

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

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

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**

COLORADO



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Colorado Department of Education		
Address: 1560 Broadway, Suite 1450 Denver, CO 80202		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Patrick Chapman		
Telephone: 303-866-6780		
Fax: 303-866-6637		
e-mail: chapman_p@cde.state.co.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Patrick Chapman		
		<u>Monday, April 1, 2013, 10:24:07 PM</u>
_____ 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	21,581	12,121	56.17
4	20,665	11,748	56.85
5	19,799	9,620	48.59
6	11,367	4,801	42.24
7	9,724	2,916	29.99
8	9,482	2,660	28.05
High School	8,320	1,244	14.95
Total	100,938	45,110	44.69
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	21,554	12,737	59.09
4	20,667	10,292	49.80
5	19,594	10,251	52.32
6	11,351	5,963	52.53
7	9,723	4,421	45.47
8	9,484	3,971	41.87
High School	8,299	3,601	43.39
Total	100,672	51,236	50.89
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	5,336	3,852	72.19
4	5,347	3,661	68.47
5	5,390	3,408	63.23
6	2,006	1,181	58.87
7	1,435	582	40.56
8	1,349	589	43.66
High School	1,380	318	23.04
Total	22,243	13,591	61.10
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	5,326	4,027	75.61
4	5,340	3,424	64.12
5	5,373	3,674	68.38
6	2,001	1,422	71.06
7	1,434	866	60.39
8	1,342	794	59.17
High School	1,378	845	61.32
Total	22,194	15,052	67.82
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,566
Limited English proficient students	63,334
Students who are homeless	8,058
Migratory students	1,203
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	2,400
Asian	4,619
Black or African American	15,648
Hispanic or Latino	116,962
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	478
White	56,090
Two or more races	4,516
Total	200,713
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	2	362			364
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	157	1,735	55		1,947
K	1,064	24,666	151	4	25,885
1	1,677	24,434	152	9	26,272
2	1,809	23,061	142	20	25,032
3	1,424	22,942	141	12	24,519
4	1,199	21,978	140	25	23,342
5	1,099	20,809	108	27	22,043
6	528	12,217	69	50	12,864
7	252	9,871	58	63	10,244
8	296	9,729	61	73	10,159
9	161	4,790	95	90	5,136
10	161	4,327	60	129	4,677
11	68	3,892	63	108	4,131
12	44	4,824	38	113	5,019
Ungraded					
TOTALS	9,941	189,637	1,333	723	201,634
Comments: blanks indicate zeros					

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	3,493
Reading/language arts	9,617
Science	13
Social studies	7
Vocational/career	3
Other instructional services	2
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	82
Supporting guidance/advocacy	364
Other support services	14
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	209	
Paraprofessionals ¹	82	
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	11	
Clerical support staff	6	
Administrators (non-clerical)	7	
Comments: Paraprofessional data comes from a different source and will be resubmitted through a corrected EdFacts file when the window re-opens.		

FAQs on staff information

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

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	2,845.00	100.00
Comments:		

2.1.4.1 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

	LEAs that Received an FY 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs *	136	39
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	17,483	2,612,207
Sum of LEAs' FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations	15,720,498	128,357,638
Percentage of LEA's FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.10	2.00

¹ *The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocation. In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.

Academy 20. Frontier Elementary designed parent nights around support strategies. Title I identified families were informed through multiple venues (website, newsletter, notes) in multiple languages in order to best provide information to parents with limited English proficiency or disabilities. High Plains held Title I nights twice a year to enrich family reading and math enjoyment. Classroom teachers and/or the Title I Coordinator/Parent Involvement Coordinator made at least 2 personal calls to parents prior to each Title I meeting and sent home written communication about the meetings. High Plains distributed a Title I newsletter with meeting dates, tips for supporting students, home activities, etc. The Title I team held Parent Academies quarterly, with discussions on reading, homework, math, student learning, and home supports. Pioneer Elementary provided parents with ongoing information about their child's progress through conferences, report cards, ILPs, IEPs, Body of Evidence Assessment Reports, IGOs, notes, letters, test scores, and phone calls. A Title I Consultant/Liaison ensured that parents received educational information and attended conferences of students receiving TA in literacy. Pioneer offered a 6-session Love and Logic program free to Title I parents to help them improve parenting skills.

