

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

## PART II

SCHOOL YEAR 2019-2020

COLORADO



The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the Bureau of Indian Education, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 8303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA)

### **Paperwork Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0724. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35.00 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain a benefit under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202.

## **2.1 ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **2.1.4 Section 1003 of the ESEA School Improvement Funds**

In the tables below, provide the amount of Section 1003 funds of the ESEA allocated to each district and school.

#### **2.1.4.1 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to LEAs**

For each LEA receiving a 1003(a) allocation, list the amount of the allocation.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

#### **2.1.4.2 Section 1003 of the ESEA Allocations to Schools**

For each school receiving a Section 1003(a) allocation of the ESEA, list the amount of the allocation.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS132/DG794

Data published outside of report

## 2.2 GRADUATION RATES AND POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENT

This section collects data on graduation rates and rates of postsecondary enrollment.

### 2.2.1 Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the state's four year adjusted cohort graduation rates for the current reporting period.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS150/DG695 and FS151/DG696

State	Student Group	# of Graduates	# of Students in Cohort	Graduation Rate
COLORADO	All students	S	67450	81.9
COLORADO	American Indian or Alaska Native	S	474	67
COLORADO	Asian	S	2351	91
COLORADO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	S	173	73
COLORADO	Black or African American	S	3185	76.6
COLORADO	Hispanic or Latino	S	22807	75.4
COLORADO	White	S	35938	86.1
COLORADO	Two or more races	S	2522	82
COLORADO	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	S	7151	61.8
COLORADO	English Learners	S	9185	70.2
COLORADO	Economically disadvantaged students	S	31440	72.3
COLORADO	Children in foster care	S	894	31
COLORADO	Children who are homeless	S	3196	56.7

#### Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on graduation rates:

What is the adjusted cohort graduation rate? The adjusted cohort graduation rate is described in sections 8101(23) and 8101(25) of the ESEA.

## 2.2.2 Postsecondary Enrollment

In the table below, provide counts of students who enrolled in programs of postsecondary education during the current reporting period.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS160/DG739

State	Student Group	# Enrolled in an IHE	# Not Enrolled in an IHE	# for which data are unavailable	Total
COLORADO	All students	36306	126	21617	S
COLORADO	American Indian or Alaska Native	206	S	193	S
COLORADO	Asian	1652	S	365	S
COLORADO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	72	S	76	S
COLORADO	Black or African American	1500	S	1062	S
COLORADO	Hispanic or Latino	9248	45	8832	S
COLORADO	White	22201	67	10369	S
COLORADO	Two or more races	1427	S	720	S
COLORADO	Female	20003	71	9390	S
COLORADO	Male	16303	55	12227	S
COLORADO	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)	1412	S	3013	S
COLORADO	English Learners	981	S	2001	S
COLORADO	Economically disadvantaged students	8342	45	8935	S

## 2.3 TITLE I, PART A PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

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

### 2.3.1 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 Schoolwide Programs (SWPs) or Targeted Assistance programs (TAS) 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
COLORADO	Children with disabilities (IDEA)	37747
COLORADO	English learners	64010
COLORADO	Homeless students	8824
COLORADO	Migrant students	2061

### 2.3.2 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 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS037/DG548

State	Race Ethnicity	# Students Served
COLORADO	American Indian or Alaska Native	2626
COLORADO	Asian	5353
COLORADO	Black or African American	19898
COLORADO	Hispanic or Latino	144891
COLORADO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1109
COLORADO	Total	257459
COLORADO	Two or more races	9381
COLORADO	White	74201

### 2.3.3 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 TAS, Title I SWP, private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS134/DG670

State	Age Grade	Public SWP	Public TAS	Local Neglected	Private	Total
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	772	205	1	17	995
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	.	.	.	.	0
COLORADO	Grade 1	27450	1062	7	166	28685
COLORADO	Grade 10	8032	52	275	25	8384
COLORADO	Grade 11	7494	49	209	13	7765
COLORADO	Grade 12	9355	93	136	15	9599
COLORADO	Grade 2	27261	958	14	131	28364
COLORADO	Grade 3	27520	905	62	170	28657
COLORADO	Grade 4	27989	906	101	120	29116
COLORADO	Grade 5	28747	749	109	126	29731
COLORADO	Grade 6	17722	467	119	61	18369
COLORADO	Grade 7	15503	402	183	67	16155
COLORADO	Grade 8	15256	465	234	39	15994
COLORADO	Grade 9	9323	37	269	5	9634
COLORADO	Kindergarten	27925	760	4	144	28833
COLORADO	Total	250349	7110	1723	1099	260281
COLORADO	Ungraded	.	.	.	.	0

## 2.4 EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (MEP) (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2018 through August 31, 2019. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migratory children
- Academic data of eligible migratory students
- Data of migratory children served during the performance period
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

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

There are two exceptions to this rule:

1. A child who turns 3 during the performance period is reported as “Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten),” only if the child’s residency in the state was verified after the child turned 3.
2. A child who turns 22 years of age during the performance is reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

### 2.4.1 Migratory Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, MEP child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each State Education Agency (SEA) should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migratory children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the State has taken action to ensure that the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §1001.

**FAQs on Child Count:**

- a. How is “out-of-school” defined? Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This term could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a high school equivalency diploma (HSED) outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are “here-to-work” only. It would not include children in preschool, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness). Enrollment in school is not a condition affecting eligibility for the MEP. Therefore, out-of-school youth who meet the definition of a “migratory child” are eligible for the MEP.
- b. How is “ungraded” defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities (IDEA). In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children (IDEA), transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Do not count students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution as ungraded; these students are counted as out-of-school youth.)
- c. How is reporting a child “in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State” defined? A State must report a child in only one age/grade category in which the child spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State. For example, a migratory child resided in State A for three months and in State B for nine months in SY2018-19. While in State A, the child enrolled in ninth grade for two months and in tenth grade for one month. Therefore, State A will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State A. In State B, the child enrolled in eighth grade for one month and in ninth grade for eight months. Therefore, State B will report the child in the age/grade category of ninth grade, because the child spent the majority of his/her time in ninth grade in State B.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

Comments
The State has no concerns with the reported child counts or underlying eligibility determinations for the 2019-20 Performance Period.

