

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08

NEBRASKA



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614 Expiration Date:
10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2007-08 X Part II, 2007-08

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

Nebraska

Address:

PO Box 94987

Lincoln, NE Person to contact about this report:

Name: Marilyn Peterson, Ph.D.

Telephone: 402-471-3504
Fax: 402-471-0117
e-mail: marilyn.peterson@nebraska.gov

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

Dr. Roger Breed

Friday, May 8, 2009, 1:48:03 PM

Signature Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009
5PM EST**

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,675	5,967	89.4
4	6,497	6,040	93.0
5	6,174	5,467	88.5
6	3,992	3,512	88.0
7	616	501	81.3
8	688	626	91.0
High School	594	535	90.1
Total	25,236	22,648	89.7
Comments:			

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

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,655	5,789	87.0
4	6,476	5,781	89.3
5	6,156	5,354	87.0
6	3,994	3,550	88.9
7	577	463	80.2
8	685	609	88.9
High School	591	549	92.9
Total	25,134	22,095	87.9
Comments:			

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

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,144	5,735	93.3
4	6,256	6,012	96.1
5	5,610	5,062	90.2
6	4,326	3,884	89.8
7	1,903	1,697	89.2
8	1,958	1,780	90.9
High School	856	768	89.7
Total	27,053	24,938	92.2
Comments:			

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

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	6,124	5,744	93.8
4	6,222	5,985	96.2
5	5,606	5,236	93.4
6	4,354	4,004	92.0
7	1,894	1,622	85.6
8	1,972	1,858	94.2
High School	879	827	94.1
Total	27,051	25,276	93.4
Comments:			

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

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals:

(1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,940
Limited English proficient students	11,080
Students who are homeless	551
Migratory students	1,266
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,566
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,094
Black, non-Hispanic	9,191
Hispanic	18,772
White, non-Hispanic	41,020
Total	72,643
Comments:	

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	60	469	0	38	567
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	630	4,256	22	26	4,934
K	852	9,186	121	16	10,175
1	1,319	8,813	138	35	10,305
2	1,247	8,479	180	42	9,948
3	1,101	8,271	160	37	9,569
4	865	7,892	119	46	8,922
5	578	7,409	89	46	8,122
6	499	4,888	74	72	5,533
7	238	1,013	N<10	160	1,414
8	209	1,035	N<10	274	1,526
9	106	713	N<10	509	1,332
10	89	751	0	569	1,409
11	85	723	0	481	1,289
12	70	768	0	280	1,118
Ungraded	N<10	18	0	95	121
TOTALS	7,956	64,684	918	2,726	76,284
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	3,356
Reading/language arts	6,898
Science	N<10
Social studies	N<10
Vocational/career	N<10
Other instructional services	571
Comments:	

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	386
Supporting guidance/advocacy	781
Other support services	392
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	189.80	
Paraprofessionals ¹	19.40	100.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0.00	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	5.00	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on staff information

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

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals3	1,564.30	100.0
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. 3 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

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

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	6
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.

4. Do not use rounding rules. The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	141
2. Adults participating	160
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	98
4. Participating children	208
a. Birth through 2 years	102
b. Age 3 through 5	68
c. Age 6 through 8	38
c. Above age 8	0
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	94
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	114
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	71
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	99
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	51
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

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

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	45
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	32
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	32
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	32
5. Total families enrolled	141
Comments:	

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

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although we have had decrease in number of programs, and a smaller total number of families participating in 2007-08, the families and children enrolled showed significant improvement as demonstrated by assessment data. Eighty-two percent of the four-year olds had gains of 4 or more standard points on the PPVT. A higher percentage of 4-year olds compared to 2006-07 improved in the PALS data with an identification rate of 16.67 uppercase letters, a trend that has continued over the past 4 years. A majority of adults enrolled in ABE achieved their GED and 12 teen parents stayed in school while 4 other teen parents received their high school diploma. Parents had significantly higher scores in the Parent Education Profile Scales I and II. The data provide evidence that our Nebraska Even Start programs are making a significant difference in the learning and literacy outcomes of families with young children.

