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 2009-10

COLORADO

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

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) 2009-10 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 EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
___Part I, 2009-10 _X_Part II, 2009-10

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

Address:
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450
Denver, CO 80202

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Patrick Chapman

Telephone: 303-866-6780

Fax: 303-866-6637

e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Patrick Chapman

_____ Wednesday, April 27, 2011, 3:28:23 PM
Signature

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	20,381	17,392	85.3
4	19,885	16,843	84.7
5	18,049	15,203	84.2
6	10,509	8,086	76.9
7	8,950	5,914	66.1
8	8,942	5,732	64.1
High School	7,054	2,877	40.8
Total	93,770	72,047	76.8
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	20,307	16,143	79.5
4	19,870	16,198	81.5
5	18,042	14,349	79.5
6	10,512	8,595	81.8
7	8,934	6,815	76.3
8	8,966	7,072	78.9
High School	7,066	5,520	78.1
Total	93,697	74,692	79.7
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	7,920	7,455	94.1
4	7,875	7,213	91.6
5	7,745	7,096	91.6
6	3,336	2,829	84.8
7	3,311	2,695	81.4
8	3,268	2,522	77.2
High School	2,378	1,368	57.5
Total	35,833	31,178	87.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	7,897	7,142	90.4
4	7,875	7,124	90.5
5	7,741	6,910	89.3
6	3,328	2,973	89.3
7	3,310	2,929	88.5
8	3,265	2,840	87.0
High School	2,379	2,126	89.4
Total	35,795	32,044	89.5
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SW 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 (*IDEA*)	17,576
Limited English proficient students	53,077
Students who are homeless	5,781
Migratory students	1,794
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,786
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,749
Black, non-Hispanic	13,998
Hispanic	95,154
White, non-Hispanic	54,200
Total	169,887
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	N<16	403			
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	162	5,410			5,572
K	1,220	23,440	95	N<16	
1	1,947	24,032	126	N<16	
2	2,214	22,798	112	22	25,146
3	2,100	22,283	121	19	24,523
4	1,924	21,703	75	27	23,729
5	1,648	19,847	47	40	21,582
6	898	11,707	31	62	12,698
7	699	9,406	28	99	10,232
8	761	9,397	17	106	10,281
9	357	4,559	57	139	5,112
10	254	3,963	25	154	4,396
11	106	3,095	19	181	3,401
12	61	3,141	31	162	3,395
Ungraded	16				16
TOTALS		185,184	784		201,355
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	5,495
Reading/language arts	15,044
Science	171
Social studies	158
Vocational/career	75
Other instructional services	83
Comments:	

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

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

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	75
Supporting guidance/advocacy	N<16
Other support services	19
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	534	
Paraprofessionals[1]	137	100.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	22	
Clerical support staff	3	
Administrators (non-clerical)	9	
Comments:		

[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]	3,865.00	100.0
Comments:		

[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

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	5
Comments:	

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, 2009. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	122
2. Adults participating	124
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	112
4. Participating children	184
a. Birth through 2 years	38
b. Ages 3 through 5	112
c. Ages 6 through 8	18
c. Above age 8	16
Comments:	

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	115
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	117
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	109
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	97
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	84
Comments:	

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, 2010). 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	N<16
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	56
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	36
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	16
5. Total families enrolled	122
Comments:	

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

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. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from the other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of both tests should be reported on the "other" line.

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 at the State level either by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), or as defined by your Even Start State Performance Indicators.

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	N<16	N<16	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level
CASAS	N<16	N<16	
Other	N<16	N<16	Work Keys Certificate, 1 semester of College
Comments:			

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)
TABE			
CASAS	65	41	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level.
BEST			
BEST Plus	28	19	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level.
BEST Literacy			
Other			
Comments:			

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			
GED			
Other			
Comments:			
Non-School-Age Adults	**# With Goal**	**# Who Met Goal**	**Explanation (if applicable)**
Diploma			
GED	N<16	N<16	
Other			
Comments:			

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.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post- Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	23	N<16	N<16	23	Inability to understand directions
PPVT-IV	N<16	N<16	N<16	N<16	Inability to understand directions
TVIP					
Comments:					

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 and who have been enrolled 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 or latest test within the reporting year.
3. # Who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring (or latest test within the reporting year) TVIP, PPVT-III or PPVT-IV
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 .