Adams 12's efforts were based on Bridging Cultures between Home and School: A Guide for Teachers and Involving Latino Families in Schools, both of which use 6 areas of responsibility: communicating, volunteering, home enrichment, decision-making, governance, advocacy, and collaboration with community. Schools offered math and literacy nights, Love and Logic, Positive Behavior Support or parent leadership training, and welcomed parent input at School Improvement Team meetings. Title I parent liaisons increased communication and participation and parents' capacity to support their child(ren) in reading and math, and get involved at the school/district level. Collaboration between DSIT membership, district personnel and parent/community volunteers provided parent training opportunities re: accountability, grad requirements, district policies, standards-based grading, budget, Title I, and the transitions project. We sent parents who were asked to be leaders for their schools and mentors to other parents to the Colorado Parent Coalition Conference.

Aurora. Title I Elementary schools developed and adopted Family and Community Involvement Plans and parent compacts. In consultation with their school advisory council of parents and community members, each determined how parent involvement funds would be spent. All non-public schools were required to host two meetings per year to educate parents about their reader and specific things they could do at home.

Denver Public Schools. Title I schools submitted parent involvement plans and received 1% of Title I funds to help support them. DPS sets aside additional funds for parent involvement and contracts with Community Resources to hold parent information meetings around curriculum, standards based report cards, etc. The Office of Parent Engagement continues to seek out best practices for engaging parents in schools to increase achievement. The Parent Teacher Home Visit Program was expanded to an additional 15 schools and Parenting Partners: Practical Tools for Positive Parenting was expanded to another 5.

Title I funds were used to implement a Parenting Partners Trainer of Trainers for 5 more schools, pay teachers to facilitate workshops, hold 2 Parent Leadership Institutes to empower families to advocate for their children and be effectively engaged in

their education, and to train, inform and support parents in Title I schools to effectively participate in their children's education and schools' Collaborative School Committees, Superintendent Parent Forums, Parent Leadership Institutes and other school and district parent organizations, train and support Title I Parent Family Liaisons to engage parents more effectively, work with 25 Title I schools district-wide to establish and sustain effective parent engagement structures, and send 2 representatives (principal, teacher, parent) from all 21 schools and 3 Office of Parent Engagement staff to the National Parent Teacher Home Visit Conference and the Colorado Statewide Parent Coalition Conference.

Boulder. Developed formal Title I Parent Involvement Plans, required in each building's School Improvement Plan and annual report: areas of focus were literacy and math trainings for parents, communication about grade level standards, and greater inclusion of second language parents on SIP teams. This plan includes the private school served and all public schools. Parent involvement includes parent participation in trainings, conferences, SITs and other school meetings/events. Title I collaborates with the Family Literacy Program, expanded to 4 sites (3 evening and 1 day program) and includes ESL classes, GED prep, computer training, parenting classes, and Parents and Children Together. Title I schools have intensive parent programs for ELLs and may involve a Community Service Program, Family Resource Schools (FRS), adult ESL classes and collaboration with the Colorado Statewide Parent Coalition.

All Title I schools submit parent involvement plans, at the start of the year, that describe parent strategies that focus on educational outcomes that provide interactive, engaging activities that are also allowable under EDGAR. Strategies are informed by parent suggestions at the Community Parent Advisory Council (C-PAC) meetings throughout the year. The plans were monitored and updated through the year, based on student needs and parent input. Previously, parents indicated a desire to use books created with ebook software and to partner with Unite for Literacy to create books for children in their words and with parents assisting with the content of the picture ebooks. Schools and parents met in the fall to develop these plans and budgets. Parent involvement plans include teacher stipends, translators and childcare for literacy and math nights. Parent nights, home visits, parenting classes and other strategies were and integrated into school-wide strategies based on student achievement data.