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

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

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2. Note:

Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	14	13	
CASAS			
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

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

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST	72	59	
CASAS			
TABE			
Other			
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<10	N<10	
GED	N<10	0	
Other			
Comments:			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED	11	N<10	
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	18	17	14		One sub-grantee failed to collect a PPVT on one eligible child
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	18	17	N<10		One sub-grantee failed to collect a PPVT on one eligible child. Average fall standard scores were 60 and average spring standard scores were 75
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

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

The following terms apply:

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	18	18	0	16.7	
Comments:					

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

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	N<10	N<10	
1	N<10	N<10	
2	N<10	N<10	
3	0	0	
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	50	46	
PEP Scale II	50	45	
PEP Scale III			Not used
PEP Scale IV			Not used
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	227
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	171
K	276
1	235
2	253
3	231
4	197
5	175
6	172
7	176
8	176
9	159
10	136
11	92
12	63
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	901
Total	3,641
Comments: 5.4.09 Confirming that the value of 1 for ungraded is correct. DS	

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

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	41
1	29
2	41
3	32
4	20
5	24
6	21
7	25
8	25
9	30
10	20
11	12
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	336
Comments: 5.4.09 Confirming "0" for Ungraded and Out-of School. DS We have taken the data from MIS 2000 for the 2007-08 school year. DS 2.4.09	

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

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	56
K	137
1	108
2	105
3	94
4	81
5	69
6	66
7	57
8	59
9	55
10	48
11	32
12	16
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	983
Comments: Data for the 2007-08 school year is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	13
K	14
1	15
2	13
3	14
4	22
5	17
6	16
7	22
8	10
9	11
10	12
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	0
Total	185
Comments: 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

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

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	127	82	18	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34	65	36	36
K	38	104	67	67
1	39	65	66	65
2	42	81	57	73
3	30	78	72	51
4	30	52	60	55
5	22	64	45	44
6	21	56	43	52
7	26	55	49	46
8	18	59	47	52
9	34	54	32	39
10	11	46	36	43
11	10	31	25	26
12	N<10	13	23	20
Ungraded	0	0	0	N<10
Out-of-school	410	226	137	130
Total	897	1,131	813	800
Comments: 2007-08 Data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09				

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

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	163
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	113
K	193
1	176
2	188
3	153
4	150
5	125
6	114
7	126
8	131
9	118
10	88
11	68
12	45
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	546
Total	2,498
Comments: 5.4.09 Data for this section has been updated to te reflect 36 month period. LR & DS 2007-08 Data comes from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

OMB NO. 1810-0614 Page 28

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	0
8	0
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Total	15
Comments: 2007-08 Data was taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

FAQ on Dropouts:

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

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	0
Comments:	

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

2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	182	177
4	164	162
5	127	124
6	115	112
7	137	134
8	128	128
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	70	68
12	0	0
Ungraded	0	0
Total	923	905
<p>Comments: 5.8.09 Data has been updated. DS, LR, & KB 2.27.09 We have found a discrepancy in our data for number of students tested and enrolled. We are looking into this and will submit the EDFacts file as soon as we have resolved the issue. The corrected numbers will be submitted during the resubmission window. Diane Stuehmer</p>		

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

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	183	178
4	164	163
5	127	125
6	114	111
7	137	136
8	127	127
9	0	0
10	0	0
11	68	64
12	0	0
Ungraded	0	0
Total	920	904
<p>Comments: 5.8.09 Data has been updated. DS, LR, & KB 2.27.09 We have found a discrepancy in our data for number of students tested and enrolled. We are looking into this and will submit the EDFacts file as soon as we have resolved the issue. The corrected numbers will be submitted during the resubmission window. Diane Stuehmer</p>		

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

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	36
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	59
K	124
1	96
2	105
3	98
4	82
5	78
6	74
7	63
8	59
9	63
10	57
11	33
12	21
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	20
Total	1,069
Comments: 5.4.09 Data updated due to decrease of Child Count. LR & DS 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	10
K	14
1	54
2	44
3	50
4	37
5	25
6	31
7	33
8	34
9	36
10	25
11	14
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	412
Comments: 5.4.09 Data has been updated. LR & DS	

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

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	N<10
Comments: 2007-08 data is from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	50
K	83
1	73
2	76
3	68
4	63
5	55
6	55
7	50
8	49
9	41
10	50
11	32
12	15
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	0
Total	761

Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS Data for the 2007-08 school year was gleaned from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09

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

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17	18	
K	55	54	
1	43	42	
2	39	36	
3	34	40	
4	33	30	
5	43	42	
6	41	41	
7	30	27	
8	32	26	
9	29	35	0
10	37	18	0
11	19	11	0
12	10	N<10	0
Ungraded	N<10	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	463	421	0

Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS Data for the 2007-08 school year was gleaned from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	24	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	47	0
K	82	N<10
1	77	N<10
2	81	N<10
3	78	N<10
4	59	N<10
5	54	N<10
6	62	N<10
7	52	N<10
8	63	N<10
9	63	17
10	47	17
11	31	N<10
12	20	N<10
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Out-of-school	28	0
Total	869	93
Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS Data for the 2007-08 school year was gleaned from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09		

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

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	12
1	10
2	17
3	15
4	N<10
5	10
6	15
7	11
8	15
9	13
10	12
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	55
Total	224
Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS Data for the 2007-08 school year was gleaned from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	93
K	80
1	79
2	73
3	82
4	68
5	57
6	42
7	40
8	29
9	24
10	28
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	728
Comments: Data taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.11.09	

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

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	N<10
K	0
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	N<10
Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2/11/2009	

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

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	3
10	4
11	4
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	15
Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2/11/2009	

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

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	91
K	77
1	78
2	72
3	79
4	63
5	54
6	39
7	36
8	26
9	21
10	16
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	663
Comments: Data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09	

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

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	71	71	
K	77	76	
1	78	76	
2	71	71	
3	78	79	
4	62	61	
5	54	52	
6	39	39	
7	34	36	
8	26	26	
9	19	19	0
10	15	12	0
11	N<10	N<10	0
12	N<10	N<10	0
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	633	624	0
Comments: 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2/11/2009			

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

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	N<10
K	N<10	0
1	18	0
2	15	N<10
3	15	0
4	18	0
5	16	0
6	N<10	N<10
7	13	N<10
8	N<10	N<10
9	N<10	N<10
10	N<10	N<10
11	0	0
12	0	0
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	126	N<10
Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2/11/2009		

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

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	N<10
2	0
3	0
4	N<10
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	N<10
Comments: 5.4.09 The percentage change in values is due to decrease of Child count. LR & DS 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2/11/2009	

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

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	40
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	69
K	163
1	140
2	134
3	133
4	101
5	99
6	92
7	81
8	82
9	76
10	74
11	39
12	21
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	33
Total	1,378
Comments: 5.4.09 Data has been updated. LR & DS 2007-08 data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2/11/2009	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	278
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,414
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

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

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

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	16	2,393
Regular school year – school day/extended day	9	286
Summer/intersession only	16	663
Year round	0	0
Comments: 2007-08 Data is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.4.09		

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

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

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

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	48	22.47	125	109.21
Counselors	2	1.35	4	4.00
All paraprofessionals	25	17.38	38	34.50
Recruiters	22	16.18	13	9.92
Records transfer staff	7	4.12	11	5.67
Comments: 5.4.09 Data has been updated. LR & DS Data for the 2007-08 school year was taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.11.09				

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	39	27.16	35	30.50
Comments: 5.4.09 Data updated. LR & DS Data for the 2007-08 school year is taken from MIS 2000. DS 2.11.09				

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

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	1	108
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	3	166
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	0
Total	5	127

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	1
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	3
Adult Corrections	1
Other	0
Total	5
Comments:	

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

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	28		619	130	
Long Term Students Served	23		576	79	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10		36	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander	0		10	N<10	
Black, non-Hispanic	N<10		142	56	
Hispanic	N<10		131	22	
White, non-Hispanic	23		300	44	
Total	27		619	130	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	28		497	130	
Female	0		122	0	
Total	28		619	130	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6	0		0	0	
7	0		0	0	
8	0		0	0	
9	0		0	0	
10	0		0	0	
11	0		0	0	
12	0		N<10	0	
13	N<10		13	0	
14	N<10		40	0	
15	N<10		108	N<10	
16	N<10		194	N<10	
17	N<10		189	N<10	
18	N<10		74	37	
19	0		0	46	
20	0		0	29	
21	0		0	N<10	
Total	28		619	130	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: One student was reported as other for race/ethnicity in the Neglected field for Subpart 1, State Agency.

