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 2008-09

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

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) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part ll.

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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 18, 2009**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 12, 2010**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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, 2008-09   _X_ Part II, 2008-09

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

Address:
1560 Broadway, Suite 1450
Denver, CO 80202

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Patrick Chapman

Telephone: 303-866-6780

Fax: 303-866-6637

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

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

_____ _____
  Signature   Date

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	17,979	15,632	87.0
4	16,999	14,274	84.0
5	15,633	12,525	80.1
6	7,841	6,050	77.2
7	6,797	4,993	73.5
8	6,450	4,103	63.6
High School	5,027	1,626	32.4
Total	76,726	59,203	77.2
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	17,772	14,913	83.9
4	16,964	13,084	77.1
5	15,609	12,200	78.2
6	7,820	6,216	79.5
7	6,798	4,943	72.7
8	6,465	4,818	74.5
High School	5,014	3,979	79.4
Total	76,442	60,153	78.7
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	9,001	8,336	92.6
4	8,791	7,957	90.5
5	8,408	7,417	88.2
6	3,408	2,899	85.1
7	3,472	3,029	87.2
8	3,421	2,863	83.7
High School	1,015	585	57.6
Total	37,516	33,086	88.2
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	8,757	7,956	90.8
4	8,752	7,507	85.8
5	8,404	7,254	86.3
6	3,401	3,035	89.2
7	3,473	3,055	88.0
8	3,421	3,072	89.8
High School	1,014	932	91.9
Total	37,222	32,811	88.2
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*)	17,448
Limited English proficient students	49,828
Students who are homeless	4,699
Migratory students	2,252
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	2,751
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,548
Black, non-Hispanic	14,312
Hispanic	93,997
White, non-Hispanic	51,268
Total	165,876
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the underlined 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		449			449
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	363	690			1,053
K	1,604	20,345	108	1	22,058
1	2,403	20,752	123	4	23,282
2	2,665	20,066	101	6	22,838
3	2,461	19,290	81	16	21,848
4	2,017	18,463	77	22	20,579
5	1,747	16,620	55	24	18,446
6	829	8,289	17	22	9,157
7	789	7,247	9	36	8,081
8	688	6,959	17	37	7,701
9	234	3,418	59	51	3,762
10	155	2,503	43	90	2,791
11	97	1,958	44	86	2,185
12	151	1,561	24	60	1,796
Ungraded			7	12	19
TOTALS	16,203	148,610	765	467	166,045

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	4,922
Reading/language arts	14,553
Science	52
Social studies	37
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	49
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	325
Supporting guidance/advocacy	296
Other support services	104
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	318	
Paraprofessionals[1]	75	100.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	6	
Clerical support staff	4	
Administrators (non-clerical)	7	
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]	2,456.20	99.6
Comments: There were 7 paraprofessionals in SWP who were reported as not HQ at the data collection last year. Three were actually HQ, but were mis-reported: two had a GED/HS diploma and the other one had taken and passed the test. Two have subsequently passed the test and the remaining two retired at the end of the school year.		

[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, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	5
Comments:	

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

**2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the
Year**

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

1. "Participating" means
    enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing
    children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2008. 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	160
2. Adults participating	162
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	114
4. Participating children	210
a. Birth through 2 years	72
b. Ages 3 through 5	91
c. Ages 6 through 8	47
c. Above age 8	0
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	82
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	83
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	71
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	62
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	41
Comments: Enrollment data is missing from 37 families. Poverty level was defined by families eligible for free or reduced lunch.	

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

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2009). 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	2
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	8
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	72
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	41
5. Total families enrolled	123
Comments: Enrollment data is missing from 37 families.	