Poudre. 2011-12 was the ESL Parent Involvement Family Literacy Program's 5th year, and incorporated its Brain Wise curriculum. The Program continued to use the "Parents as Educational Partners" Curriculum, developed in Chicago and implemented in PSD Fall 2009. Title I funds, long with migrant and Title III, offered ESL classes for parents of Title I students and ELs, making ESL Parent Involvement courses convenient to each geographic area of the district. ESL classes framed the curriculum with Parent Involvement topics that included understanding math and reading standards and CSAP and other assessments, meeting with principals and preparing for teacher conferences. The part-time coordinator speaks Spanish; sites include Wellington (outside Fort Collins), Harris Bilingual Elementary (central city), and Lincoln Middle School (Putnam and Irish in same feeder). There are 1 or 2 teachers at each site, depending on enrollment, and at least 2 educational child care providers.

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, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	3
Comments:	

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2011. 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	60
2. Adults participating	62
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	62
4. Participating children	112
a. Birth through 2 years	35
b. Ages 3 through 5	31
c. Ages 6 through 8	38
c. Above age 8	8
Comments:	

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	26
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	27
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	26
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	27
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 th grade at the time of enrollment	21
Comments:	

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2012). 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	4
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	7
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	15
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	23
5. Total families enrolled	49
Comments:	

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from the other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of both tests should be reported on the "other" line.

To be counted under "pre- and post-test", an individual must have completed **both** the pre- and post-tests.

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	0	0	Colorado criteria for significant learning gain is progressing through one Educational Functioning Level
CASAS	0	0	
Other	0	0	Work Keys Certificat, 1 semester of college
Comments:			

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

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	2	1	
CASAS	53	31	
BEST	0	0	
BEST Plus	0	0	
BEST Literacy	0	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	2	2	
GED	0	0	
Other	2	2	Citizenship
Comments:			
Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	0	0	
GED	0	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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 within the reporting year.

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. "Pre- and Post-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	24	0	0	24	Spanish-speaking; could not understand the instructions
PPVT-IV	8	0	0	8	
TVIP	8	0	0	8	
Comments:					

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	24	0	0	24	Spanish-speaking; could not understand the instructions
PPVT-IV	8	0	0	8	
TVIP	8	0	0	8	
Comments:					

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

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS subtask.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2011 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	24	9	15	17.00	Insufficient English
Comments:					

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

The following terms apply:

1. "# in Cohort" includes school-aged children who have participated in Even Start for at least 6 months.

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	11	9	Diagnostic Reading Assessment
1	14	10	Diagnostic Reading Assessment
2	20	4	Diagnostic Reading Assessment
3	4	0	Diagnostic Reading Assessment
Comments:			

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

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

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

	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	27	18	
PEP Scale II	27	20	
PEP Scale III	10	8	
PEP Scale IV	0	0	Not required in Colorado
Other			One program did not do PEP but did home visits using the Parents as Teachers curriculum and also offered incredible years to each of the families and tracked family satisfaction and improvement in surveys. Surveys were submitted to Invest in Kids (IIK) in Denver and they track data and will send us results.
Comments: We do not yet have the number in cohort and number who met goal for the program that did not do PEP but, rather, did home visits using the Parents as Teachers curriculum.			

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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	228
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	435
K	268
1	280
2	296
3	265
4	288
5	277
6	271
7	236
8	237
9	234
10	194
11	198
12	240
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	300
Total	4,247
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	33
1	43
2	59
3	34
4	43
5	35
6	35
7	38
8	43
9	36
10	24
11	29
12	26
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	101
Total	579
Comments:	

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	108
1	199
2	228
3	199
4	210
5	184
6	175
7	160
8	146
9	142
10	102
11	107
12	129
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	27
Total	2,122
Comments:	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	13
1	16
2	12
3	18
4	18
5	18
6	13
7	24
8	15
9	25
10	16
11	11
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	7
Total	216