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	1	3	1	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	2	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	3	1	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	22	546	31	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	168	14	0
Comments:				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	10	49	0	0
Earned a GED	0	88	N<10	0
Obtained high school diploma	N<10	24	0	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	N<10	0	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	N<10	0	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	N<10	0	0
Comments:				

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	19	139	63	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	N<10	284	24	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	80	N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	43	0	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	30	0	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	29	N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	102	14	0
Comments:				

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

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	20	356	32	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	N<10	288	24	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	75	12	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	42	N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	24	N<10	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	25	0	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10	122	10	
Comments:				

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

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	3	65
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	3	65

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	3
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	0
Total	3
Comments: 5.4.09 Corrected number for Juvenile detention program/facility entered. DS	

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

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	2,092	0	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	186	0	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	55	0	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	18	0	0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	778	0	0
Hispanic	0	0	258	0	0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	983	0	0
Total	0	0	2,092	0	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	1,540	0	0
Female	0	0	552	0	0
Total	0	0	2,092	0	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	N<10	0	0
11	0	0	N<10	0	0
12	0	0	21	0	0
13	0	0	103	0	0
14	0	0	240	0	0
15	0	0	366	0	0
16	0	0	569	0	0
17	0	0	623	0	0
18	0	0	165	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	0
20	0	0	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	2,092	0	0

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

Comments:

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

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	0	0	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	0	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	0	1	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	0	703	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	125	0
Comments:				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	0	873	0
Earned a GED	0	0	15	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	N<10	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	0	0	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	0	0	0
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	0	0	0	0
Comments: NA				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	0	0	0	0
Obtained employment	0	0	0	0
Comments: NA				

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			122	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)			154	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams			44	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			43	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			19	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			15	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			33	
Comments:				

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			108	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)			124	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams			28	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			39	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			14	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			35	
Comments:				

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

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Have you ever belonged to a gang? If you have ever belonged to a gang, did the gang have a name?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported gang involvement: 6th --8.4% 8th --9.7% 10th --9.7% 12th --9.5%	2005-06:	Reported gang involvement: 6th --8.6% 8th --8.9% 10th --8.2% 12th --6.2%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported gang involvement: 6th --6.9% 8th --8.3% 10th --10.0% 12th --10.0%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How much do you think people risk having themselves if they: Smoke on or more packs of cigarettes per day? Try marijuana once or twice Smoke marijuana regularly? Take on or two drinks of an alcohol beverage nearly every day? Use "meth"?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Low perceived risk of drug use: 6th --42.9% 8th --32.9% 10th --45.6% 12th --40.7%	2005-06:	Low perceived risk of drug use: 6th --37.8% 8th --28.0% 10th --43.1% 12th --38.5%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Low perceived risk of drug use: 6th --40.5% 8th --27.8% 10th --41.2% 12th --40.9%			

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to: Drink beer, wine or hard liquor regularly? Smoke cigarettes? Smoke marijuana? Use "meth"?	Nebraska Risk and			2005-06: Reported favorable attitudes towards drug use: 6th --18.5% 8th -- 27.6% 10th -- 39.9% 12th -- 45.6%	2005-06: favorable attitudes towards drug use:	Reported favorable attitudes towards drug use:	
Use LSD, cocaine, or another illegal drug?	Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2007-08: Reported 2007-08: 2008-09: 2009-10:	6th --13.4% 8th -- 23.4% 10th --36.0% 12th --43.2%	6th --21.8% 8th -- 29.9% 10th --44.8% 12th --51.0%	2003

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to : Take a handgun to school? Steal anything worth more than \$5.00? Pick a fight with someone? Attack someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported laws and norms favor drug use: 6th --34.7% 8th - -30.4% 10th -- 29.2% 12th -- 37.8% 2006-07: 2007-08: Reported laws and norms favor drug use: 6th --31.7% 8th - -27.1% 10th -- 28.9% 12th -- 39.8%	2005-06:	Reported laws and norms favor drug use: 6th --34.4% 8th --34.0% 10th -- 32.6% 12th -- 42.4%	2003

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
If you wanted to get some beer, wine, or hard liquor; cigarettes; marijuana; cocaine, LSD or amphetamines how easy would it be for you to get? Comments:	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Perceived availability of drugs: 6th -- 39.5% 8th -- 29.7% 10th -- 35.7% 12th -- 40.0% 2006-07: 2007-08: Perceived availability of drugs: 6th -- 39.0% 8th -- 27.5% 10th -- 31.4% 12th -- 35.3%	2005-06:	Perceived availability of drugs: 6th -- 42.0% 8th -- 31.7% 10th -- 38.5% 12th -- 43.3%	2003

