

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

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

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09

ARIZONA



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, unless otherwise noted.

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2008-09 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2008-09 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2008-09 X Part II, 2008-09

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

Arizona Department of Education

Address:

1535 West Jefferson

Phoenix, Arizona 85007 Person to contact about this report:

Name: Richard Valdivia

Telephone: (602) 542-3270

Fax: (602) 542-3050

e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov

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

Richard Valdivia

Friday, April 23, 2010, 2:57:55 PM

Signature Date

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	38,308	24,673	64.4
4	38,180	25,015	65.5
5	36,951	23,082	62.5
6	34,872	20,523	58.8
7	31,956	20,498	64.1
8	31,239	16,066	51.4
High School	17,768	9,910	55.8
Total	229,274	139,767	61.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	38,329	23,639	61.7
4	38,186	23,428	61.4
5	36,964	23,467	63.5
6	34,885	20,444	58.6
7	31,969	19,913	62.3
8	31,237	18,161	58.1
High School	17,885	10,901	61.0
Total	229,455	139,953	61.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	17,253	12,745	73.9
4	16,924	12,869	76.0
5	16,860	12,400	73.6
6	13,904	9,280	66.7
7	13,789	9,932	72.0
8	13,737	8,252	60.1
High School	13,524	8,687	64.2
Total	105,991	74,165	70.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	17,257	12,859	74.5
4	16,943	12,840	75.8
5	16,859	12,872	76.4
6	13,899	9,977	71.8
7	13,792	10,040	72.8
8	13,754	9,408	68.4
High School	13,560	9,447	69.7
Total	106,064	77,443	73.0
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,980
Limited English proficient students	66,885
Students who are homeless	9,365
Migratory students	1,442
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	15,006
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,262
Black, non-Hispanic	16,669
Hispanic	156,199
White, non-Hispanic	46,716
Total	238,852
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2			13		13
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	3,010	206	N<10	3,224
K	1,842	23,908	378	31	26,159
1	2,398	23,846	461	24	26,729
2	2,574	24,195	380	17	27,166
3	2,577	23,821	419	22	26,839
4	1,793	23,593	394	22	25,802
5	1,410	22,869	343	17	24,639
6	1,168	20,696	329	21	22,214
7	1,008	18,577	281	38	19,904
8	1,097	17,996	239	59	19,391
9	3,649	4,606	253	117	8,625
10	2,122	4,731	310	138	7,301
11	1,583	4,686	233	149	6,651
12	1,050	5,317	225	113	6,705
Ungraded	N<10	91	239	103	434
TOTALS	24,277	221,942	4,703	874	251,796
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	19,677
Reading/language arts	31,886
Science	1,706
Social studies	1,754
Vocational/career	682
Other instructional services	1,049
Comments:	

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

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

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	305
Supporting guidance/advocacy	3,779
Other support services	6,389
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	615	
Paraprofessionals ¹	513	82.3
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	34	
Clerical support staff	52	
Administrators (non-clerical)	68	
Comments:		

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	2,744.00	97.2
Comments:		

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

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	9
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2008. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	412
2. Adults participating	416
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	334
4. Participating children	483
a. Birth through 2 years	21
b. Ages 3 through 5	357
c. Ages 6 through 8	105
c. Above age 8	
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	274
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	283
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	262
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	214
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	163
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, 2009). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	64
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	47
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	242
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	59
5. Total families enrolled	412
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

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

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

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

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

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

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	88	76	86.4% achieved a gain of one level pre/post test.
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)
TABE			
CASAS			
BEST	255	197	76% achieved a gain of one level pre/post-test.
BEST Plus			
BEST Literacy			
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			
GED			
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	15	10	67% plus one adult who received her AA degree while learning English.
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.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	123	96	93	26	96.8% achievement
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	123	96	78	26	81.4% achievement
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2009 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	125	119	N<10	19.2	
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	79	57	72% are reading on or above grade level. Data is collected for K-3 and is not broken down by grade level. Primary assessment was DIBELS; AZELLA (Arizona's ELL Assessment) percentage is low due to high number of ELL children.
1			
2			
3			
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	346	264	76% achieved mastery.
PEP Scale II	346	329	95% achieved a .5 increase.
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other	346	258	75% achieved PEP Scale II Level III Mastery
Comments:			

