316
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	579
K	252
1	316
2	333
3	367
4	330
5	341
6	321
7	300
8	325
9	320
10	325
11	269
12	359
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	333
Total	5,386

**Comments:** The 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 during; 2) SEA requirements to identify and provide needed services to each Eligible Migrant Child, and 3) Improved data entry to document all supplemental services provided during the performance period.



**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	151
K	87
1	131
2	129
3	155
4	108
5	122
6	117
7	103
8	128
9	126
10	124
11	92
12	103
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	195
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,871</b>

**Comments:** The increase in the number of PFS students served during the performance period is due to: 1) An overall increase in the number of eligible students who met the state's PFS criteria (recently revised); 2) SEA training, monitoring, and focus on prioritizing service delivery for children and youth with PFS status; 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).

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	46
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	476
K	194
1	253
2	265
3	303
4	268
5	272
6	258
7	223
8	238
9	244
10	244
11	212
12	257
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	240
Total	3,993

**Comments:** The increase in the number of Instructional Services during the performance period 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 throughout the performance period; and 4) SEA increased focus on credit accrual for secondary students.

**2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	30	30	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87	102	////////////////////////////////////
K	13	13	////////////////////////////////////
1	38	41	////////////////////////////////////
2	38	44	////////////////////////////////////
3	51	54	////////////////////////////////////
4	45	49	////////////////////////////////////
5	54	56	////////////////////////////////////
6	46	50	////////////////////////////////////
7	35	36	////////////////////////////////////
8	32	32	28
9	47	41	182
10	45	37	203
11	39	32	168
12	40	34	231
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	54	54	34
Total	694	705	846

**Comments:** The increase in the number of Types of Instructional Services (reading and math) during the performance period 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 throughout the performance period; and 4) SEA increased focus on credit accrual for secondary students. 4) Re-focusing efforts to meet our MPOs related to literacy, specifically during summer months; and 5) Feedback from our Regional PAC related to a need for family literacy programs during the summer term. 6) Focusing efforts to meet our MPOs related to math, specifically to PFS students, during summer months

SEA increased its focus on credit accrual for secondary students. Credit Accrual was pulled from the State's Teacher Student Data Link (TSDL) for SY 2016-17 which reports course history on all students. Migrant pulled course credit for all students in grades 8-12. Therefore, the number of eligible migrant students who were reported having received high school credit increased during the performance period. Reporting Migrant course information through TSDL should eliminate duplicative data entry efforts and ensure the data is reported accurately.

**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. Beginning with SY 2016-17, high school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Support Services During the Performance Period</b>	<b>Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	315	226
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	576	253
K	251	92
1	314	108
2	331	112
3	364	135
4	328	103
5	339	124
6	320	131
7	299	128
8	323	153
9	320	165
10	323	160
11	269	140
12	356	181
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	332	124
Total	5,360	2,335

**Comments:** The increase in the number of students who received a Support Service during the performance period due to an overall increase in the number of eligible students with identified needs for support services.

The dramatic increase in the number of children and youth who received a Counseling Service during the performance period was due to clarification provided by the SEA for those Migrant students who received a counseling service. Counseling services took place between one or more counselors, advocates, liaisons, counselees and other MEP staff members.

**FAQs on Support Services:**

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

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

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

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

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

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	598
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	4,798
<b>Comments:</b> The number of eligible migrant children enrolled any time during the regular school year for schools who serve school age (grades K-12) migrant children is reflective in the number of students identified as eligible and those reported by the district as enrolled.	

**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	
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado's number of Schools where MEP Funds were consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) during the performance period is "zero".	

### 2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	597	4,215
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	39
Year round	46	3,564

**Comments:** The number of migrant children who were served by a Year Round MEP Project increase is due to 1) An increase in the number of Eligible Migrant Children and Youth identified 2) Those children and Youth who were provided services year round.

The number of students reported in Summer/Intersession term Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer only decreased. MEP students birth through age 3 were provide services as they were newly identified.

#### 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.

**2.4 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, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- | 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	84
Adult corrections		
Other		
Total	6	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1**

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			1,746		
Total Long Term Students Served			491		

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			383		
LEP Students			46		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			16		
Asian			4		
Black or African American			347		
Hispanic or Latino			727		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			6		
White			631		
Two or more races			15		
Total			1,746		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,477		
Female			269		
Total			1,746		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		
6			0		
7			0		
8			0		
9			0		
10			1		
11			5		
12			3		
13			17		
14			61		
15			150		
16			319		
17			451		
18			448		
19			207		
20			72		
21			12		
Total			1,746		

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, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

**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	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit										
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned a GED					54					
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 Earned high school course credits					1,590					
Enrolled in a GED program					82					
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					40					
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					480					
Obtained employment					3					

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Colorado’s State facilities are not allowed to have contact with students for 5 years after release or until their 21st birthday. Therefore, they do not have the ability to track students after exit.