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

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

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	19	10	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level.
CASAS	1	1	
Other	7	6	TABE-M CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level.
Comments:			

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

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

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	0	0	
CASAS	38	24	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level.
BEST	0	0	
BEST Plus	34	23	CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level.
BEST Literacy	0	0	
Other	1	0	CASAS-W CO criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level.
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	12	12	
GED	0	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	0	0	
GED	9	6	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	29	9	5	20	20 exempted due to inability to understand directions. All children were English Language Learners.
PPVT-IV	0	0	0	0	
TVIP	0	0	0	0	
Comments:					

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	29	9	4	20	20 exempted due to inability to understand directions. All children were English Language Learners.
PPVT-IV	0	0	0	0	
TVIP	0	0	0	0	
Comments:					

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

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.
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 2009 (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 <u>weighted</u> 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	29	12	11	16.8	11 were exempted due to inability to understand directions. All children were English Language Learners.
Comments:					

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

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	12	4	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments. All children were English Language Learners.
1	9	4	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments. All children were English Language Learners.
2	16	10	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments. All children were English Language Learners.
3	10	4	Sources for all ages are school district reading assessments. All children were English Language Learners.
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	45	29	Improvement shown by 0.5 gain in scale score from Time 1 to Time 2.
PEP Scale II	40	32	Improvement shown by 0.3 gain in scale score from Time I to Time 2.
PEP Scale III	0	0	
PEP Scale IV	0	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 underlined number of **eligible** migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	190
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	878
K	392
1	492
2	520
3	440
4	405
5	405
6	364
7	338
8	355
9	356
10	310
11	224
12	181
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	663
Total	6,513

Comments: This total showing is the preliminary data sent on December of 2009.

A revised number has been sent for EDfacts file N121, that total is 6,513 including Age birth through 2

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	
K	
1	
2	3
3	131
4	137
5	180
6	169
7	154
8	207
9	220
10	172
11	5
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,388

Comments: In an effort to ensure that Colorado was serving the priority for service students, we underwent a collaborative effort of redefining PFS for Colorado. Due to the change in definition at the state level, we have identified more Migrant students as priority for service.

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, <u>and</u> whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	84
K	316
1	395
2	407
3	322
4	273
5	251
6	228
7	190
8	192
9	194
10	166
11	127
12	76
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	46
Total	3,267

Comments:

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	45
K	22
1	40
2	39
3	37
4	36
5	42
6	35
7	27
8	27
9	33
10	25
11	13
12	12
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	8
Total	441
Comments:	

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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, 2008. The totals are calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | 12 Months | Last Qualifying Move
Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period | | |
		Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	70	87	33	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	154	265	258	201
K	56	111	109	116
1	67	137	140	148
2	65	126	148	181
3	58	135	115	132
4	73	108	105	119
5	46	122	92	145
6	48	87	94	135
7	36	95	98	109
8	51	96	93	115
9	40	118	90	108
10	38	76	74	122
11	22	63	65	74
12	18	42	54	67
Ungraded				
Out-of-school	211	186	155	111
Total	1,053	1,854	1,723	1,883

Comments: These totals are based on the preliminary data sent on December 2009. The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	104
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	398
K	193
1	210
2	209
3	196
4	179
5	175
6	148
7	155
8	154
9	157
10	114
11	88
12	81
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	217
Total	2,778

Comments: These totals are based on the preliminary data sent on December 2009. The decrease in totals are a reflection of the decrease in eligible migrant counts for the state. Within the past year, less qualifying work is available due to the change in agriculture, and less families are moving into Colorado because of this. Families are also seeking non-qualifing work in the state.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	6
8	2
9	22
10	28
11	26
12	22
Ungraded	
Total	106
Comments:	

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

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	4
Comments: Four districts reported eligible migrant students having received their GED for the 2008-09 SY, on the states End of Year data collection.	

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

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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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	392	389
4	347	347
5	352	346
6	332	328
7	290	288
8	325	319
9	291	280
10	247	244
11		
12		
Total	2,576	2,541
Comments: The grade level errors generated are based on the preliminary data submitted on December 2009. The decrease in the total number of participating students enrolled and tested in reading/language arts is a reflection of the states decrease in child counts for the 2008-09 SY.		

