

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report 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 *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts 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 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
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>Friday, May 8, 2009, 3:40:26 PM</u>
_____ Signature		_____ Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009
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 *NCLB* 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 *NCLB* 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	17,133	14,556	85.0
4	16,420	13,701	83.4
5	14,953	12,562	84.0
6	8,291	6,226	75.1
7	6,748	4,266	63.2
8	6,897	3,834	55.6
High School	4,612	1,564	33.9
Total	75,054	56,709	75.6
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 *NCLB* 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	17,054	13,792	80.9
4	16,449	13,209	80.3
5	14,954	11,651	77.9
6	8,273	6,539	79.0
7	6,739	4,963	73.6
8	6,893	5,209	75.6
High School	4,506	3,346	74.3
Total	74,868	58,709	78.4
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 *NCLB* 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	8,788	8,122	92.4
4	8,627	7,896	91.5
5	8,152	7,550	92.6
6	3,897	3,414	87.6
7	3,977	3,393	85.3
8	3,698	2,974	80.4
High School	1,056	592	56.1
Total	38,195	33,941	88.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 *NCLB* 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	8,766	7,843	89.5
4	8,618	7,746	89.9
5	8,130	7,184	88.4
6	3,882	3,572	92.0
7	3,961	3,569	90.1
8	3,689	3,339	90.5
High School	1,055	918	87.0
Total	38,101	34,171	89.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	17,514
Limited English proficient students	46,824
Students who are homeless	4,190
Migratory students	2,995
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category sets B, C, D and E.

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,661
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,270
Black, non-Hispanic	13,593
Hispanic	91,364
White, non-Hispanic	48,993
Total	159,881
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category set A.

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2		246			246
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	184	2,458	10	3	2,655
K	1,246	20,582	109	6	21,943
1	2,122	21,215	154	10	23,501
2	2,327	19,937	143	26	22,433
3	2,050	19,161	161	41	21,413
4	1,779	18,310	120	48	20,257
5	1,460	16,535	104	57	18,156
6	983	8,990	76	73	10,122
7	601	7,270	47	100	8,018
8	322	7,462	34	118	7,936
9	263	2,457	49	238	3,007
10	243	2,187	38	221	2,689
11	115	1,731	25	223	2,094
12	66	1,661	9	286	2,022
Ungraded		55		1	56
TOTALS	13,761	150,257	1,079	1,451	166,548
Comments:					

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X134, that is data group 670, category set A.

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

The following sections request 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.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	3,331
Reading/language arts	11,149
Science	8
Social studies	8
Vocational/career	44
Other instructional services	152
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group 549, category set A.

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.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	84
Supporting guidance/advocacy	653
Other support services	17
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036, that is data group 549, category set 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	349.00	
Paraprofessionals ¹	59.00	93.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	13.00	
Clerical support staff	11.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	11.00	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>.

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	1,703.00	94.0
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)**2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the reporting program year July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	6
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules.

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	314
2. Adults participating	320
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	195
4. Participating children	420
a. Birth through 2 years	150
b. Age 3 through 5	176
c. Age 6 through 8	94
c. Above age 8	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	203
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	206
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	194
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	170
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 th grade at the time of enrollment	105
Comments: #3 is based on free/reduced lunch data.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2008). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	26
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	50
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	137
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	98
5. Total families enrolled	311
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

In the space below, provide any explanatory information necessary for understanding the data provided in this section on performance indicators.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.2.2.5 - One program did not complete the PALS testing resulting in the high number of children (9) with missing data.

2.2.2.6 - Colorado collects data for this indicator which includes children reading on grade level and children making one year's growth in literacy skills in one year. The state performance indicator for this data will be separated into two indicators for 2008-09 so data will be available for number of children who read on or above grade level.

One program did not report data for this indicator this year. Their school district changed reading assessments so no growth data was available.

2.2.2.7 - Colorado programs are required to report PEP data on 10 families per program due to the time intensity of using the instrument. The 59 families reported in this indicator are that same families for both scales and represent an average of 10 families from each of the six programs.

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre- and post-test", an individual must have completed **both** the pre- and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	61	43	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one learning level.
CASAS			
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST			
CASAS	115	78	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one learning level.
TABE			
Other	51	39	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one learning level. (Assessment is the BEST Plus).
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	20	16	
GED			
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED	12	5	
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre- and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post- Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	53	34	23	15	Missing data on 4 eligible children. All 34 children who were tested were English Language Learners. 15 students were exempted due to inability to understand directions in English.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	53	34	20	15	Missing data on 4 eligible children. All 34 children who were tested were English Language Learners. 15 students were exempted due to inability to understand directions in English.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2008.
3. The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	54	30	15	12.6	Missing data on 9 eligible children. All 30 children who were tested were English Language Learners.
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	23	17	Sources for all levels are district reading assessments. * CO collects this data to include children reading on grade level and children who made one year's growth in literacy skills during the 2007-08 school year. Missing data on 2 Kindergarteners.
1	20	14	
2	20	13	
3	11	8	
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	59	49	Improvement was shown by an increase in the scale score (averaged score of subscale scores) from Time 1 to Time 2. New and returning families were included.
PEP Scale II	59	52	Improvement was shown by an increase in the scale score (averaged score of subscale scores) from Time 1 to Time 2. New and returning families were included.
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data – migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