Comments: The difference between the total for children with disabilities for previous year (303) and current value (216) the decrease is due to district implementation of the Full Response to Intervention (RtI) model where student needs are addressed at the universal tier before a student is identified as having a learning disability.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2011. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	125	71	28	4
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	124	123	99	89
K	79	55	63	71
1	71	71	74	64
2	83	70	73	70
3	57	49	76	83
4	69	67	81	71
5	73	62	79	63
6	54	79	72	66
7	55	60	62	59
8	67	62	45	63
9	46	61	66	61
10	50	54	52	38
11	40	56	43	59
12	40	66	78	56
Ungraded	0	0	0	0
Out-of-school	186	48	48	18
Total	1,219	1,054	1,039	935
Comments:				

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2011. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	159
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	254
K	142
1	147
2	174
3	129
4	157
5	130
6	144
7	123
8	124
9	111
10	90
11	103
12	119
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	147
Total	2,253
Comments:	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	1
8	0
9	2
10	8
11	11
12	17
Ungraded	
Total	39

Comments: The difference between the total for dropped out for previous year (59) and current year value (39) the decrease is due to the program's continued collaboration with the drop-out prevention initiatives within the state. We are a members of the interstate collaboration consortium Solutions for Out of School Youth (SOSY) and have implemented some of the resources and strategies from the consortium. Colorado doesn't have ungraded students--the blank is a zero.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2010-11 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	7
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	216	216
4	204	203
5	190	188
6	179	176
7	161	161
8	187	185
HS	320	310
Total	1,457	1,439
Comments:		

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	218	218
4	204	203
5	191	190
6	180	178
7	161	160
8	187	185
HS	321	316
Total	1,462	1,450
Comments:		

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1–3)).

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	152
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	426
K	226
1	272
2	248
3	240
4	263
5	240
6	224
7	208
8	203
9	204
10	182
11	167
12	197
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	296
Total	3,748
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	16
1	43
2	55
3	32
4	43
5	27
6	27
7	34
8	38
9	27
10	23
11	26
12	24
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	101
Total	516
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	34
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	167
K	154
1	182
2	160
3	165
4	173
5	155
6	158
7	133
8	139
9	163
10	145
11	137
12	158
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	58
Total	2,281
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	32	78	
K	80	107	
1	146	153	
2	126	129	
3	121	126	
4	117	123	
5	103	110	
6	118	122	
7	105	105	
8	94	98	
9	113	111	96
10	94	98	142
11	89	89	133
12	110	111	101
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	8	8	24
Total	1,456	1,568	496

Comments: The difference between the total for children who received high school credit accrual for previous year (0) and current year value (496) the increase is due to the implementation of collecting and entering high school secondary credit accrual for migratory children in grades 9-12 within the state for SY 2011-12 and by supporting districts and migrant personnel with training.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	146	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	396	29
K	211	6
1	255	15
2	234	13
3	219	15
4	236	17
5	207	16
6	202	13
7	196	16
8	186	16
9	187	29
10	171	19
11	151	18
12	191	23
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	290	21
Total	3,478	271

Comments: The difference between the total for Breakout of children receiving counseling service for previous year (14) and current year value (271) the increase is due the SEA taking steps to provide training to the field and a development of a common understanding of how counseling services can help the child address life problems, or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy. Colorado is also experiencing a change in demographics with more refugees participating in the program. The refugee population has unique history and one of the big needs for this population is counseling services. Colorado also has a population of recent Mexican immigrants who have experienced violence along the border with the United States. These students have also needed counseling services.

FAQs on Support Services:

- 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.
- What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	96
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	269
K	112
1	152
2	132
3	130
4	131
5	105
6	124
7	112
8	106
9	118
10	104
11	86
12	120
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	133
Total	2,030

Comments: The difference between the total for children who received a referred service for previous year (754) and current year value (2030) the increase is due to continued training to the field on how to accurately report the number of migrant children that actually received the referred service from the another program or organization.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	37
K	25
1	36
2	16
3	32
4	43
5	29
6	22
7	18
8	21
9	30
10	15
11	10
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	344