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	387	386
4	347	347
5	352	349
6	333	333
7	290	290
8	323	319
9	292	282
10	254	250
11		
12		
Total	2,578	2,556
Comments: The grade level errors generated are based on the preliminary data submitted on December 2009. The decrease in the total number of participating students enrolled and tested in math is a reflection of the states decrease in child counts for the 2008-09 SY.		

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	144
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	669
K	309
1	398
2	405
3	367
4	324
5	328
6	305
7	257
8	259
9	280
10	230
11	176
12	143
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	406
Total	5,000

Comments: The number of out of school youth (OSY) has changed as a result of guidance from the Office of Migrant Education (OME), which outlined how to count children 18 - 21 who are not in school. Those children, ages 0-5 have been appropriately moved to the child counts of 0-2 and 3-5.

The grade level errors generated, are based on the preliminary data submitted on December 2009.

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	
K	
1	
2	1
3	119
4	123
5	156
6	143
7	118
8	160
9	182
10	141
11	4
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	6
Total	1,153
Comments: In an effort to ensure that Colorado was serving the priority for service students, we underwent a collaborative effort of redefining PFS for Colorado. Due to the change in definition at the state level, we have identified more migrant students as priority for service.	

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	0
Comments: In accordance with the guidance of continuation of service, Colorado has collaborated with other available programs to support students who are no longer eligible for services through the migrant education program.	

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 underlined 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	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	199
K	211
1	266
2	270
3	263
4	222
5	227
6	220
7	191
8	205
9	248
10	196
11	149
12	127
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	24
Total	3,020
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 <u>a teacher only</u>. 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	1	1	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	143	175	
K	184	184	
1	242	233	
2	243	230	
3	231	226	
4	196	187	
5	208	203	
6	202	195	
7	157	148	
8	173	169	
9	178	175	51
10	138	134	24
11	100	97	21
12	96	89	13
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	1	1	2
Total	2,493	2,447	111

Comments: Due to the transition from New Generation System to the state database, high school credit accrual was not gathered in a format that allowed us to disaggregate the data. This has since been corrected.

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 <u>teacher</u> 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 underlined 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 underlined 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	146	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	677	11
K	312	13
1	397	23
2	407	20
3	363	14
4	324	15
5	327	19
6	306	16
7	259	15
8	262	17
9	280	52
10	231	33
11	175	28
12	143	20
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	404	5
Total	5,013	301
Comments: The decrease totals is a reflection of the states decrease in migrant child counts that received a support and counseling service.		

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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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. <u>Do not include children who were referred, but received no services</u>. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	62
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	234
K	51
1	51
2	73
3	48
4	45
5	40
6	36
7	37
8	35
9	34
10	31
11	23
12	17
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	235
Total	1,052

Comments: The decrease totals is a reflection of the states decrease in migrant child counts that received a referred service.

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 underlined underlined 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	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	48
1	61
2	66
3	53
4	56
5	39
6	28
7	27
8	24
9	38
10	36
11	23
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	536
Comments: The decrease in totals is a reflection of the states decrease in migrant child counts that received a service during the summer/intercession term. Summer school opportunities for all students have been limited, due to decreased funding to the districts from the state.	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the underlined 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	
1	1
2	1
3	21
4	25
5	25
6	18
7	20
8	16
9	27
10	28
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	182
Comments: The decrease in the total number of students who were PFS during the summer/intercession term, were a reflection of the states decrease in migrant child counts.	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	0
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 <u>NOT</u> considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would <u>not</u> 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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by <u>either a teacher or a paraprofessional</u>. 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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	41
1	58
2	65
3	50
4	53
5	36
6	27
7	22
8	20
9	37
10	36
11	23
12	10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	505
Comments:	

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)	21	18	
K	40	38	
1	55	52	
2	63	60	
3	50	47	
4	51	49	
5	35	36	
6	23	25	
7	22	22	
8	14	16	
9	9	26	
10	7	25	5
11	7	13	1
12	4	7	1
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	401	434	7

Comments: Through participation in the Math = Achievement Success (MAS) consortium, Colorado was able to provide math instruction to a greater number of students during the summer/intercession term.