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	23	N<16	N<16		Inability to understand directions
PPVT-IV	13	N<16	N<16		Inability to understand directions
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS 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 and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2010 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "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.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	36	N<16		26.0	Inability to understand directions
Comments:					

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 the 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	N<16	N<16	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments.
1	N<16	N<16	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments.
2	N<16	N<16	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments.
3	N<16	N<16	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments.
Comments:			

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	50	37	
PEP Scale II	40	34	
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other			
Comments:			

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data of 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 in section 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	233
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	602
K	306
1	353
2	364
3	342
4	370
5	312
6	295
7	282
8	274
9	282
10	236
11	200
12	171
Ungraded	N<16
Out-of-school	497
Total	
Comments:	

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)	N<16
K	40
1	50
2	41
3	46
4	41
5	29
6	45
7	33
8	36
9	53
10	43
11	28
12	24
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<16
Total	
Comments: The number of eligible migrant children and youth continues to decline in Colorado. The decline of priority for service can be attributed to the state decline.	

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)	46
K	234
1	304
2	314
3	296
4	313
5	264
6	231
7	227
8	216
9	217
10	176
11	158
12	140
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	52
Total	3,188
Comments:	

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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	38
K	31
1	44
2	55
3	42
4	44
5	46
6	45
7	37
8	36
9	32
10	18
11	19
12	N<16
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<16
Total	
Comments:	

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, 2009. The totals are calculated automatically.

	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
Age/Grade	**12 Months**	**Previous 13 – 24 Months**	**Previous 25 – 36 Months**	**Previous 37 – 48 Months**
Age birth through 2	101	73	53	N<16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	128	172	179	123
K	48	88	96	74
1	64	93	104	92
2	46	101	104	113
3	63	77	101	101
4	56	92	131	91
5	42	89	95	86
6	52	72	91	80
7	54	70	81	76
8	42	65	86	80
9	32	75	87	88
10	30	59	87	59
11	23	57	71	49
12	16	47	61	45
Ungraded				
Out-of-school	241	94	108	54
Total	1,038	1,324	1,535	

Comments: Families in Colorado are making qualifying moves with less frequency due to current immigration legislation, a continued drought in Southeastern Colorado and a lack of job opportunities.

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, 2009. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	171
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	339
K	147
1	190
2	159
3	161
4	174
5	139
6	144
7	133
8	126
9	131
10	114
11	79
12	74
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	240
Total	2,521
Comments:	

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	N<16
8	N<16
9	N<16
10	N<16
11	N<16
12	20
Ungraded	
Total	

Comments: This is a welcome change in the data as it indicates a drop in our dropped out numbers for Migrant students. Our migrant numbers have dropped as a state and Colorado as a whole is engaged in many different reform initiatives including credit accrual and dropout prevention.

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 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 2008-09 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	1

Comments: It has been difficult to track if migrant students have attained a GED or are pursuing a GED since many times we are not notified of that pursuit.

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State 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 reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	286	286
4	300	300
5	272	271
6	254	250
7	250	248
8	230	228
HS	438	426
Ungraded		
Total	2,030	2,009
Comments:		

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 mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	282	281
4	301	300
5	272	272
6	253	253
7	249	248
8	228	226
HS	435	425
Ungraded		
Total	2,020	2,005
Comments:		

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	228
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	591
K	304
1	348
2	358
3	333
4	365
5	309
6	289
7	279
8	272
9	279
10	231
11	200
12	170
Ungraded	N<16
Out-of-school	493
Total	
Comments:	

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	N<16
K	38
1	50
2	40
3	44
4	40
5	29
6	45
7	33
8	36
9	53
10	42
11	28
12	23
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<16
Total	

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children and youth continues to decline in Colorado. The decline of priority for service can be attributed to the state decline. Colorado is looking at its definition to ensure that it is understandable and identifies the children and youth with the most need.

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 Kindergarter	24
K	18
1	37
2	34
3	35
4	41
5	34
6	22
7	19
8	29
9	27
10	18
11	N<16
12	N<16
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<16
Total	
Comments: During the Regular School YearIn order to ensure that the migrant students who are at their end of eligibility can successfully proceed to reach their goals, we have increased the number of services provided to those students when comparable services are not available through the remainder of the term.	