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Reported laws and norms favor drug use: 6th -- 31.7% 8th -- 27.1% 10th -- 28.9% 12th -- 39.8%	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported laws and norms favor drug use: 6th --34.7% 8th --30.4% 10th -- 29.2% 12th -- 37.8% 2006-07: 2007-08: Reported laws and norms favor drug use: 6th --34.7% 8th --30.4% 10th -- 29.2% 12th -- 37.8%	2005-06:	Reported laws and norms favor drug use: 6th --34.4% 8th --34.0% 10th -- 32.6% 12th -- 42.4%	2003
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
If you wanted to get a handgun, how easy would it be for you to get one?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Perceived availability of handguns: 6th -- 21.0% 8th -- 33.7% 10th -- 23.7% 12th -- 27.2%	2005-06:	Perceived availability of handguns: 6th -- 24.4% 8th -- 36.3% 10th -- 24.1% 12th -- 28.2%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Perceived availability of handguns: 6th -- 21.3% 8th -- 32.4% 10th -- 24.8% 12th -- 28.2%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to: Drink beer, wine or hard liquor regularly? Smoke • Nebraska Risk and Nebraska Risk and			2007-08:	2005-06: Parental attitudes favorable towards drug use: 6th -- 15.8% 8th -- 28.1% 10th -- 44.0% 12th -- 46.2%	2005-06:	Parental attitudes favorable towards drug use:	
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Parental attitudes favorable towards drug use:			
cigarettes? Smoke	Protective Factor		2008-09:	6th --11.3% 8th -- 22.1%	6th --14.3% 8th -- 26.1%		
marijuana? Use	Study			10th --37.2%	10th --43.8%		
"meth"?	Survey	Biennial	2007	2009-10:	12th --38.0%	12th --46.6%	2003
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How many times in the last year (in the last 12 months) have you carried a handgun?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having carried a handgun in the past 12 months: 6th --4.9% 8th --6.3% 10th --6.6% 12th --6.3%	2005-06:	Reported having carried a handgun in the past 12 months: 6th --5.7% 8th -6.1% 10th --5.7% 12th --5.6%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having carried a handgun in the past 12 months: 6th --4.8% 8th --5.2% 10th --6.2% 12th --6.3%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How many times in the last year (in the last 12 months) have you attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them: 6th --7.2% 8th --9.4% 10th -9.6% 12th --8.6%	2005-06:	Reported having attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them: 6th --6.9% 8th -9.2% 10th --10.6% 12th --8.3%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them: 6th --6.0% 8th --8.4% 10th -8.8% 12th --7.6%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How many times in the last year (in the last 12 months) have you taken a handgun to school?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported			
				having carried a handgun to school in the past 12 months: 6th --0.2% 8th --0.3% 10th --0.6% 12th --0.7%	2005-06:		
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having carried a handgun to school in the past 12 months:		Reported having carried a handgun to school in the past 12 months:	
				2008-09:	6th --0.1% 8th --0.3%	6th --0.4% 8th --0.4%	
2009-10:	10th --0.4% 12th --0.7%	10th --0.4% 12th --0.7%	2003				
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
On how many occasions (if any) have you sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays in order to get high during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having used inhalants in the past 30 days: 6th --4.0% 8th --5.7% 10th --3.9% 12th --2.2%			
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having used inhalants in the past 30 days: 6th --1.6% 8th --3.6% 10th --2.7% 12th --1.4%		Reported having used inhalants in the past 30 days:	
						6th --4.4% 8th --5.7% 10th --3.6% 12th --2.2%	
							2003
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established	
On how many ●●●● 2006-07: occasions (if any) have you taken "meth" (also ● Nebraska Risk and Nebraska Risk and			2006-07:	2005-06: Reported having used methamphetamines in the past 30 days: 6th --0.3% 8th --0.4% 10th --0.9% 12th --1.1%	2005-06:	Reported having used methamphetamines in the past 30 days:		
				2006-07:				
				2007-08:	2007-08: Reported having used methamphetamines in the past 30 days:			
					2008-09:			6th --0.0% 8th --0.1% 10th --0.3% 12th --0.3%
known as crank, crystal or ice) in the past 30 days?	Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2009-10:		2003		
Comments:								