Due to the transition from New Generation System to the state database, high school credit accrual was not gathered in a format that allowed us to disaggregate the data. This has since been corrected.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received <u>any</u> MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27	
K	47	
1	58	
2	64	
3	53	
4	55	
5	38	
6	25	
7	27	
8	21	
9	38	
10	34	
11	20	
12	9	
Ungraded		
Out-of-school		
Total	516	

Comments: The decrease in totals is a reflection of the states decrease in migrant child counts. Out of 538 students that attended summer school 516 received a support service.

There is no value populated in the counseling field, I would have anticipated that the CSPR would be prepopulated with 0, but unfortunately no value was inserted, thus requiring us to indicate in the comment field that the value should be zero.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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. <u>Do not include children who were referred, but received no services</u>. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	8
1	10
2	14
3	5
4	7
5	9
6	6
7	5
8	3
9	2
10	1
11	
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	77

Comments: Students attending a district summer school were provided an instructional service in lieu of referred services. Colorado focused on providing more instructional services to enhance their educational experience and to improve their academic success.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do <u>not</u> 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	146
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	678
K	315
1	400
2	408
3	369
4	326
5	329
6	307
7	260
8	263
9	280
10	231
11	176
12	143
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	406
Total	5,037
Comments: The grade level errors generated, are based on the preliminary data submitted on December 2009. The totals reflect the decrease in the states migrant child counts for those served during the program year.	

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	725
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	4,885
Comments: There was a decrease in the number of schools who enrolled eligible migrant children that is consistent with the decrease in the overall population of eligible migrant students in Colorado. Both of these decreases are the result of changing agriculture in Colorado which includes a partial drought in one of our biggest agriculture areas, a change in the definition of temporary, as well as many of our eligible migrant students have reached their end of eligibility.	

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: There is no value populated in the fields, due to the fact that we have no schools that used consolidated MEP funds. I would have anticipated that the CSPR would be prepopulated with 0, but unfortunately no value was inserted, thus requiring us to indicate in the comment field that the value should be zero.	

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	112	4,894
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	39	507
Year round	47	5,706
Comments: The total number of migrant children participating in MEP projects has increased based on those attending students who received services provided by the district during the regular year only. The number of Summer/Intercession MEP projects has increased due the number of migrant students attending district held summer schools. The number of year round MEP projects has increased due to the migrant regional programs and districts providing year round services. The number of migrant children participating in year round projects has increased, due to the migrant regional program providing services throughout the year to out of school youth and district providing services to attending students for regular school year and summer/intercession.		

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

FAQs on type of MEP project:

a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.

b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.

c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).

d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.

e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (<u>regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds</u>) 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	40	3.35	79	9.87
Counselors	37	17.82	3	0.10
All paraprofessionals	14	4.57	27	2.18
Recruiters	28	26.53	0	0.00
Records transfer staff	17	16.50	0	0.00
Comments: Colorado institutes a regional model for service delivery and identification of migrant students. Through the regional model and the job classifications allowed, some of the MEP funded personnel are not reflected in these numbers. The funding for the MEP program for Colorado 2008-09 was decreased by 30%, due to the defect rate and the decline in eligible migrant child counts. Colorado has restructed two of it's eight regional programs and adjusted job descriptions and time and effort, as well as introduced alternative ways to better serve migrant population. This has resulted in combined roles for many of the MEP personnel (e.g. Youth Advocates - Recruiter/Couselor).				

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	5	0.70	2	0.30
Comments: The funding for the MEP program for Colorado 2008-09 was decreased by 30%, due to the defect rate and the decline in eligible migrant child counts. Colorado has restructed two of it's eight regional programs and adjusted job descriptions and time and effort, as well as introduced alternative ways to better serve migrant population.				