### 2.4.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. This figure includes all eligible migratory children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	688
COLORADO	Kindergarten	354
COLORADO	Grade 1	302
COLORADO	Grade 2	296
COLORADO	Grade 3	311
COLORADO	Grade 4	321
COLORADO	Grade 5	351
COLORADO	Grade 6	302
COLORADO	Grade 7	310
COLORADO	Grade 8	266
COLORADO	Grade 9	276
COLORADO	Grade 10	303
COLORADO	Grade 11	217
COLORADO	Grade 12	201
COLORADO	Ungraded	0
COLORADO	Out of school	307
COLORADO	Total	4805

### 2.4.1.2 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

#### Comments

The Colorado MEP believes the decrease in the number of Eligible Migrant Children ages 3-21 years was largely due to the COVID-19 Pandemic which has also impacted our recruiting practices. Throughout the state recruiters were not allowed to visit workplaces and that lead to lower referrals. We relied on our community partners for referrals. The most successful strategy was word of mouth referrals, and informational videos to highlight the program yet even so, there was a decrease. Colorado also experienced a decrease in refugee resettlements to the state of Colorado in comparison to the previous year. There was also a decrease in movement among our usual families due to agricultural employers hiring at minimum capacity to comply with COVID guidelines therefore we did not have as many seasonal workers. Colorado also experienced early crop freezes in several of the areas in our state. Finally, due to the transition to online registrations in various districts, some new arrivals were not identified in a timely manner.

### 2.4.1.3 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	239

## 2.4.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

State	Age Grade	Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer Intersession Term
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	528
COLORADO	Kindergarten	258
COLORADO	Grade 1	217
COLORADO	Grade 2	202
COLORADO	Grade 3	215
COLORADO	Grade 4	221
COLORADO	Grade 5	256
COLORADO	Grade 6	209
COLORADO	Grade 7	240
COLORADO	Grade 8	188
COLORADO	Grade 9	197
COLORADO	Grade 10	224
COLORADO	Grade 11	149
COLORADO	Grade 12	32
COLORADO	Out of school	189
COLORADO	Ungraded	.
COLORADO	Total	3325

### 2.4.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

Comments
Due to the COVID Pandemic, many of our families did not or could not travel. Therefore, Colorado experienced a decreased number of Eligible Migrant Children Served during the summer. This was exacerbated by local farmers and agricultural employers using local or an existing work force which led to a decrease in recruitment of families during the summer months. Additionally, Social Distancing restrictions made it difficult to recruit farmworkers, migrant families and H2A workers.

### 2.4.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migratory Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migratory children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2019 through August 31, 2020. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS122/DG635

## 2.4.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

### 2.4.3.1 Methods Used to Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21 are reported. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, engaged or had parents engage in migratory agricultural or fishing work, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who graduated from high school or attained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) during the performance period and ensures that these children are not counted in the subsequent performance period's child count.
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migratory student database.

## Comments

Unduplicated Count The SMART Validation Tool detects duplicate student records by running validation checks to determine if the student already exists in the system. Student records are also run against other Department Systems like the, Records Integration Tracking System (RITS) which assigns State Assigned Student IDs called (SASIDs). When MEP Field Recruiters complete a student search the system retrieves search results from both SMART and RITS. The validation tool identifies if two or more records represent the same student by checking for potential duplicate SMART IDs or SASIDs. If duplicate records are identified the records are merged and communication of the consolidation is sent to MEP field recruiters, regional data specialists and state-level managers in real-time. This ensures accurate counts of migratory children within SMART for Category 1 and 2. Similarly, a Duplicate Report can be run from SMART to identify potential duplicate student records. The systems algorithm checks for potential matches. If duplicate records are identified the records are merged and communication of the consolidation is sent to MEP field recruiters, regional data specialists and state-level managers in real-time. This ensures accurate counts of migratory children within SMART for Category 1 and 2. Potential duplicate records in MSIX or in its States system is resolved immediately. A deletion flag is transmitted to MSIX to remove the duplicate record. Therefore, only one record per student is included in the State's child count.

Residency Count The state data system or SMART has an automated process for Residency Verifications. The Regional Data Specialist will assign a residency verification notification for all non-attending students including age verifications for children two turning three on or after their third birthday to the appropriate regional recruiter. The field recruiter will then contact the parent/worker and verify the residency of the specific student. Once residency is verified by the parent/worker the recruiter will [sign-off] by capturing their electronic signature. The regional data specialist receives a notification that the residency verification has been submitted and the data specialist will then review and approve the residency verification. The recruiter who completed the residency verification will then receive a notification that the residency verification is approved. The multiple steps ensure the validation is accurate and that data quality is maintained. Age verification does require a signature however we are asking that a MEP staff member (recruiter, advocate, etc.) verify residence information of the two-year old turning three over the phone with the following comment in the parent signature section: [Due to COVID Pandemic, PV confirmed via ph.]

Graduated or attained an HSED Students who have attained their HSED or who have graduated are reported by the school districts and verified as completers in End of Year Reporting. A student who attained HSED/Graduated is flagged in SMART, including documentation of the HSED/Graduation attainment date. Students who attained their HSED/Graduation during the 2019-20 performance period. The SMART Validation Tool ensures students who have attained their HSED/Graduated are not included in subsequent child counts.