Comments: The difference between the total for students served during the summer/intersession term for previous year (212) and current year value (344) the increase is due to a 2011-12 Summer Grant funding opportunity provided to LEA's and MEP projects, which allowed us to design and implement new summer programs to serve students and families, which in turn increased the number of migrant students attending a district held summer school, or MEP Summer Literacy Program.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	5
1	9
2	5
3	7
4	13
5	9
6	5
7	5
8	1
9	10
10	1
11	1
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	72
Comments: The difference between the total number of priority for services for previous year (35) and current year value (72) the increased is due to the increased number of students that participated in a district held summer school or MEP Summer Literacy Program based on the 2011-12 Summer Grant opportunity.	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	37
K	25
1	36
2	16
3	32
4	43
5	29
6	22
7	18
8	21
9	29
10	14
11	10
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	341

Comments: The number of children receiving an instructional service for previous year (198) and current year value (341) the increase is due to the number of students that received a service by participating in a district held summer school or MEP Summer Literacy Program.

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	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8	0	
K	23	8	
1	32	25	
2	16	11	
3	32	21	
4	41	23	
5	29	22	
6	22	18	
7	16	13	
8	8	5	
9	6	5	28
10	2	1	13
11	3	2	9
12	0	0	3
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	238	154	53

Comments: The difference between the total for reading instruction for previous year (133) and current year value (238) the increase is due to the number of students that received a reading instruction service by participating in a district held summer school or MEP Summer Literacy Program based on the 2011-12 Summer Grant opportunity.

The difference between the total for high school credit accrual for previous year (0) and current year value of (51) the increase is due to the number of students that received a high school credit accrual by participating in a district held summer school or MEP Summer Literacy Program based on the 2011-12 Summer Grant opportunity.

The number of children in Grade 3 who received reading instruction (32) is more than the number reported for the same age/grade in Table 2.3.3.2.4.1 (21) the increase is due to the delayed receipt of the 2nd grader's summer reading service provided by the district which when reported in the state student information system, the student had already been enrolled in current regular school year and advance in grade level, in this case (3rd grade). This is why there is an increase of 11 students (in 3rd grade), more than what was reported as attended (2nd grade) in a district held summer school or MEP Summer Literacy Program.

The number of children in grade 4 who received reading instruction (41) is more than the number reported for the same age/grade in Table 2.3.3.2.4.1 (40) is due to the delayed receipt of the 3rd grade summer reading service provided by the district, which when reported in the state student information system the student had already been enrolled in current regular school year and advance in grade level, in this case (4th grade). This is why there is an increase of 1 student more than what was reported as attended a district held summer school, or MEP Summer Literacy Program.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	1	0
1	8	0
2	16	0
3	7	0
4	14	0
5	19	0
6	14	0
7	13	0
8	3	0
9	3	0
10	0	0
11	0	0
12	1	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	99	0
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **participating** migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	4
2	10
3	2
4	9
5	5
6	1
7	2
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	33

Comments: The difference between the total number of children who received a referred service during the summer/intersession term for previous year (0) and current year (33) the increase is due to the continued training to the field on how to accurately report the number of migrant children that actually received the referred service from the another program or organization.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	152
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	427
K	226
1	272
2	249
3	244
4	267
5	242
6	227
7	208
8	203
9	204
10	183
11	167
12	197
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	296
Total	3,764
Comments:	

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	592
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,880
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: The number of schools that consolidated MEP funds into a schoolwide program is zero. When USDE populates this field with ED Facts data, zeros do not display.	

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	597	3,210
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	68
Year round	55	2,209

Comments: The difference between the type of MEP number of migrant children participating in the projects school day only for previous year (4410) and current year value (3,210) the decrease is due to the number of student reported as eligible for the 2011-12 SY that received a service during the school day regular school year.

The difference between the type of MEP number of projects summer/intersession only for previous year (16) and current year value (1) the decrease is due to the number of summer/intersession projects now being reported under the year round category.

The difference between the type of MEP number of migrant children participating in the projects for summer/intersession only for previous year (199) and current year value of (68) the decrease is due to the number of students being reported in year round category.

The difference between the type of MEP number of projects year round only for previous year (23) and current year value (55) the increase is due the number of projects that were previously reported in last years CSPR as summer/intersession only are now included in this category, which accurately reflects the definition listed below.