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

FAQs at 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	396
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,057
K	531
1	664
2	618
3	603
4	521
5	530
6	508
7	453
8	489
9	457
10	413
11	287
12	250
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,674
Total	9,451
Comments:	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1.

2.3.1.2 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. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	16
1	49
2	65
3	81
4	55
5	71
6	53
7	57
8	61
9	60
10	40
11	31
12	19
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	166
Total	824

Comments: The State has experienced a decrease in eligible migrant students. The decrease in PFS numbers reflects the decrease in total number of eligible migrant students. We will be evaluating our PFS process to align with the CNA and SDP.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	488
1	582
2	506
3	418
4	412
5	351
6	285
7	288
8	238
9	240
10	217
11	125
12	87
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	4,237
Comments: The LEP numbers have increased. The collection for this category is being tracked by the migrant student State ID's through the State's data warehouse system which has given us a more accurate number.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	29
K	51
1	36
2	40
3	46
4	52
5	43
6	41
7	40
8	35
9	26
10	15
11	14
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	483

Comments: The IDEA numbers have increased. The collection for this category is being tracked by the migrant student State ID's through the State's data warehouse system which has given us a more accurate number.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	228	132	35	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	239	273	281	264
K	114	139	123	155
1	120	156	210	174
2	126	162	150	180
3	135	133	155	178
4	105	124	110	182
5	113	89	161	166
6	95	112	143	157
7	94	102	113	143
8	98	110	124	156
9	92	93	94	129
10	76	73	137	126
11	56	68	64	98
12	28	55	82	84
Ungraded	0	0	0	0
Out-of-school	487	425	353	385
Total	2,206	2,246	2,335	2,577

Comments: Colorado has experienced a decrease in identification. This decrease can be attributed to the following factors:

1. State legislation on immigration reform which affects the employers hiring undocumented workers, and required identification for specific states services. The legislation has made a significant impact on family mobility.
2. Families seeking employment in areas other than agriculture.
3. Families settling in their current residence.
4. Agricultural employment opportunities are decreasing.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	254
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	594
K	286
1	347
2	334
3	313
4	243
5	254
6	246
7	226
8	241
9	210
10	201
11	112
12	125
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	909
Total	4,895
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	12
8	5
9	25
10	25
11	33
12	21
Ungraded	0
Total	121

Comments: The dropout numbers have increased. The collection for this category is being tracked by the migrant student state ID's through the State's data warehouse system which has given us a more accurate number.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your state	2
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State NCLB Assessments.

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	498	497
4	496	495
5	486	483
6	445	440
7	436	435
8	391	388
9	410	400
10	301	286
11		
12		
Ungraded		
Total	3,463	3,424

Comments: This past year, Colorado has experienced a decrease in eligible migrant students. Less migrant students were enrolled and tested on the State reading/language arts assessments for the 2007-2008 SY due to the overall decrease in numbers.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	497	496
4	498	497
5	492	490
6	448	447
7	436	436
8	392	391
9	407	402
10	301	289
11		
12		
Ungraded		
Total	3,471	3,448

Comments: This past year, Colorado has experienced a decrease in eligible migrant students. Less migrant students were enrolled and tested on the State math assessments for the 2007-2008 SY due to the overall decrease in numbers.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) 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)(1–3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the **regular** school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	8
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	280
K	531
1	616
2	537
3	515
4	514
5	458
6	441
7	443
8	414
9	392
10	332
11	259
12	160
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	5,903

Comments: In the last five years Colorado has experienced a substantial decrease in migrant students, almost 50%. Realizing that with this demographic shift, needs change and so do services. Services are guided through our CNA and SDP and will be evaluated through our evaluation.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	16
1	43
2	64
3	71
4	52
5	66
6	47
7	54
8	59
9	55
10	40
11	29
12	16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	615
Comments: Colorado has experienced a decrease in eligible migrant students. The decrease in PFS for regular school year is due to decrease of total number of students.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served 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
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	3
1	2
2	3
3	2
4	4
5	2
6	2
7	3
8	3
9	0
10	0
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	26
Comments: The State continued to serve migrant students for an additional school year because comparable services were not available through other programs. The student's eligibility ended during the school term 2007-2008.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are 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.