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

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	375
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	827
K	558
1	525
2	559
3	590
4	522
5	548
6	623
7	591
8	680
9	559
10	630
11	627
12	790
Ungraded	48
Out-of-school	45
Total	9,097

Comments:

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	25
K	134
1	124
2	142
3	99
4	91
5	89
6	100
7	96
8	89
9	193
10	152
11	205
12	170
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,714
Comments:	

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	13
K	231
1	415
2	413
3	398
4	324
5	320
6	319
7	291
8	298
9	208
10	191
11	180
12	146
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	10
Total	3,760
Comments:	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	54
K	31
1	38
2	43
3	49
4	33
5	90
6	54
7	72
8	57
9	83
10	62
11	60
12	45
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	771
<p>Comments: Please note that blank values are zero, not missing data. Explanation of 25% or more difference between the total for this year's report (771) and last year's report (514): Data is more accurate due to improved synchronization of our State Migrant Education data collection system (COEstar) with the State student detail data collection system (SAIS).</p>	

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, 2008. 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	198	142	35	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	306	263	152	106
K	204	182	79	93
1	183	156	114	72
2	188	166	135	70
3	217	162	124	87
4	201	143	108	70
5	184	184	98	82
6	196	188	150	89
7	199	191	123	78
8	187	252	155	86
9	174	204	120	61
10	140	219	172	99
11	123	171	184	149
12	132	245	236	177
Ungraded	19	13	N<10	N<10
Out-of-school	20	15	N<10	N<10
Total	2,871	2,896	2,001	1,329
Comments: Please note the blank value is zero, not missing data.				

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, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	179
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	379
K	210
1	197
2	226
3	211
4	187
5	167
6	187
7	178
8	213
9	154
10	167
11	134
12	125
Ungraded	23
Out-of-school	22
Total	2,959
Comments:	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	12
8	12
9	19
10	18
11	26
12	45
Ungraded	
Total	132

Comments: Please note the blank value is zero, not missing data. Explanation of 25% or more difference between the total for this year's report (132) and last year's report (200): Professional development offered by the ADE to LEAs in the area of dropout prevention has successfully lowered the number of MEP students who drop out of school. In addition, lower dropout levels are reported due to enhancements in the State migrant education data collection system (COEstar) to include the state student ID numbers for all MEP students. Using this number helps tracks migrant students that have registered at another LEA, resulting in a more accurate count.

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	7
Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between the total for this year's report (7) and last year's report (0):	
This data is LEA generated data. The ADE MEP does not have a system in place to receive GED test scores on individuals. The ADE MEP relies on LEA MEP staff members to follow up with Dropouts and out of school youth to obtain this information.	

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

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	165	165
4	222	218
5	277	274
6	271	270
7	278	277
8	266	264
9		
10		
11		
12		
Total	1,479	1,468

Comments: The blank values for grades 9-12 result because the ADE reports these results as "high school" and not as grades 9-12. This is consistent with our Accountability Workbook which states that assessment is given in the second year of high school, not in a specific grade.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	165	165
4	222	218
5	277	274
6	271	270
7	278	277
8	266	264
9		
10		
11		
12		
Total	1,479	1,468

Comments: The blank values for grades 9-12 result because the ADE reports these results as "high school" and not as grades 9-12. This is consistent with our Accountability Workbook which states that assessment is given in the second year of high school, not in a specific grade.

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	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	374
K	399
1	428
2	453
3	398
4	431
5	440
6	458
7	443
8	424
9	526
10	519
11	481
12	458
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	12
Total	6,259
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	25
K	134
1	124
2	142
3	98
4	91
5	88
6	100
7	96
8	89
9	193
10	152
11	205
12	170
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,712
Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between the this year's report (1712) and last year's report (1366): The ADE MEP has been working with TROMIK and LEAs to gather a more accurate number in the area of Priority for Services each year. The increase in the number of students labeled as PFS is a direct result in the greater accuracy of data reporting by the MEPs.	