The difference between the type of MEP number of migrant children participating in the year round for previous year (1204) and current year value (2,209) the increase is due the number of projects that were previously reported in last years CSPR as summer/intersession only are now included in this category, which accurately reflects the definition listed below.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	24	5	41	30
Counselors	37	23	3	2
All paraprofessionals	25	2	47	7
Recruiters	26	25	0	0
Records transfer staff	16	15	0	0
Administrators	10	6	0	0

Comments: The difference between key MEP personnel staff Teachers Regular Year FTE for previous year (3) and current year value (5) is due to a Regional MEP Literacy program for at risk MEP students that required instruction be provided by certified teachers.

The difference between key MEP personnel staff Teachers Summer/Intersessions term headcount for previous year (32) and current year value (41) and FTE for previous year (13) and current year value of (30) is due to the 2011-2012 State MEP Summer Grant funding opportunity provided to regional MEP projects which in turn required the hiring of additional teachers during the summer.

The difference between key MEP personnel staff Counselors Regular Year Headcount for previous year (29) and current year value (37) and FTE for previous year (17) and current year value (23) is due to the State MEP has experience and increase in MEP students identified as refugees and experiencing trauma due to violence in border towns in Mexico. Additional counselors are needed by some regions to address this change.

The difference between key MEP personnel staff Counselors Summer/Intersession Term Headcount for previous year (1) and current year value (3) and FTE for previous year is (0) and current year value is (2) is due to the 2011-2012 State MEP Summer Grant funding opportunity provided to regional MEP projects which in turn required the hiring of additional counselors during the summer to serve refugees and student who have experienced violence in border towns in Mexico.

The difference between key MEP personnel staff All paraprofessionals Regular School Year Headcount for previous year (18) and current year value (25) and FTE for previous year (6) and current year value (2) is due an error in data provided by a new regional MEP Director. State will provide one-on-one training on this data submittal to address the error.

The difference between key MEP personnel staff All Paraprofessionals Summer/Intersession Headcount for previous year (31) and current year value (47) and FTE for previous year (3) and current year value (7) is due to the 2011-2012 State MEP Summer Grant funding opportunity provided to regional MEP projects which in turn required the hiring of additional paraprofessionals to provide one on one tutoring during the summer program.

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.
- g. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

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	12	0.60	26	6.50
Comments:				

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, 2011 through June 30, 2012.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students.

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	6	139
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	0
Total	7	
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

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

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			1,093	86	
Long Term Students Served			508	86	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			14	2	
Asian			7	0	
Black or African American			187	20	
Hispanic or Latino			427	37	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			5	0	
White			445	27	
Two or more races			8	0	
Total			1,093	86	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			774	83	
Female			319	3	
Total			1,093	86	

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			1	0	
13			7	0	
14			34	0	
15			156	0	
16			246	1	
17			299	7	
18			184	14	
19			123	33	
20			37	25	
21			6	6	
Total			1,093	86	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Blanks are zeros.

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, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	0	1,006	86	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	275	19	0

Comments:

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	0	296	0	0
Earned a GED	0	0	67	4	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	36	8	0
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	0	0	32	12	0

Comments:

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in job training course/programs	0	0	429	86	0
Obtained employment	0	0	67	8	0
Comments:					

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			325	71	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			438	86	

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 Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			17	61	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			34	21	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			95	0	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			163	3	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			129	1	
Comments: Blanks are zeros.					

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, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			351	76	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			437	86	

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 Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			12	73	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			31	10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			105	1	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			178	2	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			111	0	
Comments: Blanks are zeros.					

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students.

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	2	135
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	2	9
Juvenile corrections	12	252
Other	1	365
Total	17	
Comments:		

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	2
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	2
Juvenile corrections	12
Other	1
Total	17
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by 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	151		927	1,361	24
Total Long Term Students Served	48		32	1,177	4

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	2		24	29	
Asian	1		10	9	
Black or African American	36		277	152	3
Hispanic or Latino	20		415	414	3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			2	55	
White	89		199	623	18
Two or more races	3			79	
Total	151		927	1,361	24

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	150		766	871	24
Female	1		161	490	
Total	151		927	1,361	24

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6	1				
7					
8					
9	1			1	
10			3	5	
11			12	16	
12	2		32	43	
13	15		67	58	
14	23		112	170	
15	23		162	272	2
16	36		242	287	8
17	22		293	321	9
18	19		4	133	5
19	5			43	
20	3			12	
21	1				
Total	151		927	1,361	24

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

Comments: Blanks are zeros.