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	175
K	319
1	395
2	365
3	345
4	351
5	298
6	282
7	300
8	257
9	265
10	244
11	185
12	127
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	23
Total	3,934

Comments: Colorado has experienced a decrease in eligible migrant students. The decrease of Instructional Services provided for regular school year is due to decrease of total number of students.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. 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	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	100	144	
K	264	261	
1	329	324	
2	316	314	
3	297	287	
4	289	287	
5	245	241	
6	225	221	
7	243	240	
8	219	211	
9	219	214	131
10	191	189	182
11	150	150	138
12	109	109	115
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	17	18	50
Total	3,213	3,210	616

Comments: We at the SEA believe that in response to provisions of the guidance on supplement vs supplant many LEA's are reluctant to code instructional services in Reading and Math. We will work to clarify appropriate further guidance so that we more accurately identify instructional support

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	323	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,068	33
K	585	88
1	719	120
2	653	79
3	620	88
4	604	87
5	545	89
6	514	81
7	516	87
8	483	64
9	483	61
10	419	62
11	290	34
12	236	33
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	621	1
Total	8,679	1,007

Comments: Colorado has experienced a decrease in the number of eligible migrant students. The decrease in support service is due to the overall decrease in total numbers. Through our CNA and SDP processes the secondary initiative with focus on graduation was identified in the CNA and is implemented in our SDP. Therefore, more students received a counseling service to promote graduation and decrease the dropout rate.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another 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 were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	180
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	397
K	70
1	62
2	53
3	51
4	46
5	46
6	46
7	40
8	43
9	57
10	32
11	17
12	18
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	341
Total	1,499
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the **summer/intersession term** instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is *EDFacts* file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do **not** count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	141
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	237
K	117
1	177
2	184
3	172
4	145
5	140
6	138
7	115
8	112
9	129
10	105
11	70
12	54
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	776
Total	2,812

Comments: The number of student served during the summer session is less. Focus was throughout the year in order to ensure academic achievement. The Out of School youth category includes students who were designated as OS but were ages P0-P2. Out of school youth received support services during the summer session.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	5
1	18
2	24
3	21
4	17
5	24
6	16
7	18
8	14
9	18
10	13
11	8
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	84
Total	290
Comments: By the definition of Colorado's PFS, students are considered PFS if they have a QAD from 9-1 to 6-1 of the current year, have interrupted school, and who are failing or most at risk of failing. The increase in total number of students that are priority for services during the summer is due to students who were recruited during the summer months and have a summer enrollment however, the qualifying arrival date (QAD) was during the regular year.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served 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
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:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are 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.

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	4
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12
K	28
1	50
2	67
3	55
4	43
5	25
6	22
7	30
8	23
9	26
10	21
11	12
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	425
Comments: Colorado has experienced a decrease in the number of migrant students attending a district held summer school.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. 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	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	2	2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9	7	
K	26	24	
1	50	35	
2	67	49	
3	53	44	
4	40	33	
5	25	20	
6	18	18	
7	20	27	
8	18	18	
9	24	21	46
10	20	18	45
11	11	9	35
12	4	2	7
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	2	2	18
Total	389	329	151

Comments: The decrease in students who received a reading and math instruction has decreased due to the number of students who attended a district held summer school.

Through our CNA and SDP processes the secondary initiative with focus on graduation was identified in the CNA and is implemented in our SDP. Therefore, more students participated in credit accrual opportunities to promote graduation and decrease the dropout rate.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	154	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	335	0
K	169	0
1	202	0
2	206	0
3	203	0
4	179	0
5	157	0
6	153	0
7	143	0
8	124	0
9	140	0
10	114	0
11	71	0
12	37	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	401	0
Total	2,788	0
Comments: Colorado experience a decrease in the number of students who received a support service during the summer. Immigration legislation has made a significant impact on family mobility, family access, and family confidence in government programs.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another 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 were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	7
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	29
K	15
1	23
2	24
3	28
4	19
5	16
6	14
7	9
8	10
9	5
10	3
11	3
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	52
Total	258
Comments: More families were referred to community agencies and received a tangible service from these agencies. (Dental, food, clothing, housing services) This is a reflection of our enhanced collaboration throughout the State.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	374
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,020
K	515
1	650
2	585
3	550
4	512
5	478
6	449
7	453
8	432
9	427
10	372
11	269
12	231
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,818
Total	9,135

Comments: Out of school category includes students who were P0-P2. As the new regulations came out students who are not attending a school should be listed as out of school. (00)

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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 year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	905
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	9,451
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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 year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	0
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 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 by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

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

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	111	1,322
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	10	51
Year round	113	1,327

Comments: Colorado has collaborated with school districts to provide summer academic services. However the attendance of students attending these district held summer schools is significantly decreased due to legislation reform and families access to those schools.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	52	19.25	101	30.70
Counselors	14	9.59	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	9	5.77	31	20.26
Recruiters	30	29.50	21	20.50
Records transfer staff	12	10.20	7	6.30
Comments: In the last five years Colorado has experienced a substantial decrease in migrant students, almost 50%. Realizing that with this demographic shift, needs change and so do services. The change in key MEP personnel is due to a conscience effort to provide the needed services to our changing population. These changes are guided through our CNA and SDP and will be evaluated through our evaluation.				