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

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.
- 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 <u>only</u> 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	128
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	0
Total	7	155

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

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

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

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the underlined 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			1,042	146	
Long Term Students Served			521	146	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			25	0	
Asian or Pacific Islander			9	0	
Black, non-Hispanic			201	29	
Hispanic			352	82	
White, non-Hispanic			455	35	
Total			1,042	146	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			871	141	
Female			171	5	
Total			1,042	146	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			4	0	
13			11	0	
14			60	1	
15			165	1	
16			263	6	
17			344	25	
18			157	38	
19			32	40	
20			6	26	
21			0	9	
Total			1,042	146	

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, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

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 <u>not</u> exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

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

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	574	146	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	196	14	0
Comments:				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	294	0	0
Earned a GED	0	53	14	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	11	29	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	57	42	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	52	42	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	351	76	0
Comments:				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	0	20	5	0
Obtained employment	0	23	0	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the underlined number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading.Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		370	124	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		267	98	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		40	35	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		21	8	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		17	10	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		113	9	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		76	36	
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, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		394	129	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		271	98	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		38	30	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		24	5	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		35	9	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		117	15	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		57	39	
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	23	86
Juvenile detention	0	
Juvenile corrections	18	240
Other	0	0
Total	41	150

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	23
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	18
Other	0
Total	41
Comments:	

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

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the underlined 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		1,925		2,558	
Total Long Term Students Served		717		1,969	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		52		69	
Asian or Pacific Islander		21		26	
Black, non-Hispanic		454		448	
Hispanic		564		935	
White, non-Hispanic		830		1,080	
Total		1,921		2,558	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male		1,134		1,803	
Female		791		755	
Total		1,925		2,558	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5		6		0	
6		1		0	
7		8		0	
8		24		0	
9		30		1	
10		36		5	
11		46		15	
12		70		41	
13		123		103	
14		180		223	
15		230		378	
16		322		484	
17		397		535	
18		214		458	
19		124		224	
20		73		84	
21		41		7	
Total		1,925		2,558	

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

Comments: Four students were coded as "other" for their race/ethnicity for Neglected Programs. EDFacts does not allow for submission of an "other" status.

The number of long-term students served in juvenille corrections should actually be 2003. One facility did not report pre/post

test data as the information was lost in administrator turn-over. As a result, while 1969 students were included in the pre/post test data file, 2003 students were actually served long-term in juvenille corrections.

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, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (<u>not students</u>) 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 <u>not</u> 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	18	17	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	5	8	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	8	13	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	0	1,017	2,096	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	482	107	0
Comments:				

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

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

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	0	417	667	0
Earned a GED	0	148	186	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	38	63	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	45	43	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	36	42	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	0	392	1,403	0
Comments:				

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

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

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	0	213	226	0
Obtained employment	0	229	284	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the underlined number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		442	744	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		460	848	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		54	179	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		62	101	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		100	319	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		93	81	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		151	168	
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, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		458	671	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		424	851	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		57	202	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		59	82	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		97	344	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		93	67	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		118	156	
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 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.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: Baseline 2007-08: 5% 2008-09: 65% 2009-10: 75% 2010-11: 80%	2006-07: Baseline 2007-08: 58% 2008-09: 74%	2006-07	2006-07
Comments: Note: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct incidents, statewide for all schools.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: Baseline 2007-08: 5% 2008-09: 45% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55%	2006-07: Baseline 2007-08: 39% 2008-09: 45%	2006-07	2006-07
Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of in-school suspensions for 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct, (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 5% / 2007-08: 5% / 2008-09: 35% / 2009-10: 50% / 2010-11: 55%	07: Baseline / 2007-08: 27% / 2008-09: 45%	2006-07	2006-07

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of 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	2008-09 school year	2006-07: Baseline / 2007-08: 5% / 2008-09: 50% / 2009-10: 60% / 2010-11: 65%	2006-07: Baseline / 2007-08: 41% / 2008-09: 45%	2006-07	2006-07