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	N<16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	174
K	211
1	261
2	271
3	244
4	273
5	222
6	216
7	205
8	200
9	211
10	178
11	153
12	134
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	32
Total	
Comments:	

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			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	54	48	
K	187	186	
1	219	231	
2	227	239	
3	204	214	
4	234	245	
5	186	199	
6	188	202	
7	182	188	
8	168	174	
9	179	191	
10	145	156	N<16
11	133	142	
12	113	119	N<16
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	N<16	N<16	
Total			

Comments: The migrant education program has not delivered as many high school credit accrual services because the districts have identified this need for all of their students, including migrant, and have begun to offer more opportunities for credit accrual. The migrant students are still completing credit accrual programs but the funding is coming from a different source.

The quantity of services provided to MEP eligible children and youth did not change drastically but we have experienced a change in the focus of the services provided to them. The Colorado MEP is collaborating with many of the State's initiatives that are dealing with the secondary population. For example, the Colorado Department of Education has recently instituted a dropout prevention office as well as a new requirement for each secondary student to have an Individual Career and Academic Plan (ICAP). With these two initiatives, the MEP has coordinated efforts to ensure that eligible MEP students are participating and receiving the benefits of these statewide efforts. School readiness is a focus area of the Colorado MEP and will continue to be so, as long as it remains an indentified need of the Colorado MEP population.

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	228	N<16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	591	N<16
K	304	N<16
1	348	N<16
2	358	N<16
3	333	N<16
4	365	
5	309	N<16
6	289	
7	279	N<16
8	272	N<16
9	279	28
10	231	24
11	200	16
12	170	N<16
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	493	N<16
Total	5,049	
Comments: The Colorado migrant program has a limited number of licensed counselors. If the person supporting the students is not a licensed counselor then we do not count that as a service from counselors.		

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)	234
K	20
1	27
2	31
3	25
4	31
5	29
6	25
7	21
8	23
9	29
10	25
11	16
12	22
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	290
Total	1,028
Comments:	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the **summer/intersession term** instead of the regular school year.

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	N<16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<16
K	16
1	N<16
2	18
3	20
4	N<16
5	16
6	N<16
7	N<16
8	N<16
9	16
10	16
11	N<16
12	N<16
Ungraded	N<16
Out-of-school	N<16
Total	
Comments: Due to economic circumstances many of the programs have cut down on summer programs and have focused on coordinating supplemental services during the regular school year.	

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	
K	N<16
1	N<16
2	N<16
3	N<16
4	N<16
5	N<16
6	
7	N<16
8	N<16
9	N<16
10	N<16
11	N<16
12	N<16
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

Comments: Due to economic circumstances many of the programs have cut down on summer programs and have focused o coordinating supplemental services during the regular school year, which in turn means the less students served, the less students that are identified as priority for services.

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 Kindergarter	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments:	

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	N<16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<16
K	16
1	N<16
2	18
3	20
4	N<16
5	16
6	N<16
7	N<16
8	N<16
9	16
10	16
11	N<16
12	N<16
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<16
Total	
Comments: Due to economic circumstances many of the programs have cut down on summer programs and have focused o coordinating supplemental services during the regular school year, which in turn means the less students served.	

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			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<16	N<16	
K	N<16	N<16	
1	N<16	N<16	
2	18	17	
3	20	17	
4	N<16	N<16	
5	16	16	
6	N<16	N<16	
7	N<16	N<16	
8	N<16	N<16	
9	16	16	
10	16	N<16	
11	N<16	N<16	
12	N<16	N<16	
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	N<16	N<16	
Total			

Comments: The number of eligible migrant children and youth continues to decline in Colorado. The number of services has also declined in the area of Math and Reading but we continue to provide services in our focus area as identified in our comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan.

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	N<16	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<16	
K	16	
1	N<16	
2	18	
3	20	
4	N<16	
5	16	
6	N<16	
7	N<16	
8	N<16	
9	16	
10	16	
11	N<16	
12	N<16	
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	N<16	
Total		
Comments: Due to economic circumstances many of the programs have cut down on summer programs and have focused o coordinating supplemental services during the regular school year, which in turn means the less students served.		

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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<16
Total	
Comments: Many of the organizations that were used for referrals have become more selective with the lack of resources they are working with. The need for referrals has increased but the resources to provide the services have declined.	