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	4	2.10	15	15.00
<p>Comments: More of the services are coming from the region instead of using the district to provide the services. The money is held at the regional office to provide the service. Realizing that with this demographic shift, needs change and so do services. The change in key MEP personnel is due to a conscience effort to provide the needed services to our changing population. These changes are guided through our CNA and SDP and will be evaluated through our evaluation.</p>				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of *ESEA*).

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, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- 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.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **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. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	6	122
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	0
Total	7	138

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: At the Youthful Offender System, students are incarcerated and attend year-round school.	
At the Zebulon Pike Youth Services facility, out of 82 students of the total population, 12 of those youth were here only within the report year, and 70 were included in the previous year count.	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	6
Adult Corrections	1
Other	0
Total	7
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served 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	0	0	1,575	139	0
Long Term Students Served	0	0	1,032	139	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	21	0	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	11	0	0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	280	29	0
Hispanic	0	0	508	69	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	689	41	0
Total	0	0	1,509	139	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	1,258	135	0
Female	0	0	317	4	0
Total	0	0	1,575	139	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	2	0	0
13	0	0	7	0	0
14	0	0	40	1	0
15	0	0	197	9	0
16	0	0	364	30	0
17	0	0	399	48	0
18	0	0	377	47	0
19	0	0	138	4	0
20	0	0	47	0	0
21	0	0	4	0	0
Total	0	0	1,575	139	0

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: There were 66 students coded as "other" in the race/ethnicity category for juvenile corrections. But, there is no place to enter this information.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	6	1	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	3	1	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	5	1	0
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	1,402	139	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	186	13	0
Comments: This information was not tracked by Mount View Youth Services Center in 07-08, but will be for future years.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	586	0	0
Earned a GED	0	50	13	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	17	36	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	21	52	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	16	52	0
Comments: This information was not tracked by Mount View Youth Services Center in 07-08, but will be for future years. Platte Valley Youth Services Center does not have a process in place to award diplomas. They will have one in place for next year.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	530	87	0
Comments: This information was not tracked by Mount View Youth Services Center in 07-08, but will be for future years.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	0	48	1	0
Obtained employment	0	49	3	0
Comments: This information was not tracked by Mount View Youth Services Center in 07-08, but will be for future years. Platte Valley Youth Services facility is an assessment center and while they have youth there for 3 to 4 months they are not ending there placement there and this makes it difficult to have them leave the facility unsecured.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent 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 pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, 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. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	541	109	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	519	82	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	60	29	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	36	10	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	9	5	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	261	9	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	153	29	0
Comments: For Zebulon Pike Youth services, the balance of students were either still in the facility as of 6/30/08 or were discharged and test scores are not available.				

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	525	124	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	502	82	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	42	13	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	52	12	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	18	8	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	288	9	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	102	40	0
Comments:				

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. 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	3	104
Neglected programs	22	133
Juvenile detention	6	231
Juvenile corrections	7	293
Other	3	140
Total	41	198

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: Urban Peak operates a shelter for homeless/transient youth. The length of stay varies. Many of our students transition out of the shelter and into community based housing or "couch surfing", but do return to the shelter to pursue educational goals.	

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 LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	3
Neglected programs	22
Juvenile detention	6
Juvenile corrections	7
Other	3
Total	41
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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 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	187	1,718	460	1,956	268
Total Long Term Students Served	96	827	376	1,635	179

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	7	33	31	51	4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	15	4	19	3
Black, non-Hispanic	36	388	86	364	45
Hispanic	48	527	115	700	89
White, non-Hispanic	95	718	224	820	127
Total	187	1,681	460	1,954	268

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	104	1,143	329	1,190	229
Female	83	574	131	766	39
Total	187	1,717	460	1,956	268

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	0	4	0	0	0
6	0	2	0	0	0
7	0	16	0	0	0
8	0	15	0	0	0
9	0	26	1	0	0
10	0	51	4	0	0
11	0	63	6	11	1
12	1	92	11	33	3
13	0	168	30	91	16
14	16	214	51	184	25
15	25	283	69	310	66
16	47	306	79	418	80
17	59	272	101	490	61
18	30	99	65	306	15
19	8	48	31	97	1
20	1	36	12	14	0
21	0	23	0	2	0
Total	187	1,718	460	1,956	268

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

Comments: For the race/ethnicity category, there are actually 37 students in neglected programs coded as "other" and 2 students in juvenile corrections coded as "other." There is no place to enter this data.