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of expulsions for 3rd degree assaults and disorderly conduct, (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: Baseline / 2007-08: 5% / 2008-09: 35% / 2009-10: 40% / 2010-11: 45%	2006-07: Baseline / 2007-08: 27% / 2008-09: 27%	2006-07	2006-07

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in weapons incidents, statewide for all schools	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 40% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55%	2006-07: 3.9% 2007-08: 35% 2008-09: 44%	2005-06	2005-06

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of in-school suspensions for weapons (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 30% 2009-10: 35% 2010-11: 40%	2006-07: 35% increase 2007-08: 27% 2008-09: 2%	2005-06	2005-06

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15%	2006-07: 7%		

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of out-of-school suspensions for weapons (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2007-08: 21% 2008-09: 25% 2009-10: 40% 2010-11: 45%	2008-09: 37%	2005-06	2005-06

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of expulsions for weapons (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 55% 2009-10: 60% 2010-11: 65%	2006-07: 5.10% 2007-08: 48% 2008-09: 53%	2005-06	2005-06

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in alcohol incidents, statewide for all schools.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 20% 2008-09: 60% 2009-10: 65% 2010-11: 70%	2006-07: 17.8% 2007-08: 55% 2008-09: 55%	2005-06	2005-06

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the

2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of in-school suspensions for alcohol (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 70% 2009-10: 55% 2010-11: 60%	2006-07: 16% 2007-08: 63% 2008-09: 47%	2005-06	2005-06
Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 60% 2009-10: 65% 2010-11: 70%	2006-07: 18.3% 2007-08: 54% 2008-09: 56%	2005-06	2005-06
Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15%	2006-07: 45%		

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

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in tobacco incidents, statewide for all schools	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 50% 2009-10: 55% 2010-11: 60%	2006-07: 9% 2007-08: 43% 2008-09: 42%	2005-06	2005-06

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction in drug incidents, statewide for all schools.	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 45% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55%	2006-07: 2.7% 2007-08: 40% 2008-09: 41%	2005-06	2005-06

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of in-school suspensions for drugs (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 20% 2009-10: 25% 2010-11: 30%	2006-07: 60% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 6%	2005-06	2005-06
Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reduction of out-of-school suspensions for drugs (unduplicated count), statewide	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15% 2008-09: 45% 2009-10: 50% 2010-11: 55%	2006-07: 2.6% 2007-08: 40% 2008-09: 40%	2005-06	2005-06
Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 15%	2006-07: 89%		

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

Comments: Performance measures were readjusted following the 2007-08 school year because, in many cases, we far exceeded our goals. For this 2008-09 report, and this performance measure section, we: 1) Maintained the course with subsequent performance measures if we met or closely met our performance measure. 2) If we fell quite short, we adjusted the forthcoming year performance measures because we probably set unrealistic goals during the adjustment of the 2007-08 school year. 3) If we exceeded our goals by quite a bit, we checked to see if we also exceeded our 2009-10 goal. If so, the 2009-10 performance measure was increased in order to continue striving for improvement. 5) We added a 5% increment from the 2009-10 school year to set the measure for the 2010-11 school year. Due to the elimination of the State Grants program for the 2010-11 school year and the uncertainty of continued funding for 2011-12, we will not re-set our baseline year.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of schools decreasing truancy rates	Department's "Safety and Discipline Incidents" Report via the Automated Data Exchange.	Annually	2008-09 school year	2006-07: 10%	2006-07: Was not analyzed		
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: Was not analyzed.		
				2008-09: 20%	2008-09: Not analyzed.		
				2009-10: 25%			
				2010-11: 30%		2005-06	2005-06

Comments: We continue to lack the time and personnel to evaluation this data. School-by-school rates are posted publicly as required by the Uniform Management Information Reporting System in the Title IV law.