Qualifying Move Only children who have a SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) documenting their eligibility for the State of Colorado Migrant Education Program have been entered in SMART. The SMART software interface includes eligible children ages three through 21 that have a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) within 36 months and the child's eligibility expiration date does not occur prior to the start of the performance period. For example: If the State is reporting for SY 2019-20, a child with a qualifying arrival date as early as Sep 2, 2016 could be included in the child count due to the child's 36-month period of eligibility. If the State is qualifying on a previous move, the child's eligibility period will be for the remainder of the 36 months.

SEA Approved COE The ease and accuracy of SMART Migrant Student Tracking software guarantees greater accuracy and resulting improvement of State's affirmation of eligibilities. Authenticated student data and staff approval help support the state's eligibility certification to count children who had an active Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD), and a State approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) entered in SMART. SMART software can force the accuracy of data entry during the eligibility collection phase thereby guaranteeing greater record acceptance at the state level. SMART workflows focus on what data fields are necessary for eligibility, to ensure the student record is quickly processed through to final certification. SMART's end-to-end certification enables regional data specialists to immediately begin the record verification process after field recruiters have completed data entry. The electronic record is moved paperlessly through the SMART system from the regional office on to the State's MEP managers for final certification. If after review at each workflow there is missing or invalid information the COE is rejected, and the COE processing workflow is reassigned to the recruiter for updated information.

Considering the COVID-19 pandemic the following guidance was provided to Colorado MEP staff due to the state mandated social distancing guidelines. The Colorado Migrant Education Program issued the following guidance for regional recruiters. This guidance was issued March 2020 and continues at this time until local and state health agencies provide updated guidance. As the Colorado Migrant Education Program continues to follow social distancing guidelines, recruiters are asked to do the following while working with the SMART database.

COE Submission/Validation: Step 1. Recruiter indicates within the parent signature section VI, [Due to COVID Pandemic, Info. confirmed via ph.] Step 2. Data Coordinators indicate within section V of the COE [Validated by (initials).] Step 3. MEP recruiters will obtain parent/worker signature for COE and age verifications once social distancing guidelines are suspended. Step 4. Signed COE will be uploaded on SMART.

Category 2 Colorado MEP conducts several Category 2 validation processes to ensures only unduplicated eligible migratory children who were served during the summer/intercession term are included in its child counts. The data validation process ensures all required data has undergone data cleansing to warrant the data quality is, valid, reliable, and accurate. SMART's reporting functionality uses validation rules and constraints to check for accuracy, completeness, and validity. Data that does not conform are not included in its Category 2 child count. Only Eligible Migratory children who received services from an MEP funded project and resided in our State for one or more days during the Summer/Intercession term, which was verified by using an enrollment date that occurred during the term.

Child Count Category SMART accurately accounts for all migrant children reported to the Office of Migrant Education. Data is captured seamlessly and populates all required state and federal forms. Electronic signatures are supported, approval workflows and notifications are automated. A Validation Tool can instantly indicate on-screen which data fields in a student record requires further information to complete the certification process. This kind of management level oversight is especially critical for State MEP departments to ensure each COE processed is valid, reliable and accurate.

Does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migratory children in every EDFacts data file? Please respond in the table below.

**The State deployed a process that ensured that it transmits accurate migrant data to the Department in every required EDFacts data file.**

Yes

**Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?**

Yes

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

<b>Comments</b>
Colorado cross-references its validation checks against other systems like MSIX using the Child Count Reconciliation Report to identify and resolve data quality issues that may cause State child counts and the MSIX child counts to differ. This same validation process is utilized for both Category 1 and 2 child counts. Any irregularities found, are corrected in the States system and an update of the correction is sent to MSIX during the next available transmission. Should the irregularities be within MSIX, an email is sent to the MSIX helpdesk to resolve the issue.

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>
The State reconciles its child counts to ensure that all migratory children are matched with the migratory children contained within MSIX.

### 2.4.3.2 Quality Control Processes

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	90
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	39
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	39

<p><b>What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.</b></p>
2017-18

Comments
NA

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

a. What are independent prospective re-interviews? Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migratory children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migratory children.

Obtaining Data from Families	Response
How were the re-interviews conducted	Phone interviews
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	Yes

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent re-interviews in SY2018-19.

Comments
NA

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migratory children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

<b>Comments</b>
<p>The re-interview sampling is directly pulled from our data management system, known as SMART, which is designed to randomly select student IDs from the performance period identified, following re-interviewing guidelines. The list of children with COE Approval Dates from 09/01/19 to 04/30/20 was randomly pulled within SMART to begin Sample 1. The random sample of 50 students was checked for appropriate QAD from a total sample of 1021 total students. Of the 1,021 total students, an algorithm was created based on the total number of eligible students within each of the 5 regions. Region 1 was assigned 22% with a total of 11 randomly selected students from 523 in that region; Region 2 was assigned 20% with a total of 10 randomly selected students from 225 in that region; Region 3 was assigned 14% with a total of 7 randomly selected students from 68 in that region; Region 4 was assigned 22% with a total of 11 randomly selected students from 79 in that region; and Region 5 was assigned 22% with a total of 11 randomly selected students from 126 in that region. Of the 50 re-interviews randomly sampled in Sample 1, 16 were successfully completed by telephone and not face-to-face, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. All 16 of the re-interviews successfully completed were determined eligible. The remaining 34 re-interviews were all attempted by telephone and after 3 attempts to reach the families by telephone were documented on different days at different times of the day, these were documented as "unable to determine". A second list of children with COE Approval Dates from 05/01/20 to 08/31/20 was randomly pulled within the SMART database to begin Sample 2. The random sample of 40 students was checked for appropriate QAD from a total sample of 515 students. Of the 515 total students, an algorithm was created based on the total number of eligible students within each of the 5 regions. Region 1 was assigned 20% with a total of 8 selected students from 269 in that region; Region 2 was assigned 25% with a total of 10 randomly selected students from 76 in that region; Region 3 was assigned 12.5% with a total of 5 randomly selected students from 19 in that region; Region 4 was assigned 22.5% with a total of 9 randomly selected students from 64 in that region; and Region 5 was assigned 20% with a total of 8 randomly selected students from 87 in that region. Of the 40 re-interviews randomly sampled in Sample 2, 23 were successfully completed by telephone and not face-to-face, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. All 23 successfully completed re-interviews were determined eligible. The remaining 17 re-interviews were all attempted by telephone and after 3 attempts to reach the families by telephone were documented on different days at different times of the day, these were documented as "unable to determine". Between Sample 1 and Sample 2, 39 re-interviews were successfully completed and determined eligible in total. The SEA determined that due to the execution of the random sampling as two large samples (pulling the 50 random sample and then a 40 random sample) was not conducive to locating the families in a timely manner. In addition, the barrier of re-interviewing families over the telephone (due to COVID-19) is not the best method as many families simply did not answer, or some had disconnected telephones. Colorado continues enhancing our quality control processes for the 2020-2021 Performance Period, the Colorado MEP plans to pull three random samples quarterly through the 2019-2020 Performance Period which will include: Sample 1: 16 total students; Sample 2: 17 total students; and Sample 3: 17 total students to increase the probability of successfully completing a re-interview, given the high mobility of migratory families. Although a telephone re-interview was the means of completing this re-interviewing this past year due to COVID-19, the SEA would like to use a variety of technology as a tool to successfully connect with families for re-interviews apart from a telephone call.</p>