There was one "transgender" student in Urban Peak, which is why the male/female totals don't align for neglected programs.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

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, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	3	18	12	3
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	7	6	1
Awarded GED(s)	2	8	10	3
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	103	852	2,042	262
Enrolled in a GED program	32	244	74	59
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	24	545	470	136
Earned a GED	25	62	239	25
Obtained high school diploma	1	83	50	4
Were accepted into post-secondary education	1	14	49	9
Enrolled in post-secondary education	1	10	45	6

Comments: The Beacon Center School cannot track enrollment post-secondary education.

One student at PSI Cendar Springs Southgate School was a runaway and did not return to school or home.

At Midway Youth Services, typically, they do not have data on students after they are discharged. This data is to the best of their knowledge.

Urban Peak's education program provides GED preparatory classes and we do not provide high school classes or credits. We have developed a Partnership with Colorado Youth for a Change to assist youth/students in re-enrolling in highschool. For the current year being reported, data is not available, although this information will be available in the future. We have recently incorporated a series of workshops "College Connection" to assist our youth/students in exploring higher/postsecondary education and to provide on-going support/mentoring when enrolled in postsecondary education. Due to the nature of transient/homeless youth in our shelter much of the education information is self-reported. A majority of our clients are living independently (adults over 18) and do not report education/IEP history.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	48	300	1,182	268
<p>Comments: At Lost and Found, Inc. all students have the opportunity to go out on work-orders in the community for pay. Also, the students that move on to our Transitional Living Program are required to gain employment.</p> <p>At Turning Point, all students in the education program participate in vocational education.</p> <p>Urban Peak provides programming for the Office of Economic Development. We provide a Job Readiness Training (JRT) curriculum as well as case-management services for WIA services.</p>				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	5	172	59	48
Obtained employment	41	210	247	30
<p>Comments: At Family Tree Gemini, students are enrolled in the Jefferson County Youthworks program once given approval by their caseworker.</p>				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent 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 format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, 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. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	51	545	686	146
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	21	473	934	67

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	3	39	329	7
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	6	82	80	7
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	9	153	267	13
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	79	103	12
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	3	120	155	28

Comments: At Ridge View Academy, the MAP test is administered four times a year at about three-month intervals. This interval was chosen to capture results for as many students as possible given that RVA enrolls and exits about the same number of students each month. According to Northwest Evaluation Association staff, normative data for a group of students comparable to those served at Ridge View is not available. Therefore, Ridge View has chosen to measure growth based on the mean fall to spring growth for more than 2.3 million students assessed with the MAP in 2005.

At Shiloh Home, runaways, students taken into detention, immediate discharges, and students still with them are causes for long term students not taking pre and post tests.

At Turning Point- Center for Youth and Family Development, all of their students take pre-tests in math and reading; however, due to unexpected exits, many do not receive post-tests.

For Urban Peak, this data is difficult to obtain. Due to the nature of transient/homeless youth and their education program being voluntary. They do have a new database in which this information will be tracked.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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, 2007, through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	54	626	795	165
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	21	445	947	76

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	1	46	408	2
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7	64	56	8
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	8	118	250	17
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	86	100	20
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	5	131	133	29

Comments: Please note, for Arapahoe House Stepwise Program, that the average length of stay on the unit is 70 days. Only one third of all of the students served during the review period met the long term requirement of at least 90 days needed to measure academic growth. During Fiscal 2007/08 the Woodcock, McGrew, Werder Mini Battery of Assessment (MBA) was used to assess basic skills at admit and the Wide Range Achievement Tool (WRAT III) was used at discharge. While these tools were somewhat compatible, a true measure of academic gain is unlikely. In addition, educational staff were not adequately informed of the time frame in which academic outcomes would be measured. As a result post assessments were not regularly completed or reported to clinicians who are responsible for entering scores into the agency data system from which data for this report are extracted. A partial effort was made to remedy this situation in the fall of 2008 when the WRAT IV was adopted to be used with students pre and post admission. This is now occurring. This reporter took over responsibility for the report in December 2008. Now that the reporting criteria are understood, every effort will be made to shore up communication on the unit so that the appropriate data is input to measure academic growth data for our clients. As such, the best results will be available for the second half of this fiscal year, from January through June. In addition, it should be understood that shorter lengths of stay in treatment are rapidly becoming the statewide norm and it is expected that few students will fall within the range of a 90 or more day stay for reporting purposes. All students are currently receiving a pre and post assessment and those who fit the criteria will be reported on during the next reporting period.

This data was not collected at the DeNier Center, as it is in the process of implementing NWEA testing, which will monitor the progress of all student achievement.

The Discover Home data was never found when the new director began in August of 2008. Currently all clients have been administered the WRAT IV. Upon discharge they will be assessed again.