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, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	111	0	422	1,062	22
Enrolled in a GED program	6	0	50	109	0
Comments:					

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	81	0	922	443	2
Earned a GED	2	0	23	170	2
Obtained high school diploma	8	0	3	37	8
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	3	0	1	44	0
Comments:					

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	4	0	0	397	0
Obtained employment	9	0	0	147	0
Comments:					

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	39		32	871	4
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	35		28	623	4

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 Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			2	94	1
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	1		2	114	1
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	4		4	45	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	25		6	118	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	5		14	252	2
Comments: Blanks are zeros. Neglected students not served with Title ID funds.					

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, 2011, through June 30, 2012.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	41		26	973	3
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	35		28	621	4

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 Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	1			98	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	1		6	126	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7		4	49	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	22		6	115	2
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	4		12	233	2
Comments: Blanks are zeros. Neglected students not served with Title ID funds.					

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 (TITLE IV,PART A).

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
				2009-10:	2009-10:		
				2010-11:	2010-11:		
				2011-12:	2011-12:		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.							

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	
Illicit drug related	
Violent incident without physical injury	
Violent incident with physical injury	
Weapons possession	
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.	

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		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.		

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Colorado no longer receives Title IV funds.

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	3
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	2
Parental involvement activities	0
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

11 districts were eligible for the RLIS program in 2011-2012; 6 were identified with an "Improvement" plan on the District Performance Framework and 5 were identified with a "Priority Improvement" plan. Two districts improved their plan type, one district decreased one level and 8 districts remained at the same level compared to the previous year. Districts that had a "Priority Improvement" plan used funds to help meet Title I section 1116 requirements.

Below are highlights of how the education leaders in these 11 districts used RLIS program funds to supplement other efforts and support student academic achievement.

0100 - ALAMOSA RE-11J DPF - Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Instruction that integrates multi-media has been proven to increase understanding and achievement in ELL, SPED and economically disadvantaged students. Teachers were given professional development around these strategies on August 22, 2011. All teachers will and/or have had WestEd's Teach for Success Model of Instruction.

1140 - CANON CITY RE-1 DPF - Priority Improvement Plan (Lower than previous year). Canon City Schools utilized and implemented the coaching model of teacher instruction to assure implementation of effective math strategies identified through the coaching process. Teachers were taken through a series of observations, instructional dialogue, modeling and ultimately full implementation of math strategies specific to struggling math students.

2520 - EAST OTERO R-1 DPF - Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Funds were used to purchase technology equipment and software so all Title I teachers had access to the same level of instructional tools. We continue to bring teachers to the empowered collaboration of the technology community. Teachers will target media rich and relevant learning opportunities using technology for the underperforming target group.

1150 - FREMONT RE-2 DPF - Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Fremont and Penrose Elementary schools used Everyday Math pre-and-post assessments, Everyday Math on-line and Numbers World, in conjunction with designated interventions, to provide flexible grouping and strategic and intensive intervention in math. Read Well, Corrective Reading, SIPPS, Read Naturally and SPIRE in flexible and designated reading intervention blocks provided strategic and intensive intervention.

For math, Fremont Middle and High Schools used more effective instruction for re-teaching, along with intensive strategies proven to help students with disabilities found in the IES Practice Guide, What Works Clearinghouse and CollaborationWorks Math Evidence-Based Instruction, along with computer-assisted instruction using A+, CPM home links and Hotmath tutoring. For reading, Fremont Middle School used Language!, REWARDS, and 6-Minute Solutions along with effective instruction methods recommended by the Secondary Literacy Pilot Project.