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)	
K	N<10
1	
2	
3	N<10
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	N<10
9	
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	N<10
<p>Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between this year's report (6) and last year's report (65): TROMIK made a change to the business rules in how this number is obtained. The change was made to include a "flag" to mark when there is a continuation of services, instead of quarrying the system for services added after the date of end of eligibility. This change in the business rules ensures a more accurate representation in the reporting. Many MEP students who are reaching the end of their eligibility are being served through other programs to meet their needs.</p>	

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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	68
K	122
1	151
2	164
3	167
4	172
5	150
6	174
7	146
8	156
9	422
10	431
11	382
12	370
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	3,080
<p>Comments: Blank value for "age birth through 2" equals zero, not missing data. Explanation of difference between out-of-school count in this answer (4) and the out-of-school count of 12 in 2.3.3.1.4.2: The correct number of out-of-school students is 12. The correct number cannot be entered here manually (to override computer-generated input).</p>	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42	49	
K	47	19	
1	59	11	
2	55	31	
3	58	30	
4	57	33	
5	58	33	
6	56	34	
7	27	21	
8	39	23	
9	412	411	35
10	421	422	47
11	364	362	73
12	338	338	98
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	12
Total	2,037	1,820	265

Comments: Please note that blank values equal zero, not missing data. Explanation of difference between out-of-school count in this answer (12) and the out-of-school count of 4 in 2.3.3.1.4.1: The correct number of out-of-school students is 12. Explanation of 25% or more difference between Credit Accrual for this year (265) and last year (733): The definition of high school accrual (below) requires that services be "provided by a teacher." Because more students are using online services that are not supervised by a teacher, the total count is lower.

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	N<10	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	370	20
K	351	177
1	349	169
2	369	192
3	308	165
4	345	183
5	373	227
6	379	202
7	344	204
8	330	209
9	524	430
10	517	447
11	473	398
12	456	382
Ungraded	N<10	
Out-of-school	11	N<10
Total	5,514	3,409
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 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	32
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	245
K	328
1	318
2	337
3	275
4	327
5	352
6	344
7	322
8	313
9	179
10	209
11	222
12	192
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	
Total	3,998
Comments:	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	82
K	118
1	112
2	149
3	117
4	119
5	121
6	151
7	159
8	79
9	61
10	49
11	64
12	50
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,439
<p>Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between this year's report and last year's report: Due to budget constraints, many LEAs did not run the Title I-A summer programs that had served MEP students in the past. The State MEP office campaigned for MEP funded LEAs to apply for MEP summer school funds from the State to ensure that all MEP students had an opportunity to participate in summer school programs. As a result, various LEAs with migrant populations ran MEP-funded summer programs and the number of MEP funded summer schools grew more by than 42%.</p>	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	
K	10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	
10	N<10
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	57
Comments: No error is found, but the ED Facts system will not accept this page without a comment.	

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

Comments: Explanation of the 25% or more difference between this year's report (0) and last year's report (2): TROMIK made a change to the business rules in how this number is obtained. The change was made to include a "flag" to mark when there is a continuation of services, instead of quarrying the system for services added after the date of end of eligibility. This change in the business rules ensures a more accurate representation in reporting. MEP students who are reaching the end of their eligibility are being served through other programs to meet their needs.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	81
K	101
1	95
2	125
3	103
4	104
5	97
6	104
7	104
8	48
9	20
10	N<10
11	18
12	19
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,035

Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between this year's report and last year's report: Due to budget constraints, many LEAs did not run the Title I-A summer programs that had served MEP students in the past. The State MEP office campaigned for MEP funded LEAs to apply for MEP summer school funds from the State to ensure that all MEP students had an opportunity to participate in summer school programs. As a result, various LEAs with migrant populations ran MEP-funded summer programs and the number of MEP funded summer schools grew by more than 42%. This resulted in an increase in the number of students receiving an instructional service during summer school.