For Excelsior Youth Center, for this reporting year, the number of students taking both pre and post test is lower due to many students discharging before post testing could be completed or refusing to take the test due to high anxiety levels or not giving a valid effort on the test. Additionally, Excelsior Youth Center is in the process of changing its data collection system for the purpose of collecting more detailed post discharge data on students as well as data needed for this report.

For Griffith Centers for Children, the students who showed no improvement were those who tested out during the pre-test.

At Youthtrack Jeffco, the students were tested with the KTEA based on age level, not grade level. Scores were translated in the KTEA into grade level. In #1, students that tested below average or lower were listed as "below grade level."

For Reflections for Youth, at the time of this report we were administering pre assessment exams to students in the areas of reading and math but due to the circumstances around student discharge we did not have post test exams for most of our students. As part of our goal to implement RTI and progress monitoring this year, we will have this data in the future.

For Midway Youth Services, they began addressing math needs in '08-'09 therefore there is no math data for last year because students were not assessed in this area nor services provided. This year we are giving the students the PIAT upon entering and exit as well as the BRI and Key Math 3 for Title I pre/post. All students who were given a pre-test were below their grade level.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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

This section collects data on student behaviors under the *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act*.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in 1st degree, second degree, and vehicular assaults.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08 school year	2005-06: Not collected	2005-06: Not collected	2006-07	2006-07
				2006-07: Baseline year	2006-07: Baseline year		
				2007-08: 5%	2007-08: 58%		
				2008-09: 65%			
				2009-10: 70%			
<p>Comments: The Safe Schools Act was amended in the spring of 2006 to separate 1st and 2nd degree and vehicular assaults from 3rd degree assaults. It also combined disorderly conduct, which is defined as fighting in a public place, to the 3rd degree assaults reporting category. This was intended to better inform the public about the degree to which the most common behavior, fighting, was happening in schools.</p>							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct (fights).	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Not collected	2005-06: Not collected	2006-07	2006-07
				2006-07: Baseline	2006-07: Baseline		
				2007-08: 5%	2007-08: 39%		
				2008-09: 45%			
				2009-10: 50%			
<p>Comments: The Safe Schools Act was amended in the spring of 2006 to separate 1st and 2nd degree and vehicular assaults from 3rd degree assaults. It also combined disorderly conduct, which is defined as fighting in a public place, to the 3rd degree assaults reporting category. This was intended to better inform the public about the degree to which the most common behavior, fighting, was happening in schools.</p>							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in In-School Suspensions for 3rd degree assaults and	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via			2005-06: Not collected	2005-06: Not collected		
				2006-07: Baseline	2006-07: Baseline		
				2007-08: 5%	2007-08: 27%		
				2008-09: 35%			

disorderly conduct (fights).	the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2009-10: 40%		2006-07	2006-07
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in Out-of-School Suspensions for 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct (fights).	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Not collected.	2005-06: Not collected	2006-07	2006-07
				2006-07: Baseline	2006-07: Baseline		
				2007-08: 5%	2007-08: 41%		
				2008-09: 50%			
				2009-10: 60%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in Expulsions for 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct (fights).	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Not collected	2005-06: Not collected	2006-07	2006-07
				2006-07: Baseline	2006-07: Baseline		
				2007-08: 5%	2007-08: 27%		
				2008-09: 35%			
				2009-10: 40%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline		
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 3.9%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 35%		

Reduction in possessions of dangerous weapons incidents.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2008-09: 40%		2005-06	2006-07
				2009-10: 45%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in In-School Suspensions for weapons.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	20005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 35% increase		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 27%		
				2008-09: 30%			
				2009-10: 35%			
Comments: A possible explanation for such an increase for in-school suspensions for weapons could be that more districts were receiving grants from the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants. Therefore, schools had more options for serving students. Also, school resource officers are fairly institutionalized at this point so more students may have been getting caught with drugs. This is speculation only but could, nonetheless, contribute to the increase in 2006-07. The goal was met in 2007-08 so adjustments were made to the goals in 2008-09 and 2009-10.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in Out-of-School Suspensions for weapons.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 7%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 21%		
				2008-09: 25%			
				2009-10: 30%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline		

Reduction in expulsions for weapons.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 5.10%	2005-06	2005-06
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 48%		
				2008-09: 55%			
				2009-10: 60%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in alcohol-related incidents.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 17.8%		
				2007-08: 20%	2007-08: 55%		
				2008-09: 60%			
				2009-10: 65%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of In-school Suspensions for alcohol incidents	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 16% increase		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 63%		
				2008-09: 70%			
				2009-10: 75%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	---------	--------------------	----------	---------------------------