**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, 2016, 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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			83		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			6		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			36		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			121		
Total			246		
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			90		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			13		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			83		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			106		
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

**2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	16	150
Other		
Total	16	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

**2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2**

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	15
Other	
Total	15
<b>Comments:</b> Colorado experienced the closure of one of its Title ID facilities during 2016-17. Despite CDE's best attempts to retrieve data from this facility, the people who worked there and their records were not available.	

**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				2,234	
Total Long Term Students Served				1,219	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )				774	
LEP Students				178	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native				52	
Asian				18	
Black or African American				497	
Hispanic or Latino				904	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander				8	
White				712	
Two or more races				43	
Total				2,234	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				1,652	
Female				582	
Total				2,234	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7				1	
8					
9				3	
10				11	
11				22	
12				47	
13				121	
14				217	
15				378	
16				547	
17				590	
18				237	
19				47	
20				8	
21				5	
Total				2,234	

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, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

**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.

<b>Outcomes (once per student), only after exit</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>		<b>Neglected Programs</b>		<b>Juvenile Detention</b>		<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>		<b>Other Programs</b>	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit							250			
<b>Outcomes (once per student)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>		<b>Neglected Programs</b>		<b>Juvenile Detention</b>		<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>		<b>Other Programs</b>	
# 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							97	15		
Obtained high school diploma							40	5		
<b>Outcomes (once per student per time period)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>		<b>Neglected Programs</b>		<b>Juvenile Detention</b>		<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>		<b>Other Programs</b>	
# 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							1,296	106		
Enrolled in a GED program							187	18		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education							36	8		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs							404	6		
Obtained employment							69	180		

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** 8 of the 15 LEA programs/facilities are permitted to track student outcomes after exit, although one facility didn't have a system in place to do so at this point, and others reported only incomplete post-exit data. Seven programs/facilities were not permitted to track student outcomes after exit either because they are not legally allowed to do so or because the confidential nature of clinical treatment and services makes this difficult. One is only allowed to collect data on students for 30 days from discharge. Another reported that once discharged from the program, the facility no longer serves as the custodial guardian and has no legal or ethical rights to know where they attend school, what schooling or transition services they receive, or any other clinical data. Another reported that students are only allowed to be contacted by the facility through a case worker or client manager referral for non-residential services on behalf of the former client.



**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, 2016, 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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				30	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				36	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				226	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				380	
Total				672	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

*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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams				35	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				55	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				255	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				329	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

*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.

<b>Purpose</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	8
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	5
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	8
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

13 districts were eligible in 2016-17: 3 Accredited, 1 Accredited-Distinction, 8 Accredited-Improvement and 1 Accredited-Priority Improvement or Turnaround. Activities and resources funded included: MTSS Coordinator at the secondary level to identify and prioritize students academically and/or behaviorally at risk. This position will include parent communications, scheduling meetings, establishing leveled interventions, progress monitoring, and decision making based on results. PD and trainings for the district MTSS Coordinators to support them in the work of identifying and prioritizing students academically and/or behaviorally at risk. Salary and benefits for one full time paraprofessional who will use pull-out small group instruction for students in kindergarten through fifth grade who need supplemental math interventions. Sub costs will be provided for a half day while Grade level teams meet once a month for 7 months for team planning and PLC work. Stipends and benefits for teachers for after school planning. Support for instruction for the Colorado Academic Standards will be given by purchase of curriculum for Core teachers including printed material, online accessibility and PD. Building Leadership teams will meet regularly to review systems and strategies and data that effect the intervention programs that students are offered. Organize and pay a stipend to MTSS team members to meet and analyze individual and school level academic and behavioral data to provide individualized and school-wide support based upon local and state measures. Subs will be hired to cover teachers for various reasons such as peer evaluations, updating curriculum maps, etc. Math PD for K-12 staff to develop a deeper understanding of the 8 Standards of Mathematical Practice Writing exemplar trainings provided to fully understand writing across the curriculum as related to the new standards. Secure a technology specialist to train building level staff to assist with properly implementing all aspects of PD for technology such as data systems and preparations for assessments. Continue to implement school culture program with PD for all new staff. School Culture team will meet to discuss behavior and attendance data and work toward solutions to continue to move the building forward. Secure specialists from out of district to evaluate the schools and their progress toward their school improvement ratings and initiatives. DIBELS trainings for new teachers and student engagement trainings for all middle school staff. Classroom specific technology purchases and associated PD. Additional funds to provide more direct instruction for kindergarten and 1st grade ELL students which increases language acquisition skills and academic success. Recruit new teachers in-state and out-of-state to provide students with the highest quality instruction. Provide essential supports for those recruiting efforts, including travel and registration to recruiting events. Partially fund one Family Liaison who will work with the administrative team to insure that parent engagement strategies for Spanish-speaking parents are aligned and effective. Provide a stipend and benefits to the Accounting Manager for the fiscal management of federal funds and the consolidated application. The teacher/mentor instructional coach will establish a systemic process to support new teachers in their instructional practice. The district will embed this process in its practice to support and retain teachers. After School Program - Small group instruction in reading and math for student sub groups (free and reduced, Native American) scoring below benchmark and progress monitoring assessments. Interventionists to provide additional targeted instruction in reading for at risk students as identified using DIBELS, STAR and progress monitoring data. Skills Navigator Web-based Intervention System. Equipment—Chromebooks. Fund a K-5 Curriculum Coordinator who is responsible for studying, evaluating and implementing reach-based curriculum and instruction, assists in the evaluation of academic programs and their effect on student achievement and leads and coordinates PD surrounding the curriculum and instruction. Site license for My Learning Plan, an online tool used to track PD opportunities for all staff.