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	N<10	N<10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65	42	
K	99	80	
1	92	65	
2	120	81	
3	100	85	
4	96	73	
5	91	61	
6	102	78	
7	101	73	
8	46	23	
9	17	15	N<10
10	N<10	N<10	14
11	17	17	10
12	17	17	18
Ungraded	N<10	N<10	
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	
Total	976	719	49

Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between this year's report and last year's report: Due to budget constraints, many LEAs did not run the Title I-A summer programs that had served MEP students in the past. The State MEP office campaigned for MEP funded LEAs to apply for MEP summer school Funds from the State to ensure that all MEP students had an opportunity to participate in summer school programs. As a result, various LEAs with migrant populations ran MEP-funded summer programs and the number of MEP funded summer schools grew more than 42%, naturally resulting in an increase in the number of students receiving an math and reading instruction during summer school.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	N<10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	78	N<10
K	96	
1	80	
2	114	
3	83	
4	80	
5	91	
6	76	
7	93	
8	54	
9	25	N<10
10	N<10	N<10
11	21	
12	14	N<10
Ungraded	N<10	
Out-of-school	N<10	
Total	917	N<10
<p>Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between this year's report and last year's report: Due to budget constraints, many LEAs did not run the Title I-A summer programs that had served MEP students in the past. The State MEP office campaigned for MEP funded LEAs to apply for MEP summer school funds from the State to ensure that all MEP students had an opportunity to participate in summer school programs. As a result, various LEAs with migrant populations ran MEP-funded summer programs and the number of MEP funded summer schools grew by more than 42%.This resulted in an increase in the number of students receiving support and counseling service during summer school.</p>		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	69
K	98
1	58
2	91
3	62
4	56
5	77
6	58
7	64
8	54
9	13
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	13
Total	724
<p>Comments: Explanation of the difference between the Total number of children who received a Referred Service during the Summer/Intersession Term for previous year (0) and current year value (724): The prior year's count of zero was incorrect.</p>	

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	10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	417
K	404
1	430
2	462
3	408
4	439
5	444
6	469
7	452
8	431
9	538
10	528
11	485
12	468
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	12
Total	6,403
Comments:	

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	182
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,090
Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference between this year's report and last year's report: The numbers above were reported in September, 2009 for the Common Core Data (CCD) report. However, due to a fault in the upload of migrant student data to the ADE student information system, not all migrant students were reflected in the above counts. The actual number of schools is approximately 237. The actual number of enrolled migrant children is 9097.	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: Blank value equals zero, not missing data.	

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	30	6,343
Regular school year – school day/extended day	N<10	985
Summer/intersession only	27	1,374
Year round		
Comments: Explanation of 25% or more difference in this year's report and last year's report: There are several reasons for the change in numbers in this section. 1) The ADE MEP has worked with TROMIK and the LEAs to ensure more accurate reporting. 2) MEP numbers in the State continue to decrease, due in part to a lack of agriculture in areas that were at one time large agricultural fields. Thus, we lose school based programs. 3) Schools have changed from school day only to school day/ extended day programs to meet the needs of their MEP students.		

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	0.50
Comments: No explanation should be needed, but system will not accept page without comment.	

FAQs on the MEP State director

- 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.*
- 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	34	11.46	121	110.95
Counselors	22	7.85	2	2.00
All paraprofessionals	19	10.29	44	40.45
Recruiters	49	29.97	15	12.07
Records transfer staff	31	14.85	14	9.70

Comments: Explanation for 25% or more difference between this year's report and last year's report: As our programs change from regular school day to regular and extended school day program, there has been an increased need for teachers to provide the academic needs of the MEP students. While the headcount of counselors has increased greater than 25%, the FTE has not. Respectively, the headcount for records transfer staff has not increased greater than 25%; however, the FTEs for that position have. These changes are all based on the need of the LEA and the MEP students. As for the summer school staffing, due to budget constraints, many LEAs did not run the Title I-A summer programs that had served MEP students in the past. The State MEP office campaigned for MEP funded LEAs to apply for MEP summer school funds from the State to ensure that all MEP students had an opportunity to participate in summer school programs. As a result, various LEAs with migrant populations ran MEP-funded summer programs and the number of MEP funded summer schools grew more than 42%. This resulted in an increase in the number of staff members needed during summer/ intersession.