Indicator	Data Source	Collection	collection	Targets	Performance	Baseline	Established
Reduction in Out-of-School Suspensions for alcohol.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 18.3%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 54%		
				2008-09: 60%			
				2009-10: 65%			

Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in Expulsions for alcohol.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 45%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 62%		
				2008-09: 70%			
				2009-10: 75%			

Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in tobacco-related incidents.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 9%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 43%		
				2008-09: 50%			
				2009-10: 55%			

Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in drug-related incidents.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 2.7%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 40%		
				2008-09: 45%			
				2009-10: 50%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in In-School Suspensions for drug-related incidents.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 60% increase		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 15%		
				2008-09: 20%			
				2009-10: 25%			
Comments: A possible explanation for such an increase for in-school suspensions for drugs could be that more districts were receiving grants from the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants. Therefore, schools had more options for serving students. Also, school resource officers are fairly institutionalized at this point so more students may have been getting caught with drugs. This is speculation only but could, nonetheless, contribute to the increase in 2006-07. The goal was met in 2007-08 so adjustments were made to the goals in 2008-09 and 2009-10.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in Out-of-School Suspensions for drug-related incidents.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 2.6%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 40%		
				2008-09: 45%			
				2009-10: 50%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior							

Support initiative.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in Expulsions for drug-related incidents.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: 89%		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 37%		
				2008-09: 45%			
				2009-10: 50%			
Comments: Because the 2007-08 goal far exceeded expectations, performance measures for 2008-09 and 2009-2010 have been adjusted. We believe progress can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the institutionalization of strategies such as the SDFSC "Principles of Effectiveness" to support research-based practices, the State's increased services for students participating in the Expelled and At-Risk Student Services grants, and the growth of the statewide Positive Behavior Support initiative.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in number of schools reducing truancy rates.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Indicator" report via the Automated Data Exchange	Annually	2007-08	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06: Baseline	2005-06	2005-06
				2006-07: 10%	2006-07: Was not analyzed.		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: Not yet analyzed.		
				2008-09: 20%			
				2009-10: 25%			
Comments: Due to a lack of resources and attention needed on other Title IV administrative requirements, we are having difficulty with accomplishing a more timely analysis of the school-by-school truancy rates. (We do meet the requirement to publicly report the school-by-school truancy rates on an annual basis, although the lag time between having the data and posting the data on our website is increasing.) The reduction of funding has resulted in a reduction of staff assigned to the program.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Use, possession or sale of alcohol on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events.
Illicit drug related	Use, possession, or sale of drugs or controlled substances on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events.
Violent incident without physical injury	Colorado does not have a definition for this category, nor does it collect information per this label.
Violent incident with physical injury	Meets the state criminal code definition for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd degree assaults, and vehicular assaults. Also includes "disorderly conduct" that covers physical fights, whereas actual injury is unknown, but still most likely fits the definition of "injury" per state statutes. Third degree assault and disorderly are not disaggregated in the collection so if disorderly were not reported, then 3rd degree assault wouldn't be either.
Weapons possession	This could be a firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, or a firearm facsimile that could reasonably be mistaken for an actual firearm; - Any pellet or BB gun or other device, whether operational or not designed to propel projectiles by spring action or compressed air; - It also includes a fixed blade knife with a blade that measures longer than three inches in length or a spring-loaded knife or a pocket knife with a blade longer than three and one-half inches; or, - That could be any object, device, instrument, material, or substance that could be used or intended to be used to inflict death or serious bodily injury.
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	183
6 through 8	0	183
9 through 12	0	183

Comments: School districts in Colorado are not required by law to report data to the Colorado Department of Education for this particular category. We are reporting zero because the system does not let us enter text characters to state "not collected."

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	183
6 through 8	0	183
9 through 12	0	183

Comments: School districts in Colorado are not required by law to report data to the Colorado Department of Education for this particular category. We are reporting zero because the system does not let us enter text characters to state "not collected."

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	965	183
6 through 8	1,826	183
9 through 12	1,934	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	2	183
6 through 8	43	183
9 through 12	110	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	209	183
6 through 8	130	183
9 through 12	199	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	86	183
6 through 8	99	183
9 through 12	275	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	22	183
6 through 8	166	183
9 through 12	847	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	2	183
6 through 8	6	183
9 through 12	36	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	86	183
6 through 8	578	183
9 through 12	2,474	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	5	183
6 through 8	156	183
9 through 12	406	183
Comments: Data is for the 2007-08 school year and reflects corrections in response to the data quality review instructions.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
<u>Yes</u>	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
<u>Yes</u>	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
<u>Yes</u>	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
<u>Yes</u>	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
<u>No</u>	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
<u>Yes</u>	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
<u>No</u>	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
<u>No</u>	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
<u>No</u>	Other Specify 1
<u>No</u>	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of *ESEA*.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of *ESEA*, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	17	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	17	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The **4 strategic priorities** are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the *ESEA* that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	1,280,552	98.2
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	1,303,727	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
2. That did not use **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you **do not know** whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	109	30
Did <u>not</u> use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	7	3
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	116	33
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	39
Comments: This is based on the proposed budgets at the start of the school year, as not all Annual Financial Reports have been received.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	1
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	1
Parental involvement activities	0
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments: The above numbers reflect the six eligible districts that received RLIS funds for the 2007-08 school year.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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.