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

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

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>
Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were eligible, were entered in the State's migratory student database during the performance period.

**FAQ on priority for services:**

Who is classified as having “priority for service?” Migratory children who have made a qualifying move within the previous 1-year period and who 1) are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet challenging State academic standards, or 2) have dropped out of school.

**2.4.4.2 English Learners (ELs)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who are also ELs. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>ELs During the Performance Period</b>
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	8
COLORADO	Kindergarten	206
COLORADO	Grade 1	193
COLORADO	Grade 2	177
COLORADO	Grade 3	192
COLORADO	Grade 4	181
COLORADO	Grade 5	187
COLORADO	Grade 6	142
COLORADO	Grade 7	161
COLORADO	Grade 8	115
COLORADO	Grade 9	130
COLORADO	Grade 10	146
COLORADO	Grade 11	106
COLORADO	Grade 12	76
COLORADO	Out of school	5
COLORADO	Ungraded	.
COLORADO	Total	2025

### 2.4.4.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	.
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	20
COLORADO	Kindergarten	21
COLORADO	Grade 1	30
COLORADO	Grade 2	20
COLORADO	Grade 3	33
COLORADO	Grade 4	28
COLORADO	Grade 5	44
COLORADO	Grade 6	36
COLORADO	Grade 7	30
COLORADO	Grade 8	20
COLORADO	Grade 9	12
COLORADO	Grade 10	16
COLORADO	Grade 11	17
COLORADO	Grade 12	17
COLORADO	Out of school	1
COLORADO	Ungraded	.
COLORADO	Total	345

#### 2.4.4.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children whose QAD occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2020 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS121/DG634

State	Age Grade	QAD During the Performance Period
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	106
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	177
COLORADO	Kindergarten	88
COLORADO	Grade 1	78
COLORADO	Grade 2	68
COLORADO	Grade 3	68
COLORADO	Grade 4	71
COLORADO	Grade 5	80
COLORADO	Grade 6	70
COLORADO	Grade 7	54
COLORADO	Grade 8	66
COLORADO	Grade 9	67
COLORADO	Grade 10	77
COLORADO	Grade 11	43
COLORADO	Grade 12	25
COLORADO	Out of school	126
COLORADO	Ungraded	.
COLORADO	Total	1264

## 2.4.5 Academic Status

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

### 2.4.5.1 Dropouts

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

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS032/DG326

State	Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
COLORADO	Grade 7	3
COLORADO	Grade 8	2
COLORADO	Grade 9	8
COLORADO	Grade 10	6
COLORADO	Grade 11	14
COLORADO	Grade 12	19
COLORADO	Ungraded	.
COLORADO	Total	52

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

How is “dropouts” defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2019-20 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2020-21) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another school district, private school or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), (b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or (c) death. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2019-20 performance period should not be reported in this item.

### 2.4.5.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migratory students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g. GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period
1

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>
------------------------------

This child count accurately reflects what was reported by the districts for those Migrant student eligible for the 2019-20 Performance Period.
--

## 2.4.6 MEP Services - During the Performance Period

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to migratory children during the performance period.

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

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

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	239
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	674
COLORADO	Kindergarten	347
COLORADO	Grade 1	293
COLORADO	Grade 2	283
COLORADO	Grade 3	297
COLORADO	Grade 4	313
COLORADO	Grade 5	340
COLORADO	Grade 6	290
COLORADO	Grade 7	307
COLORADO	Grade 8	258
COLORADO	Grade 9	266
COLORADO	Grade 10	295
COLORADO	Grade 11	209
COLORADO	Grade 12	185
COLORADO	Ungraded	0
COLORADO	Out of school	299
COLORADO	Total	4895

### 2.4.6.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who have been classified as having “priority for services” and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

<b>State</b>	<b>Age Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	198
COLORADO	Kindergarten	90
COLORADO	Grade 1	103
COLORADO	Grade 2	70
COLORADO	Grade 3	80
COLORADO	Grade 4	77
COLORADO	Grade 5	109
COLORADO	Grade 6	84
COLORADO	Grade 7	108
COLORADO	Grade 8	68
COLORADO	Grade 9	90
COLORADO	Grade 10	85
COLORADO	Grade 11	63
COLORADO	Grade 12	48
COLORADO	Ungraded	0
COLORADO	Out of school	196
COLORADO	Total	1469