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	232
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	599
K	306
1	352
2	364
3	342
4	370
5	312
6	295
7	282
8	274
9	282
10	236
11	200
12	171
Ungraded	N<16
Out-of-school	496
Total	
Comments:	

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	604
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,857
Comments:	

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	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: No schools consolidated MEP funds into a schoolwide program. When USDE populates this field with EDFacts data, zeros do not display.	

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	100	3,941
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	12	189
Year round	20	1,303
Comments: Due to economic circumstances many of the programs have cut down on summer programs and this is reflected in the number of students attending summer school or projects. Students that were participating in Projects that were offering regular and summer school has decreased as a result of many summer programs that have been canceled, thus decreasing the number of projects that are considered year round.		

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:	

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	12	2.20	31	6.08
Counselors	37	21.44	3	0.34
All paraprofessionals	14	7.55	6	0.44
Recruiters	31	24.89	0	0.00
Records transfer staff	14	13.25	0	0.00
Comments: As we have seen a decrease in the number of eligible migrant children and youth in Colorado, we have downsized the number of projects and personnel within the existing projects and programs to be in accordance with this drop in numbers.				

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.

c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.

d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.

e. *Who is a 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	0	0.00	0	0.00
Comments: The districts and the Colorado MEP are collaborating to better utilize resources for the students. There are no ME funded qualified paraprofessional as a result of the collaboration with the districts to provide support to all students (including migrant eligible students). The districts have used their resources to fund qualified paraprofessional for all students and many summer projects are no longer in service which accounts for a portion of the decrease of numbers.				

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, 2009 through June 30, 2010.
- 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	139
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	0
Total	7	161

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency 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:	

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			1,194	167	
Long Term Students Served			541	167	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			36		
Asian or Pacific Islander			N<16		
Black, non-Hispanic			226	43	
Hispanic			421	85	
White, non-Hispanic			506	39	
Total				167	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,025	161	
Female			169	N<16	
Total			1,194		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12			N<16		
13			N<16		
14			58		
15			162	N<16	
16			288	N<16	
17			330	25	
18			207	42	
19			107	49	
20			25	25	
21				16	
Total					

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

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	4	1	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	4	1	0
Comments:				

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		796	167	
Enrolled in a GED program		211	24	
Comments:				

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		354	N<16	
Earned a GED		98	N<16	
Obtained high school diploma		22	28	
Were accepted into post-secondary education		124	43	
Enrolled in post-secondary education		105	43	
Comments:				

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		777	167	
Comments:				

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		167	N<16	
Obtained employment		75	N<16	
Comments:				

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 tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, 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 tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		386	114	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		349	125	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		34	38	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		24	17	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		N<16	N<16	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		214	N<16	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		66	50	
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term students:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

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 testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		383	120	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		336	125	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		47	28	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		24	N<16	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		N<16	N<16	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		214	N<16	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		45	71	
Comments:				

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. 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	0	
Neglected programs	21	132
Juvenile detention	1	14
Juvenile corrections	17	241
Other	0	0
Total	39	151

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	21
Juvenile detention	1
Juvenile corrections	17
Other	0
Total	39
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by 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		1,490	936	2,294	
Total Long Term Students Served		863	11	1,784	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		30	N<16	57	
Asian or Pacific Islander		19	N<16	N<16	
Black, non-Hispanic		349	317	403	
Hispanic		391	438	694	
White, non-Hispanic		697	150	1,084	
Total		1,486			

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male		985	764	1,579	
Female		505	172	715	
Total		1,490	936	2,294	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5		N<16			
6		N<16			
7		23			
8		24		N<16	
9		29	N<16	N<16	
10		43	N<16	N<16	
11		67	22	19	
12		77	47	28	
13		126	85	96	
14		149	112	172	
15		194	214	299	
16		249	260	430	
17		226	186	528	
18		145	N<16	407	
19		81		211	
20		44		76	
21		N<16		18	
Total					

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

Comments: Four students in the neglected program, four students in the juvenile detention program, and 41 students in the juvenile corrections program reported their race as "other." There is no reporting option in CSPR for "other."