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established	
On how many occasions (if any) have you used cocaine or crack during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having used cocaine in the past 30 days: 6th --0.2% 8th --0.4% 10th --1.0% 12th --1.5%	2005-06:	Reported having used cocaine in the past 30 days: 6th --0.2% 8th --0.4% 10th --1.2% 12th --1.7%	2003	
				2006-07:				
				2007-08:	2007-08: Reported having used cocaine in the past 30 days: 6th --0.1% 8th --0.3% 10th --0.6% 12th --1.1%			
Comments:								

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
On how many occasions (if any) have you used LSD or other psychedelics during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having used hallucinogens during the past 30 days: 6th -- 0.2% 8th --0.4% 10th --0.9% 12th --1.2%	2005-06:	Reported having used hallucinogens during the past 30 days: 6th -- 0.3% 8th --0.6% 10th --1.0% 12th --1.3%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having used hallucinogens during the past 30 days: 6th -- 0.0% 8th --0.2% 10th --0.5% 12th --1.0%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
On how many occasions (if any) have you used marijuana during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having used marijuana in the past 30 days: 6th --0.5%		Reported having used marijuana in the past 30 days: 6th --0.9% 8th --4.0% 10th --11.9% 12th --15.6%	2003
				8th --3.2% 10th --9.4% 12th --13.6%	2005-06:		
				2006-07: 2007-08: Reported having used marijuana in the	past 30 days: 6th --0.3% 8th --2.1%		
				2008-09: 2009-10:	10th --8.5% 12th --13.2%		
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Think back over the last two weeks. How many times have you had five or more alcoholic drinks in a row? Comments:	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having had five or more alcoholic drinks in a row: 6th --3.3% 8th -- 7.7% 10th -- 20.6% 12th -- 32.8% 2006-07: 2007-08: Reported having had five or more alcoholic drinks in a row: 6th --0.7% 8th -- 4.7% 10th -- 14.7% 12th -- 26.8%	2005-06:	Reported having had five or more alcoholic drinks in a row: 6th -- 2.1% 8th --6.6% 10th --20.8% 12th --32.9%	2003

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
On how many occasions (if any) have you had beer, wine, or hard liquor during the past 30 days? Comments:	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having had alcohol in the past 30 days: 6th --3.5% 8th -- 13.9% 10th -- 31.6% 12th -- 47.2% 2006-07: 2007-08: Reported having had alcohol in the past 30 days: 6th --2.1% 8th -- 10.3% 10th -- 27.1% 12th -- 41.8%	2005-06:	Reported having had alcohol in the past 30 days: 6th --6.5% 8th -- 18.1% 10th -- 36.2% 12th -- 48.9%	2003

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How frequently have you used smokeless tobacco during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having used Smokeless Tobacco in the last 30 days: 6th --1.1% 8th --3.1% 10th --9.1% 12th --12.9%	2005-06:	Reported having used Smokeless Tobacco in the last 30 days: 6th --1.3% 8th --3.2% 10th --8.2% 12th --13.4%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having used Smokeless Tobacco in the last 30 days: 6th --0.4% 8th --2.2% 10th --7.6% 12th --12.5%			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How frequently have you smoked cigarettes during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having smoked cigarettes the last 30 days: 6th --1.9% 8th --6.9% 10th --15.3% 12th --26.1%	2005-06:	Reported having smoked cigarettes the last 30 days: 6th --2.6% 8th --7.7% 10th --19.3% 12th --28.0%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having smoked cigarettes the last 30 days: 6th --0.9% 8th --4.7% 10th --13.4% 12th --24.1%			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: Reported having been drinking and driving in the past year: 6th -- 2.0% 8th --5.1% 10th --13.0% 12th --39.5%	2005-06:		
During the past year, how many times (if any) have you driven a car, truck or motorcycle after drinking alcohol? Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey Comments:		Biennial	2007	2007-08: 2008-09: 2009-10:	Reported having been drinking and driving in the past year: 6th --2.9% 8th --5.5% 10th --16.1% 12th --42.3% 2007-08: Reported having been drinking and driving in the past year: 6th --1.4% 8th --3.4% 10th --10.2% 12th --31.5%		2003