## 2.4.6.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migratory children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Section 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS054/DG102

State	Age Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	1
COLORADO	Kindergarten	1
COLORADO	Grade 1	1
COLORADO	Grade 2	3
COLORADO	Grade 3	1
COLORADO	Grade 4	5
COLORADO	Grade 5	1
COLORADO	Grade 6	0
COLORADO	Grade 7	1
COLORADO	Grade 8	2
COLORADO	Grade 9	1
COLORADO	Grade 10	0
COLORADO	Grade 11	2
COLORADO	Grade 12	2
COLORADO	Ungraded	0
COLORADO	Out of school	0
COLORADO	Total	21

### FAQ on Continuation of Services:

What is Continuation of Services? The “continuation of services” provision found in Section 1304(e) of the ESEA provides that: (1) a child who ceases to be a migratory child during a school term shall be eligible for services until the end of such term; (2) a child who is no longer a migratory child may continue to receive services for one additional school year, but only if comparable services are not available through other programs; and (3) secondary school students who were eligible for services in secondary school may continue to be served through credit accrual programs until graduation.

### 2.4.6.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	166
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	457
COLORADO	Kindergarten	196
COLORADO	Grade 1	149
COLORADO	Grade 2	130
COLORADO	Grade 3	145
COLORADO	Grade 4	143
COLORADO	Grade 5	168
COLORADO	Grade 6	129
COLORADO	Grade 7	127
COLORADO	Grade 8	103
COLORADO	Grade 9	126
COLORADO	Grade 10	157
COLORADO	Grade 11	101
COLORADO	Grade 12	80
COLORADO	Ungraded	.
COLORADO	Out of school	103
COLORADO	Total	2480

## 2.4.6.4 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	.	.	.
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	.	.	.
COLORADO	Grade 1	3	3	.
COLORADO	Grade 10	2	6	121
COLORADO	Grade 11	.	.	90
COLORADO	Grade 12	.	1	63
COLORADO	Grade 2	6	8	.
COLORADO	Grade 3	4	6	.
COLORADO	Grade 4	2	1	.
COLORADO	Grade 5	2	2	.
COLORADO	Grade 6	.	2	.
COLORADO	Grade 7	1	7	.
COLORADO	Grade 8	1	3	84
COLORADO	Grade 9	.	3	103
COLORADO	Kindergarten	.	1	.
COLORADO	Out of school	.	.	66
COLORADO	Total	21	43	527
COLORADO	Ungraded	.	.	.

### FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is “high school credit accrual”? MEP-funded instruction, funded in whole or in part by MEP funds, 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. High school credit accrual includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. High school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12. NOTE: Children receiving a MEP-funded high school credit accrual service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

## 2.4.6.5 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS145/DG684

State	Age Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period
COLORADO	Age 3 through 5 (Not Kindergarten)	538	51
COLORADO	Age Birth through 2	191	8
COLORADO	Grade 1	261	34
COLORADO	Grade 10	257	108
COLORADO	Grade 11	184	91
COLORADO	Grade 12	142	82
COLORADO	Grade 2	240	30
COLORADO	Grade 3	265	38
COLORADO	Grade 4	273	47
COLORADO	Grade 5	297	61
COLORADO	Grade 6	254	86
COLORADO	Grade 7	276	109
COLORADO	Grade 8	216	82
COLORADO	Grade 9	226	99
COLORADO	Kindergarten	306	41
COLORADO	Out of school	263	45
COLORADO	Total	4189	1012
COLORADO	Ungraded	.	.

### FAQs on Support Services:

a. What are support services? These MEP-funded educationally-related services are provided to students. These services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migratory children; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. Activities related to identification and recruitment, parental involvement, professional development, program evaluation, and 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 counsees, or between students and students in MEP peer-to-peer counseling activities, or between students and MEP-funded staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy. NOTE: Children who receive a MEP-funded counseling service should be reported only once, regardless of frequency.

## 2.4.7 School Data during the Regular School Year

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

### 2.4.7.1 Schools and Enrollment – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migratory 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 migratory children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110

State	Number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children	Number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools
COLORADO	553	3041

### 2.4.7.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in SWPs – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migratory 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 migratory child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Populated with SCH-LEVEL FS165/DG110 and FS165/DG514

## **2.5 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK**

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, 2019 through June 30, 2020.
- 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:
  - o 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.
  - o At-Risk Programs: Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, dependency adjudication, or delinquency adjudication, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice or child welfare system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, are English learners, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - o Juvenile Corrections: An institution for delinquent children and youth that 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.
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o Other: Any other programs, not defined above, that receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

### **2.5.1 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.

#### **2.5.1.1 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 or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Adult corrections	.	.
Juvenile corrections	5	116
Juvenile detention	.	.
Neglected programs	.	.
Other programs	.	.
Total	.	.

### FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

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

Data Quality Comments

### 2.5.1.2 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Adult corrections	.
Juvenile corrections	5
Juvenile detention	.
Neglected programs	.
Other programs	.
Total	.

Data Quality Comments

### 2.5.1.3 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA) and EL status, 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS119/DG656

State	# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Total Long-Term Students Served	.	.	432	.	.
COLORADO	Total Unduplicated Students Served	.	.	794	.	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	.	.	222	.	.
COLORADO	English learner	.	.	5	.	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	American Indian or Alaska Native	.	.	7	.	.
COLORADO	Asian	.	.	8	.	.
COLORADO	Black or African American	.	.	181	.	.
COLORADO	Hispanic or Latino	.	.	333	.	.
COLORADO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	.	.	2	.	.
COLORADO	Total	.	.	794	.	.
COLORADO	Two or more races	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	White	.	.	263	.	.

Provide the number of students served by gender.