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, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

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)	0	17	17	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	4	7	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	8	13	0
Comments:				

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		845	2,619	
Enrolled in a GED program		110	266	
Comments:				

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		861	1,061	
Earned a GED		70	164	
Obtained high school diploma		24	81	
Were accepted into post-secondary education		36	88	
Enrolled in post-secondary education		19	82	
Comments:				

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		407	2,189	
Comments:				

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		42	148	
Obtained employment		128	169	
Comments:				

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 tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.
Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, 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. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		603	1,089	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		577	928	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		50	175	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		93	149	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		159	107	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		116	148	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		159	349	
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010.

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 testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		636	1,208	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		572	954	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		64	191	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		77	139	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		159	110	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		109	154	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		163	360	
Comments:				

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 (from baseline) in 1st and 2nd degree assaults and vehicular assault incidents, statewide for all schools.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annual	2009-10	2007-08: 5% 2008-09: 65% 2009-10: 75% 2010-11: 80% 2011-12:	2007-08: 58 2008-09: 74 2009-10: 68	492	2006-2007
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	**Instrument/ Data Source**	**Frequency of Collection**	**Year of most recent collection**	**Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Baseline**	**Year Baseline Established**
Reduction (from baseline) in 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct incidents, statewide for all schools.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annual	2009-10	2007-08: 5% 2008-09: 45% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55% 2011-12:	2007-08: 39 2008-09: 45 2009-10: 36	9,555	2006-07
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	**Instrument/ Data Source**	**Frequency of Collection**	**Year of most recent collection**	**Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Baseline**	**Year Baseline Established**
Reduction (from baseline)of in-school suspensions for 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct, (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-2010	2007-08: 5% 2008-09: 35% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55% 2011-12:	2007-08: 27 2008-09: 45 2009-10: 30	1310	2006-2007
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	**Instrument/ Data Source**	**Frequency of Collection**	**Year of most recent collection**	**Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Baseline**	**Year Baseline Established**
				2007-08: 5%	2007-08: 41		

Reduction (from baseline) of out-of school suspensions for 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct (unduplicated count), statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2008-09: 50% 2009-10: 60% 2010-11: 65% 2011-12:	2008-09: 45 2009-10: 37	7747	2006-07
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	**Instrument/ Data Source**	**Frequency of Collection**	**Year of most recent collection**	**Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Baseline**	**Year Baseline Established**
Reduction (from baseline) of expulsions for 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct, (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 5% 2008-09: 35% 2009-10: 40% 2010-11: 45% 2011-12:	2007-08: 27 2008-09: 27 2009-10: 29	168	2006-07
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	**Instrument/ Data Source**	**Frequency of Collection**	**Year of most recent collection**	**Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Baseline**	**Year Baseline Established**
Reduction (from baseline) in weapons incidents, statewide for all schools.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 40% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 2011-12:	2007-08: 35 2008-09: 44 2009-10: 51	1655	2005-06
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	**Instrument/ Data Source**	**Frequency of Collection**	**Year of most recent collection**	**Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Baseline**	**Year Baseline Established**
Reduction (from baseline) of in-school suspensions for weapons (unduplicated count), statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 30% 2009-10: 35% 2010-11: 40% 2011-12:	2007-08: 27 2008-09: 2% 2009-10: 8%	49	2005-06
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	**Instrument/ Data Source**	**Frequency of Collection**	**Year of most recent collection**	**Targets**	**Actual Performance**	**Baseline**	**Year Baseline Established**
				2007-08: 15% 2008-	2007-08: 21 2008-09: 37		

Reduction (from baseline) of out-of-school suspensions for weapons (unduplicated count), statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	09: 25% 2009-10: 40% 2010-11: 45% 2011-12:	2009-10: 44	683	2005-06

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction (from baseline) of expulsions for weapons (unduplicated count) statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 55% 2009-10: 60% 2010-11: 65% 2011-12:	2007-08: 48 2008-09: 53 2009-10: 59	891	2005-06

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction (from baseline) in alcohol incidents, statewide for all schools.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 20% 2008-09: 60% 2009-10: 65% 2010-11: 70% 2011-12:	2007-08: 55 2008-09: 55 2009-10: 58	2494	2005-06

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction (from baseline) of in-school suspensions for alcohol (unduplicated count) statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 70% 2009-10: 55% 2010-11: 60% 2011-12:	2007-08: 63 2008-09: 47 2009-10: 51	81	2005-06