1390 - HUERFANO RE-1 DPF - Priority Improvement Plan (Higher than previous year). District used Cooperative Learning; Stand Out math; Family Math Literacy Activities for elementary-middle; Math-Literacy Connection; Differentiated learning; Small class size, "flooding" for math and reading in elementary classrooms; Implementation of Math Solutions and Mathematics their Way curriculum activities for elementary classrooms; Quality Math and Reading and Star assessment; Alternative educational opportunities for at-risk students; small group and one-on-one pull-out with instructional coaches for math and reading; high interest-relevant learning materials plus: ongoing onsite professional development for school serving preschool through 12th grades and the facilitated development of an aligned curriculum in all subject areas beginning with Math.

1510 - LAKE COUNTY R-1 DPF - Improvement Plan (Higher compared to previous year). Lake County used instructional and peer coaching models for improved instruction. Adjustments to instruction were based on student progress. The instructional coach was able to model classroom instruction, assist with intervention groups and give teachers feedback for improved instructional strategies.

2660 - LAMAR RE-2 DPF - Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Lamar used Partners for HOPE for after school tutoring and homework help. SIOP strategies were used throughout the district. The Odyssey program was used throughout the district to differentiate instruction. DIBELS was used kindergarten through 6th grade. Step up to Writing is the research-based strategy used to improve writing skills in both reading and math.

2740 - MONTE VISTA C-8 DPF - Priority Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Title VI-B funds were used to meet the needs of students identified as at-risk through direct, systematic and explicit instruction provided by HQ teachers that had received professional development to deliver research-based programs. Planning for instructional groups was based on screening, progress monitoring and assessment data analysis. Students received services through extended day learning opportunities.

Funds were used to increase learner "sense of belonging" to the school environment - building relationships, reducing disruptive behaviors and increasing engagement and grad rates. The LEA also continued their contract with Mental Health to provide on-campus services to students 3 days per week. These services greatly impact a student's ability to achieve in the school setting.

2035 - MONTEZUMA-CORTEZ RE-1 DPF - Priority Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Cortez Middle School has the highest number of students identified as ELL of any school in the district. To meet the needs at CMS, teachers embedded the S.I.O.P. instruction into their daily classroom instruction. Also, students received Direct Language and Literacy

instruction using the pull out model and core Language Arts instruction. A differentiated instructional coach supported the professional development identified in Title I, Title IIA and the District Improvement Plan by providing mentoring and modeling on differentiated instruction to classroom teachers.

Funds also supported the implementation and evaluation of Math I and English I remediation improvement strategies including conducting pre- and post-tests to progress monitor their effectiveness.

Attendance at the National Singapore Math Summer Institute to gain knowledge and understanding of the CPA learning approach in mathematics to provide an alternate way to learn math concepts for the ELL student population. Funding was blended from Title III and Title VI-B to provide the professional development

2530 - ROCKY FORD R-2 DPF - Priority Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Core math class: Math instruction at the 3-6 level was provided via leveled classes, allowing students to get targeted instruction. This accommodated strategic interventions. More significant interventions were provided in a second period of instruction. Identified 7th and 8th grade students received interventions in math.

1580 - TRINIDAD 1 DPF - Improvement Plan (Stable compared to previous year). Teachers received job-embedded PD through the use of instructional coaches. Because of limited FTE at the middle school, district supplemented coaching through an outside consultant. The LEA provided appropriate interventions for both reading and math for grades 6-8. For the last three years Trinidad Middle School has used Learning Force as their Tier II math intervention program but has not seen the results that the high school has seen with ALEKS Math. Therefore, the LEA chose to implement ALEKS Math at TMS.

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 2011-12?	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	1
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2012 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)	12,407.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		12,407.00
Total	12,407.00	12,407.00
Comments:		

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2011-12). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	75.35
American Indian or Alaska Native	57.65
Asian	82.89
Black or African American	66.20
Hispanic or Latino	62.45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	70.08
White	82.12
Two or more races	80.43
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	53.66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	53.30
Economically disadvantaged	61.40

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States granted ESEA Flexibility should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to EDFacts.

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to reward (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the school was identified as a high progress or high performing reward school
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(g).

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

² The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific designation (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessmentWhether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement v Year 1, School Improvement v Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

2.12.3.1 Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific status for SY 2012-13 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

2.12.4.1 Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.