State	Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Female	.	.	119	.	.
COLORADO	Male	.	.	675	.	.
COLORADO	Total	.	.	794	.	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	10 years old	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	11 years old	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	12 years old	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	13 years old	.	.	6	.	.
COLORADO	14 years old	.	.	12	.	.
COLORADO	15 years old	.	.	71	.	.
COLORADO	16 years old	.	.	130	.	.
COLORADO	17 years old	.	.	219	.	.
COLORADO	18 years old	.	.	217	.	.
COLORADO	19 years old	.	.	89	.	.
COLORADO	20 years old	.	.	41	.	.
COLORADO	21 years old	.	.	9	.	.
COLORADO	3 through 5	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	6 years old	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	7 years old	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	8 years old	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	9 years old	.	.	0	.	.
COLORADO	Total	.	.	794	.	.

**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, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

### 2.5.1.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days after Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column (“in fac.”) or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the “in fac.” column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the “90 days after exit” column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career, and technical outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90–day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS180/DG783 and FS181/DG785

State	Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Enrolled in local district school			35		

State	Outcomes	Neglected Programs - In Fac	Neglected Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Detention - In Fac	Juvenile Detention - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Corrections - In Fac
COLORADO	Earned a GED					57
COLORADO	Obtained high school diploma					87
COLORADO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs					195
COLORADO	Earned high school course credits					546
COLORADO	Obtained employment					12
COLORADO	Enrolled in a GED program					80
COLORADO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					16

State	Outcomes	Juvenile Corrections - 90 Days After Exit	Adult Corrections - In Fac	Adult Corrections - 90 Days After Exit	Other Programs - In Fac	Other Programs - 90 Days After Exit
COLORADO	Earned a GED	S				
COLORADO	Obtained high school diploma	4				
COLORADO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs	6				
COLORADO	Earned high school course credits	35				
COLORADO	Obtained employment	43				
COLORADO	Enrolled in a GED program	3				
COLORADO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	5				

## 2.5.2 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

### 2.5.2.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Up to one full grade			33		
COLORADO	No Change			50		
COLORADO	More than one full grade			77		
COLORADO	Negative change			102		
COLORADO	Total			262		

### 2.5.2.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in mathematics pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, 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.

Populated with SEA-LEVEL FS113/DG628

State	Performance Data (Based on most recent pre post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Up to one full grade			33		
COLORADO	No Change			50		
COLORADO	More than one full grade			77		
COLORADO	Negative change			102		
COLORADO	Total			262		

## 2.5.3 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.

### 2.5.3.1 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 or Facility Type	# Programs or Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	1	.
Juvenile corrections	10	74
Juvenile detention	.	.
Neglected programs	.	.
Other programs	.	.
Total	.	.

#### 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.

#### Data Quality Comments

Although one at-risk program received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year, the school in which the program was operated closed in June 2020. Therefore, data was unable to be collected and the average length of stay was not reported for that program.

### 2.5.3.2 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 or Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Juvenile corrections	10
Juvenile detention	.
Neglected programs	.
Other programs	.
Total	.

#### Data Quality Comments

Although one at-risk program received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year, the school in which the program was operated closed in June 2020. Therefore, data was unable to be collected and 0 was reported for that program.

### 2.5.3.3 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA), and EL status, 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.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS127/DG657

State	# of students served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Total Long-Term Students Served	0	.	.	542	.
COLORADO	Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	.	.	1537	.

Provide the number of students served by special populations.

State	Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Children with one or more disabilities (IDEA)	0	.	.	544	.
COLORADO	English learner	0	.	.	143	.

Provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity.

State	Race Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	.	.	26	.
COLORADO	Asian	0	.	.	20	.
COLORADO	Black or African American	0	.	.	381	.
COLORADO	Hispanic or Latino	0	.	.	525	.
COLORADO	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	0	.	.	3	.
COLORADO	Total	0	.	.	1537	.
COLORADO	Two or more races	0	.	.	69	.
COLORADO	White	0	.	.	513	.

Provide the number of students served by sex.

State	Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Female	0	.	.	320	.
COLORADO	Male	0	.	.	1217	.
COLORADO	Total	0	.	.	1537	.

Provide the number of students served by age.

State	Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	10 years old	0	.	.	9	.
COLORADO	11 years old	0	.	.	11	.
COLORADO	12 years old	0	.	.	34	.
COLORADO	13 years old	0	.	.	113	.
COLORADO	14 years old	0	.	.	151	.
COLORADO	15 years old	0	.	.	302	.
COLORADO	16 years old	0	.	.	387	.
COLORADO	17 years old	0	.	.	432	.
COLORADO	18 years old	0	.	.	79	.
COLORADO	19 years old	0	.	.	15	.
COLORADO	20 years old	0	.	.	2	.
COLORADO	21 years old	0	.	.	.	.
COLORADO	3 through 5	0	.	.	.	.
COLORADO	6 years old	0	.	.	.	.
COLORADO	7 years old	0	.	.	.	.
COLORADO	8 years old	0	.	.	.	.
COLORADO	9 years old	0	.	.	2	.
COLORADO	Total	0	.	.	1537	.