Six Colorado school districts were eligible for Rural, Low-Income funds during the 2007-08 school year. The goals and objectives continue to be the original five goal areas in the 2002 state application. Below is a summary of progress per goal area for the six districts. More specific information per district follows the goal summary.

GOAL 1 -High Standards in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

Five of the six districts are making AYP in either reading or math, or both, at one or more school levels. However, overall, none of the six are making AYP as a district in either reading or math.

GOAL 2 -English Proficiency in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

AMAO's are not applicable for two of the districts. Of the remaining four, three are meeting reading targets and one is not. Two are meeting math targets and two are not.

GOAL 3 -Highly Qualified Teachers

Two of the six districts have attained 100% for highly qualified teachers. Four have not. Percentages for how close they are to 100% are: 89.19, 90.70, 96.23, and 97.92.

GOAL 4 -Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities

None of the districts have schools identified as "persistently dangerous."

GOAL 5 -Graduation from High School

The department does not yet have available the graduation rates for the 2007-08 school year.

SPECIFIC DISTRICT INFORMATION

Because none of the districts have made AYP overall in reading and math, all districts are required to align their use of funds to the school improvement requirements described in Title I's section 1116. Reading and math data is available by subpopulation groups that help the district analyze and focus on the specific grade levels and content areas for specific student populations. It is encouraging to see all six districts making very specific and concentrated efforts to address the factors related to not making AYP. The following highlights only some of the efforts being made toward improvement of student achievement, as described in the approved applications for funding:

ALAMOSA Re-11J ----- Allocation: \$62,571

The Alamosa school district met 82.29% of its 96 targets. It is the only district of the six that is not making AYP in reading and math at any grade level. The district is using the support provided by RLIS funds to provide more intense literacy interventions during daily literacy enrichment classes in grades 3 - 12 for students most in need. Their other focus is on staff development for utilizing technology in the classroom to improve achievement for English language learners, high poverty students, and Special Education students.

LAS ANIMAS Re-1 ----- Allocation: \$15,002

The Las Animas school district met 96.83% of its 63 targets. It made AYP in reading and math at both the elementary and middle school levels. It did not make AYP in either reading or math at the high school level. The district is using the support provided by RLIS funds to maintain its program to supplement/enrich reading outside of the classroom. Their math department is utilizing a program to concentrate on math weaknesses beyond the week's regular math classes. A writing program's high school model was to be implemented at the high school after the district experienced success with this program at the elementary level.

HUERFANO Re-1 ----- Allocation: \$19,167

The Huerfano school district met 87.69% of its 65 targets. It made AYP in reading at the elementary and middle school levels. It made AYP in math at the elementary school level but not the middle school. It did not make AYP in either reading or math at the high school level. The district is using the support provided by RLIS funds to concentrate on increasing math achievement, particularly for Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students and closing those achievement gaps. They are using a comprehensive set of math program strategies that also include more intensive assistance individual students through after-school and Friday classes, and parent education and involvement activities.

EAST OTERO R-1 ----- Allocation: \$42,413

The East Otero school district met 97.56% of its 82 targets. It made AYP in reading at the elementary and middle school levels. It made AYP in math at the middle school level. It did not make AYP in reading at the middle school or math at the high school level. The district is using the support provided by RLIS funds to diagnose individual reading difficulties through assessments and provide intensive reading interventions to students most in need.

ROCKY FORD R-2 ----- Allocation: \$23,187

The Rocky Ford school district met 87.30% of its 63 targets. It made AYP in reading at the elementary and middle school levels. It made AYP in math at the elementary school level but not the middle school. It did not make AYP in either reading or math at the high school level. The district is using the support provided by RLIS funds to provide additional reading classes to the high school students on Individual Literacy Plans.

LAMAR Re-2 ----- Allocation: \$46,287

The Lamar school district met 88.89% of its 90 targets. It made AYP in reading and math at the elementary school level. It did not make AYP in either reading or math at the middle and high school levels. The district is using the support provided by RLIS funds to support a part-time interventionist to assist teachers with diagnosing individual student achievement needs and then matching their needs to specific strategies.

End of Colorado's progress report.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2007-08?	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	10
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from and to each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	6	2
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	1	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	7	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	1	5
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		2

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	167,836.00	4,347.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	556.00	6,800.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	17,114.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	722.00	139,138.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		35,943.00
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

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