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 15% 2008-	2007-08: 54 2008-09: 56		

Reduction (from baseline) iof out-of-school suspensions for alcohol (unduplicated count), statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	09: 60% 2009-10: 65% 2010-11: 70% 2011-12:	2009-10: 58	2246	2006-07

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction (from baseline) of explusions for alcohol (unduplicated count) statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 70% 2009-10: 60% 2010-11: 65% 2011-12:	2007-08: 62 2008-09: 43 2009-10: 60	115	2005-06

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction (from baseline) in tobacco incidents, statewide for all schools	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 50% 2009-10: 55% 2010-11: 60% 2011-12:	2007-08: 43 2008-09: 42 2009-10: 50	3087	2005-06

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction (from baseline) in drug incidents, statewide for all schools/	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 45% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55% 2011-12:	2007-08: 40 2008-09: 41 2009-10: 21	6389	2005-06

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 15% 2008-	2007-08: 15		

Reduction (from baseline) of in-school suspensions for drugs (unduplicated count) statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	09: 20% 2009-10: 25% 2010-11: 30% 2011-12:	2008-09: 6% 2009-10: 7%	86	2005-06
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction (from baseline) of out-of-school suspensions for drugs (unduplicated count), statewide.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 45% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55% 2011-12:	2007-08: 40 2008-09: 40 2009-10: 21	5214	21%
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction(from baseline) of expulsions for drugs (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2009-10	2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 45% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55% 2011-12:	2007-08: 37 2008-09: 41 2009-10: 17	899	2005-06
Comments:							

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 fists the definition of "injury" per state statutes. Third degree assault and disorderly are not disaggregated in the data collection.
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:	

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
6 through 8		0
9 through 12		0
Comments: Colorado does not collect this information.		

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
6 through 8		0
9 through 12		0
Comments: Colorado does not collect this information.		

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	1,090	181
6 through 8	2,092	181
9 through 12	1,775	181
Comments:		

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	N<16	181
6 through 8	39	181
9 through 12	100	181
Comments:		

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	159	181
6 through 8	87	181
9 through 12	134	181
Comments:		

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	82	181
6 through 8	111	181
9 through 12	169	181
Comments:		

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	17	181
6 through 8	124	181
9 through 12	803	181
Comments:		

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	N<16	181
6 through 8	N<16	181
9 through 12	30	181
Comments:		

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	85	181
6 through 8	801	181
9 through 12	3,239	181
Comments:		

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	N<16	181
6 through 8	185	181
9 through 12	549	181
Comments:		

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.

Y	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
Yes	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
No Response	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
No Response	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
Yes	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
No Response	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	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
No Response	Other Specify 1
No Response	Other Specify 2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	33
Comments:	

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	# LEA
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	5
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	5
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	9
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In Colorado, nine districts were eligible for the Rural, Low-Income School (RLIS) program during the 2009-10 school year. This was an increase of three LEAs from the previous year. All nine received the funds. Although all nine did not make AYP in 2009-10, each made gains in various areas. All nine used program funds to help meet Title I section 1116 requirements.
The summary of progress toward the five NCLB goals is:
1 of the 9 made AYP in reading
2 of the 9 made AYP in math
0 of the 9 made AYP overall
6 of the 9 have 100% highly qualified teachers, 2 of the nine have more than 90% highly qualified
0 of the 9 have any persistently dangerous schools

The nine RLIS districts continue to greatly appreciate the additional financial resources and flexibility that the RLIS program provides. The quality of the applications continues to increase over time, as does the intentional targeting of the funds toward the specific non AYP-related issues.
Below are highlights of how the education leaders in these nine districts used RLIS program funds to supplement other efforts and support students' academic achievement:

ALAMOSA RE-11J, Alamosa, Colo.
Allocation: $61,740
The Alamosa school district met 82% of its 94 AYP targets and had 100% of its teachers highly qualified. Funds support the purchase of a NWEA progress monitoring tool, support materials for math and reading, a technology assessment program, and partial salaries and benefits for paraprofessionals to teach keyboarding to 5th graders and staffing the computer lab. The district placed a heavy emphasis on integrating technology into curriculum, use of the computer lab for student access to NWEA tests and maps to support data-driven instruction, and use of reading curriculum that incorporated best practices for instruction for English Language Learners and Special Ed students.