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

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Use, possession or sale of alcohol on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events.
Illicit drug related	Use, possession, or sale of drugs or controlled substances on school grounds, in school vehicles, or at school activities or sanctioned events.
Violent incident without physical injury	Colorado does not have a definition for this category, nor does it collect information per this label.
Violent incident with physical injury	Meets the state criminal code definition for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd degree assaults, and vehicular assaults. Also includes "disorderly conduct" that covers physical fights, whereas actual injury is unknown, but still most likely 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:	

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	0	0
Comments: This category of incidents is not collected by the SEA from LEAs.		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	0	0
Comments: This category of incidents is not collected by the SEA from LEAs.		

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	593	181
6 through 8	2,018	181
9 through 12	1,735	181
Comments: This category includes 1st and 2nd degree assaults, vehicular assaults, 3rd degree assault, and disorderly conduct. Disorderly conduct is defined by state statute as fighting in a public place. The majority of fights that would result in a suspension or expulsion would likely have caused some degree of injury.		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	1	181
6 through 8	31	181
9 through 12	18	181
Comments: This category includes 1st and 2nd degree assaults, vehicular assaults, 3rd degree assault, and disorderly conduct. Disorderly conduct is defined by state statute as fighting in a public place. The majority of fights that would result in a suspension or expulsion would likely have caused some degree of injury.		

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

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

The following sections collect data on <u>weapons possession</u>.

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 <u>weapons possession</u> by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>weapons possession</u>, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	128	181
6 through 8	154	181
9 through 12	146	181
Comments:		

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

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	38	181
6 through 8	136	181
9 through 12	245	181
Comments:		

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

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	9	181
6 through 8	187	181
9 through 12	803	181
Comments:		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	181
6 through 8	17	181
9 through 12	49	181
Comments:		

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

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

The following questions collect data on <u>illicit drug-related</u> 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 <u>illicit drug-related</u> incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>illicit drug-related</u> incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	30	181
6 through 8	592	181
9 through 12	2,489	181
Comments:		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	4	181
6 through 8	150	181
9 through 12	380	181
Comments:		

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

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
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
Yes	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
No	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
Yes	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
No	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	Other Specify 1
No	Other Specify 2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We did not have "other" strategies outside of those checked from the list.

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

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

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

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

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

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

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

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

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	19	70.4
Total received Title V, Part A funds	27	
Comments: The 8 districts that did not complete a credible Title V, Part A needs assessment were distributing carry over funds from the 07 - 08 allocation.		

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

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

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

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

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

	$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	371,783	99.4
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	373,893	
Comments: The amounts provided reflect actual expenditures from the districts' Annual Financial Reports.		

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

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

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

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
<u>Used</u> **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	27	27
Did <u>not use</u> **at least 85 percent** of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	2	2
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	29	29
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

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

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	41
Comments: During the 2008-09 school year, 99 LEAs were eligible for SRSA participation. Of those, 90 received funds and 41 took advantage of the REAP-flex option. Of the participating districts, 16 that did not make AYP in 2007-08 continued to not make AYP in 2008-09. However, 14 districts that did not make AYP the 2007-08 school year did make it in 2008-09. And, 8 districts that did make AYP in 2007-08 did not make it in 2008-09.	

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	4
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	1
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	9
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments: Nine LEAS were eligible for RLIS funds. All nine are focusing on meeting requirements of Title I Section 1116. There are probably more devoting time and attention to professional development and parental involvement than what is expressly stated in the application plans for funding. This is because these strategies are often embedded in the other strategies, such as when new curriculum is implemented, when academic advisers tutor students and keep parents informed, and when new technology is purchased for diagnosing academic achievement data. One can reasonably believe that a person would not be able to implement new programs or assess the data from new software without receiving training to do so.	

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

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In Colorado, nine districts were eligible for the Rural, Low-Income School (RLIS) program during the 2008-09 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 2008-09, 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:

2 of the 9 made AYP in reading
0 of the 9 made AYP in math
0 of the 9 made AYP overall
4 of the 9 made AMAOs overall
3 of the 9 have 100% highly qualified teachers, 5 of the nine have more than 90% highly qualified
0 of the 9 have any persistently dangerous schools
3 of the 9 improved graduation rates between the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school year.