Purchase 350 copies of Next Steps in Guided Reading for K-5 teachers and lit paras. To be used in district book study of guided writing to support the reading process.

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

Purchase K-5 math curriculum which includes a technology and intervention component. The district needs to update the K-5 Math program to align to Colorado Academic Standards. PD for the implementation of K-5 math curriculum. ADD+Vantage Math Recovery course teacher tool kit. Educational Technology Lab to give students better access to technology for testing, enrichment activities and learning. Supplies and resources for incoming kindergarten students and parents to ensure a smooth transition to school. Supplies for the reading and math intervention programs. PD for reading, math, and school climate & culture. Teachers and classroom aides will participate in ongoing PD provided by PEBC, Learning Keys, and other similar opportunities. Purchase multi-media projectors to replace older ones that are no longer functioning. Benchmark, interim, and diagnostic assessments used as an indicator of teachers' implementation of the curriculum documents. The assessments are also used to identify struggling students and the areas in which they need targeted instruction. The district will use Alpine Achievement as an assessment warehouse to track student data on TCAP, NWEA, the READ Act assessments, the School Readiness assessment, and the progress monitoring in Intervention classes. Primary MAPS assessments from the NWEA to measure teachers' implementation of the curriculum documents and students' mastery of the standards.

Messaging system to communicate regularly with parents including: reminders of events and meetings, emergency notices, and notices of student absences. Software to compile information from the Data Walks (classroom walkthroughs). The software will collect, tabulate, and organize data from the Data Walks which will then be used by grade level and content area teams to make goals and adjust lesson plans. Accelerated Math program from Renaissance Learning to provide supplemental instruction to students and to measure their progress toward mastery of the standards. Tutoring support will be provided to identify students who are at risk of not meeting proficiency standards in Language Arts and Math. The district will continue to implement comprehensive data analysis to address school performance challenges. An Assessment Coordinator/Data Analysis Person at each building will continue to review existing school and district student academic performance and provide support to other staff members on the use of data to inform instruction. Stipends for district staff to implement a differentiated instruction plan. A staff member will receive a stipend to organize Family Fun Nights for parents, students and extended family members. Family Fun Nights provide learning games and other activities that can be continued at home, and provide an opportunity to build relationships between parents and staff members. Contract with the San Luis Valley Behavioral Health Group to provide on-campus services to students experiencing high percentage of poverty, unemployment, drug and alcohol use/abuse, teen pregnancy, and other negative factors. Provide students with extended day and expanded learning opportunities through after school tutoring programs, Credit Recovery, Friday School and Jump Start Summer School.

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

**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

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

<b>State Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2016-17?	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

**2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	6	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		6

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2016 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	212,616.00	
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		212,616.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>212,616.00</b>	<b>212,616.00</b>
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

This section collects graduation rates.

**2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2016-17). 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	64,140	50,700	79.05
American Indian or Alaska Native	549	352	64.12
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,169	1,922	88.61
<i>Asian</i>	1,973	1,772	89.81
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	196	150	76.53
Black or African American	3,175	2,284	71.94
Hispanic or Latino	20,601	14,648	71.10
White	35,456	29,738	83.87
Two or more races	2,190	1,756	80.18
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,553	3,723	56.81
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,685	4,961	64.55
Economically disadvantaged students	30,138	20,646	68.50

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

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

The response is limited to 500 characters.

The American Indian/Alaska Native student group reported an unexpected decline in graduation rates in 2015-16. In 2016-17 this rate rose to match consistent trends. The English Learner count is steadily increasing in Colorado. The dropout rate for ELs is decreasing (improving). It's at its lowest point since 2003-04; the 2016-17 EL dropout rate was down to 3.8% compared to 5.1% as recently as 2011-12.

<sup>4</sup> The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability 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

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved *ESEA* Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in section 2.12.1. All other states should follow the instructions in section 2.12.2. 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<sup>5</sup> under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (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:** Colorado switched to identifying schools for ESSA Targeted and Comprehensive Support beginning in 2017-18. Our list of those schools has been submitted. Colorado did not identify schools as priority or focus in 2017-18.

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

## 2.12.2 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 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>6</sup>
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *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:**

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