LAS ANIMAS RE-1, Las Animas, Colo.
Allocation: $15,530
The Las Animas school district met 86% of its 63 AYP targets and made AMAOs overall. It made AYP in reading and math at all levels except for math at the high school. Funds supported the Accelerated Reader student and parent support, and parental involvement activities. Most of the emphasis was on parent engagement.

HUERFANO RE-1, Walsenburg, Colo.
Allocation: $18,882
The Huerfano school district met 90% of its 58 targets and 100% of its teachers were highly qualified. It made AYP in a reading at the elementary and middle school grade levels and math at the elementary level. Funds will support researched based strategies for the improvement of mathematics and reading instruction and in student learning as well as out-of-School Time Programs, including after-school, Fridays, and summer school. Funds will also support professional Learning Community groups with Book Studies and discussing student work.

Fremont RE2, Florence, Colo.
Allocation: $47,534
The Fremont school district met 92% of its 75 AYP targets. It met AYP in reading at the high school level. Funds supported strategic or intensive reading intervention materials for students not at benchmark on DIBELS or not proficient on CSAP, using research-based intervention models/programs recommend by Reading First and the Secondary Literacy Pilot Project research and aligned to the Five Components of Reading. Funds also supported math intervention materials (Numbers World and Algebra Essentials, etc.) for struggling students by providing flexible instructional groupings in order to target and close math achievement gaps.

MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1, Cortez, Colo.
Allocation: $87,554
The Montezuma-Cortez School district met 82% of its 117 AYP targets and made AYP in reading at the elementary level. Funds supported the following purchases and strategies: Technology for student assessment, .5 FTE for embedded SIOP instruction, .5 FTE Differentiated Instruction coach for job embedded professional development, Math Success Maker licenses and technology to improve reading and math skills.

EAST OTERO R-1, La Junta, Colo.
Allocation: $39,450
The East Otero school district met 99% of its 74 AYP targets, and made AYP in math at all levels and reading at the elementary

and high school levels. The funds were used to purchase technology equipment and software so all teachers have access to the same level of instructional tools. This will bring teachers to the empowered collaboration of the technology community. They will target the media rich and relevant learning opportunities using technology for the underperforming target group.

ROCKY FORD R-2, Rocky Ford, Colo.
Allocation: $23,455
The Rocky Ford school district met 88% of its 68 AYP targets and made AYP in reading at the elementary and high school levels, and math at the elementary level. Funds supported
1. Intervention math class: The intervention math class at the middle school will move from a shortened 'enrichment' period to the regular schedule and a full period class taught by at HQT. The intervention math class at the high school will now be taught by a HQT.
2. Algebra Applications: The high school began an algebra applications class for students needing a stronger foundation before entering Algebra I. The class is a hands-on pre-algebra class.
3. Learning Force Newton Math is the curriculum for intervention math grades 3-8. This program came to us via an opportunity CDE provided in Southeast Colorado.
4. Starting SY 2009-2010, we are hiring math consultants at both the elementary and secondary level to work with our math teachers

LAMAR RE-2, Lamar, Colo.
Allocation: $45,744
The Lamar school district met 95% of its 84 AYP targets and had 100% of its teachers highly qualified. It made AYP in math in all levels and reading at the middle school. Funds supported Academic Advisors to monitor student progress), and the revamping of our ESL program through professional development such as SIOP, RTI and the purchase of additional instructional materials (Title III). The funds will also support the Odyssey program that will benefit these various sub-populations in many ways. Odyssey diagnoses student strengths and weaknesses and prescribes appropriate curriculum.

MONTE VISTA C-8
Allocation: $32,603
The Monte Vista school district met 86% of its 80 AYP targets. It made AYP in math at the elementary level and reading at the elementary and high school level. Funds supported school professionals at each site to analyze data and make instructional decisions based on the analysis to improve student achievement. Funds will also support extended day and summer school learning opportunities for students identified as not meeting academic proficiency in reading or math. Salaries for MS & HS Summer School Teachers and Paras.

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 2009-10?	_____No
Comments:	

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).	6
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2010 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	101,317.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	36,513.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	15,022.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		79,826.00
Total	116,339.00	116,339.00
Comments:		

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