Allocations all decreased from the 2007-08 school year. However, 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 nonAYP-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: $52,887
The Alamosa school district met 81% of its 96 AYP targets and had 100% of its teachers highly qualified. Their graduation rate increased to 74% in 2008-09. It made AYP in reading at the high school. Funds supported 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: $13,388
The Las Animas school district met 94% of its 64 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 NWEA Map renewal, and parental involvement activities. Most of the emphasis was on parent engagement.

HUERFANO RE-1, Walsenburg, Colo.
Allocation: $17,293
The Huerfano school district met 94% of its 63 targets and 100% of its teachers were highly qualified. It made AYP in a reading at all grade levels and math at the elementary level. Funds supported consultant fees for enrichment activities in the area of math and professional development for leadership teams that included a focus on math and curriculum alignment. These efforts supplemented a heavy concentration on math through a wide variety of programs and strategies, K-12.

TRINIDAD 1, Trinidad, Colo.
Allocation: $36,790
The Trinidad school district met 94% of its 80 AYP targets and made AMAOs overall. It met AYP in reading at the middle and high school level. Funds supported a heavy emphasis on professional development of math teachers for more data-driven instruction and to better equip teachers to understand the needs of high poverty students. This included the paying of stipends for high school teachers for attendance at trainings.

MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1, Cortez, Colo.
Allocation: $74,589
The Montezuma-Cortez School district met 79% of its 117 AYP targets and made AYP in math at the middle school level. Funds supported the following purchases and strategies: A .5 FTE reading coach and stipends for teachers involved in curriculum alignment; new laptop computers for new staff, a software program for targeting math interventions for at-risk students, a web-based formative assessment system that helped serve at-risk students identified by Response to Intervention, a math evaluation consultant to evaluate the district's current math program, and instructional supplies and materials to help meet the

needs of the sub-groups not making AYP.

EAST OTERO R-1, La Junta, Colo.
Allocation: $34,054
The East Otero school district met 90% of its 78 AYP targets, made AMAOs overall and increased its graduation rate to 89%. It made AYP in high school reading and elementary math. Funds supported the salary and benefits of a reading specialist at the middle school to concentrate on reading interventions based on a second dose of intensive reading instruction and individual literacy plans.

ROCKY FORD R-2, Rocky Ford, Colo.
Allocation: $20,932
The Rocky Ford school district met 87% of its 69 AYP targets and made AYP in reading at the elementary and high school levels, and math at the elementary level. Funds supported partial salaries and benefits for a language arts teacher and a math teacher at the high school. These teachers provided a second-dose reading class for identified students, and an intervention math class for students who needed extra support. Additionally, Algebra Applications was offered to students not yet ready for the core Algebra I class.

LAMAR RE-2, Lamar, Colo.
Allocation: $41,279
The Lamar school district met 90% of its 89 AYP targets and had 100% of its teachers highly qualified. It made AYP in reading and math at the middle school and increased its graduation rate to 84%. Funds supported an Academic Advisors and tutors program in the way of professional development, benefits, extra duty stipends, and supplies. The district utilized one bilingual academic advisor per class from 7th through 12th grade. Tutors were utilized for before and after school programs for students at risk of not meeting model content standards for AYP.

MONTE VISTA C-8
Allocation: $29,565
The Monte Vista school district met 89% of its 76 AYP targets and made AMAOs overall. It made AYP in reading at the elementary level and math at the elementary and middle school levels. Funds supported the salary and benefits of the districts' summer school teachers and a portion of the contract with mental health services. In addition to these strategies, after school tutoring and other extended learning opportunities were provided.

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 2008-09?	__No__
Comments: No comment.	

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	8
Comments:	

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

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)	8	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	2
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	1
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	3
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		5

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2009 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)	281,118.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	46,074.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	19,472.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	139,085.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		76,487.00
Total	281,118.00	281,118.00
Comments: No comment.		

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

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