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
During the past year, how many times (if any) have you been a passenger in a car or truck, or on a motorcycle driven by someone after they had been drinking alcohol?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06: Reported having been a passenger with someone who had been drinking and driving: 6th -- 25.3% 8th -- 33.4% 10th -- 43.1% 12th -- 52.3%	2005-06:	Reported having been a passenger with someone who had been drinking and driving: 6th -- 26.6% 8th -- 32.8% 10th -- 44.3% 12th -- 54.5%	2003
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having been a passenger with someone who had been drinking and driving: 6th -- 21.9% 8th -- 28.5% 10th -- 35.6% 12th -- 43.0%			

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
On how many occasions (if any) have you used steroids during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey	Biennial	2007	2005-06:	2005-06:	2005 Baseline: Reported having used steroids in the past 30 days: 6th --0.3% 8th --0.4% 10th --0.7% 12th --0.7%	2005
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having used steroids in the past 30 days: 6th --0.1% 8th --0.3% 10th --0.6% 12th --0.5%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
On how many occasions (if any) have you used performance enhancing drugs during the past 30 days? Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey Comments:		Biennial	2007	2005-06:	2005-06:	2005 Baseline: Reported having used performance enhancing drugs in the past 30 days: 6th --0.1% 8th --0.8% 10th --3.4% 12th --5.8% 2005 2006-07: 2007-08: Reported having used performance enhancing drugs in the past 30 days: 6th --0.0% 8th --0.5% 10th --3.0% 12th --4.1%	
				2006-07: 2007-08: 2008-09: 2009-10:			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
On how many occasions (if any) have you used prescription drugs during the past 30 days?	Nebraska Risk and Protective Factor Study Survey			2005-06:	2005-06:	2005 Baseline: Reported having used prescription drugs in the past 30 days: 6th --1.3% 8th --3.8% 10th --6.2% 12th --	2005
				2006-07:			
				2007-08: Reported having used prescription drugs in the past 30 days: 6th --			

				0.6% 8th --1.8% 10th --4.3% 12th --4.8%		7.4%	
Comments:							

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

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	The definitions are part of a data collection revision. The Nebraska definitions will be available for the 2008-09 school year.
Illicit drug related	The definitions are part of a data collection revision. The Nebraska definitions will be available for the 2008-09 school year.
Violent incident without physical injury	The definitions are part of a data collection revision. The Nebraska definitions will be available for the 2008-09 school year.
Violent incident with physical injury	The definitions are part of a data collection revision. The Nebraska definitions will be available for the 2008-09 school year.
Weapons possession	The definitions are part of a data collection revision. The Nebraska definitions will be available for the 2008-09 school year.
Comments: The definitions are part of a data collection revision. The Nebraska definitions will be available for the 2008-09 school year.	

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.		

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

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data collection is being revised. Nebraska data will be available for 2008-09 school year.

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

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

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

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

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

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

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

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

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	155	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	155	
Comments:		

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

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

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

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

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 1920, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	1,414,005	95.9
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	1,474,409	
Comments:		

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

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

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

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	143	97
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	12	5
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	155	102
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

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

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	117
Comments:	

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	1
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	1
Parental involvement activities	0
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	0
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments: For the past five years, Scottsbluff Public Schools is the only district eligible for the RLIS grant.	

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

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the past five years, the RLIS grant has been awarded to the Scottsbluff Public Schools--the only eligible district in the state. During the 2007-08 school year, the district used the RLIS funds for the following:

Professional development in the areas of Response to Intervention, Positive Behavior Supports, and Increasing Student Achievement.

Purchase of a computer program that assists students to meet state and district standards. The technology application allows tracking of student progress which helps teachers in adjusting instruction.

Continued implementation of scientifically based research educational reform and school improvement programs.

Listed below are the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standards for the 2007-08 school year.

Lincoln Heights Elementary: Reading, 81.25%; Math, 90.91%; Writing, 90.63%
Longfellow Elementary: Reading, 92.31%; Math, 98.08%; Writing, 100%
Roosevelt Elementary: Reading, 97.87%; Math, 100%; Writing, 79.07%
Westmoor Elementary: Reading 96.23%; Math, 100%; Writing, 85.96%
Bluffs Middle School: Reading, 98.20%; Math, 95.98%; Writing, 89.39%
Bluffs Sr. High School: Reading, 72.67%; Math, 83.24%; Writing, 96.20%

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

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

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

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	23
Comments:	

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	17	4
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	7	5
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	11	3
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	4	11
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		7

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

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	266,762.00	18,569.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	9,614.00	64,596.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	40,337.00	5,203.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	4,640.00	127,904.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		105,081.00
Comments:		

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

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