**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, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

### 2.5.3.4 Academic, Career and Technical Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic, career and technical outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either in the while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column (“in fac.”) or in the within 90 calendar days after exiting column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the “in fac.” column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the “90 days after exit” column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic, career and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS180/DG782 and FS181/DG784

State	Outcomes(once per student, only after exit)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	Enrolled in local district school				474	

State	Outcomes	At-Risk Programs - In Fac	At-Risk Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Neglected Programs - In Fac	Neglected Programs - 90 Days After Exit	Juvenile Detention - In Fac
COLORADO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					
COLORADO	Obtained high school diploma					
COLORADO	Obtained employment					
COLORADO	Enrolled in a GED program					
COLORADO	Earned high school course credits					
COLORADO	Earned a GED					
COLORADO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs					

<b>State</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention - 90 Days After Exit</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections - In Fac</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections - 90 Days After Exit</b>	<b>Other Programs - In Fac</b>	<b>Other Programs - 90 Days After Exit</b>
COLORADO	Were accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education		S	24		
COLORADO	Obtained high school diploma		25	S		
COLORADO	Obtained employment		11	65		
COLORADO	Enrolled in a GED program		107	S		
COLORADO	Earned high school course credits		921	46		
COLORADO	Earned a GED		39	S		
COLORADO	Enrolled in job training courses/programs		195	S		

### 2.5.3.5 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

#### 2.5.3.5.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

State	Performance Data(Based on most recent pre post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	More than one full grade				43	
COLORADO	No change				53	
COLORADO	Negative change				100	
COLORADO	Up to one full grade				127	
COLORADO	Total				323	

#### 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, 2019, through June 30, 2020.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

### 2.5.3.5.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in mathematics pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2019, 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.

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS125/DG629

State	Performance Data(Based on most recent pre post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
COLORADO	More than one full grade				41	
COLORADO	No change				62	
COLORADO	Up to one full grade				113	
COLORADO	Negative change				115	
COLORADO	Total				331	

## 2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (TITLE IV, PART A)

### 2.6.1 Funds Spent Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the amount of funds spent by LEAs on the three content areas under Title IV, Part A of the ESEA.

Content Area	Amount of Funds Spent
Well-Rounded	\$2,914,159
Safe and Healthy Students	\$2,659,489
Effective Use of Technology	\$1,644,778

#### Data Quality Comments

Colorado began collecting Title IV, Part A expenditures by content area for the first time in the 2019/20 school year. The amount of funds reported here is not a complete representation of all Title IV, Part A funds spent in the state. Rather, these amounts represent only the amount of funds spent by LEAs that were able to report their expenditures by content area. Colorado will continue to work with LEAs to ensure all are able to report by content area in the future.

### 2.6.2 LEAs Who Spent Funds Under Title IV, Part A

This section collects data on the number of LEAs who spent funds by the content areas under Title IV, Part A of the ESEA. For the “Any” category, report the number of LEAs that spent funds in any of the three content areas. An LEA should be included in the count of each content area it spent funds on (i.e. an LEA may be represented in more than one content area in the table below).

Content Area	Number of LEAs Spending Funds
Well-Rounded	95
Safe and Healthy Students	66
Effective Use of Technology	52
Any Content Area	148

#### Data Quality Comments

Colorado began collecting Title IV, Part A expenditures by content area for the first time in the 2019/20 school year. The number of LEAs reported here is not a complete representation of all Title IV, Part A funds spent in the state. Rather, these amounts represent only the number of LEAs that were able to report their expenditures by content area. Colorado will continue to work with LEAs to ensure all are able to report by content area in the future.

## 2.7 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE V, PART A)

### 2.7.1 State Transferability of Funds

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

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 5103(a) during SY2019-20?
No

Data Quality Comments

### 2.7.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 5103(b).
16

Data Quality Comments

### 2.7.3 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
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	2
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	8
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	0
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	0
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	14	1
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	4	5

Data Quality Comments

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2019 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	.	\$0
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act (Title III, Part A)	.	\$40,095
Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs (Title I, Part A)	.	\$198,787
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	.	\$0
Rural Education Initiative (Title V, Part B)	.	\$0
Student Support and Enrichment Grants (Title IV, Part A)	\$224,047	\$0
Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)	\$85,133	\$70,298

<b>Data Quality Comments</b>

## 2.8 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP)

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds during SY2019-20 for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Activities authorized under Part A of Title I	11
Activities authorized under Part A of Title II	10
Activities authorized under Title III	2
Activities authorized under Part A of Title IV	7
Parental involvement activities	3

Data Quality Comments

### 2.8.2 RLIS Objectives and Outcomes

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the objectives and outcomes for the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

## Comments

Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has worked with LEAs through their consolidated applications to administer this funding to align with and enhance other federal, state, and local programs. The specific measurable program objectives and outcomes for each LEA receiving RLIS funds will be aligned with the specific Title program(s): Use of Funds and Program Objectives and Outcomes. The following are examples of uses of RLIS funds by various Colorado districts:

" Incentives to recruit retain teachers by assisting them to pay to get their alternative license/endorsement. " Alamosa School District (ASD) will provide job-embedded professional development through the use of instructional coaches. This position is new to Alamosa School District. The instructional coaches will provide coaching on strategies to engage all students in tier one core content areas. This will help to retain staff since they will receive the support they need to meet the needs of all students. " Blended learning experience for middle school students that are on READ plans (have significant reading deficiencies). Funds will pay for a portion of the annual subscription cost to provide Reading Plus to middle school students. Reading Plus is shown to have the highest level of evidence as needed under ESSA. " ASD will create a PBIS coordinator position whose responsibilities include implementing the PBIS matrices, implementing reinforcements, and coordinating PBIS activities. " Purchase of Chromebooks for student use in the classroom and at home during remote learning. " Pagosa Peak Open School will institute a Multi-tiered System of Support in order to identify students in need of additional time and support to meet educational expectations for their grade level. " The district will provide ESEA (Title) funding for Schoolwide Programs and consolidate state and local funds with federal funds in an effort to support school reform. " During Family Night Events parents will be educated as to the additional support programs available for the most at risk student population. This will allow teachers and parents to be able to focus on academic student success. Intended Outcome: Teachers and Parents will be able to collaborate together in order to meet the individual student needs. How will LEA Evaluate Activity Effectiveness? The Building Level Accountability Committee (BAC) will send Parent Surveys out to families the day following the Family Night Activity in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the activity. This information will be shared with the building level administrator. Supplies: family related games, communication related office items, refreshment items, etc. " Recruitment or retention of teachers, these funds will be used to address the critical teacher shortage and pay BOCES for Alternative Licensure candidates. " Parental involvement activities-including supplies for family night, back to school activities. " Professional development for teachers to include programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching. " Substitutes for PLC planning, grades K-8. " Benefits for substitutes for K-8 PLC planning. " Stipends for Curriculum Alignment Teams of Teachers to Adjust Pacing Calendars and Assessments per quarter. " Benefits for Stipends for Curriculum Alignment Teams of Teachers to Adjust Pacing Calendars and Assessments per quarter. " Stipends for Admin and Teacher Leaders to develop and deliver PD on District PD Days-November 1 and January 20. " Benefits for Stipends for Admin and Teacher Leaders to develop and deliver PD on District PD Days-November 1 and January 20. " Travel to PD opportunities offered through Beyond Textbooks for 20 admin, teachers and specifically SPED teachers to attend the BT Super Conference and the BT SPED conference held at Vail District, Tucson, Arizona. BT is the district's new curriculum framework. Attendees will also visit Arizona schools who are using BT in their classrooms. " Supplies and copies for implementation of Beyond Textbooks, K-10 including online resources. " To conduct a Gifted and Talented Education Art Enrichment Program for students in GATE programs from K-12. " To conduct a summer reading academy for up to 50 students, district-wide, who are reading below grade level, using Lindamood-Bell Seein Stars and Visualizing and Verbalizing techniques. " Building level leadership team member stipends for the purpose of planning instructional improvement, conducting MTSS processes, and engaging parents in educational processes. " Train charter and exploratory school teachers in the use of research -proven schoolwide culture initiatives such as Capturing Kids Hearts and Choice Theory respectively. This service will be purchased by the district on behalf of the charter school. " To support the launch and implementation of CañonThrives, a district driven community bulletin board aimed at promoting the Cañon City region as a place to live and work, and at recruitment of highly qualified staff to teaching and classified positions. " Support for students who can not afford to pay for Advanced Placement tests at the high school level. " This is to be used as a stipend for our Safety and At-risk coordinator for training of staff for all emergency situations and working in conjunction with law enforcement and OEM personnel to ensure proper protocols are developed and followed. " RUVNA safety program software(app) for a direct link to law enforcement and staff members and parents via cellphone texts and 1 button notifications will greatly enhance our safety and notification tools. " Huerfano RE-1, being a small rural school, has seen immense periods of lackluster recruiting and retention of personnel due to many factors. Needless to say. it often takes incentives to sign a contract with our district. Therefore these monies will be used as sign-on/retention bonus to attract and keep certified and qualified personnel. " Professional Development-Supporting efforts detailed in Title II. " Support students experiencing homelessness, supporting efforts detailed in Title I. " Teacher stipends for k-12 teachers. Teachers who attend professional development days on Fridays when school is not in session, teachers who tutor our EL students on Fridays and after school, Teachers who work on Lighthouse teams for students and parents. " Purchase supplemental materials for our English Language students (for example text books in Spanish or any other language needed). " Achieve 3000 intervention to support reading and close achievement gap for highest risk, lowest performing students. " Illuminate FAST to support reading, math and behavior issues and close the achievement gap for highest risk, lowest performing students. " Student Engagement Coordinator with Pinon Project to target students in need of support for consistent school attendance, and creating a positive self-image and esteem while connecting to their school campus. " Incentive Student Teacher Retention strategy as part of the partnership with student teacher pipeline work with Fort Lewis College. Capturing quality student teachers with the challenge of distance to the closest university, while giving additional professional learning to retain student teachers into our work force. " Charter allocation for Children's Kiva

### 2.8.3 RLIS Technical Assistance

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in providing technical assistance for RLIS LEA sub-grantees as described in the State's most current Consolidated State Application. If providing quantitative data along with your narrative, please ensure all data is converted to text format.

Comments
Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has enhanced LEA's capacity to administer these funds by providing technical assistance through an annual review of LEA's uses of funds, 16 program trainings through 5 regions of the state (one virtual and statewide), ongoing emails, and regular telephone support throughout the year to support LEAs in using RLIS funds to meet district needs aligned with intent and purpose of the RLIS program. CDE shared several communications and provided trainings with LEAs to support dual-eligible districts in making informed decisions on participation in RLIS vs. SRSA program.

### 2.8.4 RLIS Subgrant Award Determination

Please report the method the SEA used to award grants to eligible LEAs. If the SEA used a competitive process, please describe that process and include a description of the methods and criteria the SEA used to review applications, award funds to LEAs, and how the LEAs were notified of the process. If the SEA used a formula besides one based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State, please describe that formula, including an explanation of how this alternative formula enables the SEA to allot grant funds in a manner that serves equal or greater concentrations of children from families with incomes below the poverty line, relative to the concentration that would be served if the SEA used a formula based on the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

Comments
Colorado awards grants by the number of students in average daily attendance served by eligible LEAs in the State.

## 2.8.5 RLIS State Administrative Funds

In the table below, provide information on state administrative funds.

Question	Percentage
What percentage of the RLIS grant funds were retained for State-level administration?	5
What percentage of those funds retained for State-level administration were used specifically for technical assistance?	85

Data Quality Comments

## 2.8.6 RLIS LEAs Awarded Funds

Please list the NCES LEA ID and name of each LEA that received RLIS funds and the amount each received.

Data published outside of report

Data Quality Comments

## 2.8.7 Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) Program, Alternative Fund Use Authority (AFUA)

Populated with LEA-LEVEL FS131/DG614

State	Number of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.	Percent of SRSA- and Dual-eligible LEAs informed their SEA of an intent to utilize SRSA's AFUA, under Section 5211 of the ESEA.
COLORADO	53	51