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	33	17.00	69	61.50
Comments: The explanation in 2.3.6.1.2 is also applicable here. As our programs change and the needs of the students change, the LEAs change how they use their money to serve the students. This sometimes changes the number of staff members that they hire.				

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

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	15	10
Juvenile corrections	4	60
Adult corrections	10	45
Other	0	0
Total	29	29

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	13
Comments:	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	15
Juvenile Corrections	4
Adult Corrections	10
Other	0
Total	29
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		10,589	595	1,083	
Long Term Students Served			595		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		677	28	80	
Asian or Pacific Islander		67	N<10	N<10	
Black, non-Hispanic		1,144	71	168	
Hispanic		4,793	321	556	
White, non-Hispanic		3,812	173	276	
Total		10,493	595	1,083	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		8,280	540	1,004	
Female		2,309	55	79	
Total		10,589	595	1,083	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8		N<10			
9		14			
10		28			
11		84			
12		219			
13		527	N<10		
14		1,183	42		
15		1,975	96	N<10	
16		2,724	177	27	
17		3,764	277	57	
18				111	
19				226	
20				376	
21				279	
Total		10,522	595	1,083	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The number of long term juvenile detention students served is zero.

Explanation of discrepancy between the unduplicated count of students for that category (10,589), the number of students\

The tables have no "other" or "unknown" options.

For student race and ethnicity,there were 28 uncounted "other" students and 68 "unknown" students. For age, there were 67 uncounted students whose age was "unknown."

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	12	0	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	5	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	11	10	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		1,420	404	
Enrolled in a GED program				
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		268		
Earned a GED		359	238	
Obtained high school diploma		37		
Were accepted into post-secondary education		74	220	
Enrolled in post-secondary education			220	
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		43	220	
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				
Obtained employment		59		
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the 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, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		535		
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		396		

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		49		
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		58		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		27		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		34		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		228		
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		535		
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		396		

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		44		
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		27		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		45		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		35		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		245		
Comments:				

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	18	84
Neglected programs	6	17
Juvenile detention	2	3
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	26	62

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	2
Comments: Phoenix Union High School District data from this time period has not yet been corroborated.	

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	18
Neglected programs	6
Juvenile detention	2
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	0
Total	26
Comments: Phoenix Union High School District data from this time period has not yet been corroborated.	

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	2,231	1,325	512		
Total Long Term Students Served	491			98	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	93	448		
Asian or Pacific Islander	12	N<10	N<10		
Black, non-Hispanic	321	138	N<10		
Hispanic	1,311	913	40		
White, non-Hispanic	433	180	20		
Total	2,231	1,325	512		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,487	878	375		
Female	744	447	137		
Total	2,231	1,325	512		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6	N<10				
7	N<10				
8	19				
9	20		N<10		
10	20		N<10		
11	28		N<10		
12	54		12		
13	72	N<10	46		
14	147	50	83		
15	377	212	101		
16	566	327	140		
17	583	297	125		
18	251	146	N<10		
19	69	46			
20	11	N<10			

21	N<10	N<10			
Total	2,226	1,094	512		

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

Comments: 1. Due to a glitch in communication between the collection and reporting systems, the total number of long term Juvenile Detention students (98) is misreported under Juvenile Corrections.

2. The number of students served by age in at-risk and neglected programs is less than the total because one LEA did not

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (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)	18	3	2	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	11	3	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	0	0	0
Comments: Phoenix Union High School District data from this time period has not yet been corroborated.				

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	1,687	915	53	
Enrolled in a GED program	N<10		N<10	
Comments: Phoenix Union High School District data from this time period has not yet been corroborated.				

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	720	21	91	
Earned a GED	N<10		N<10	
Obtained high school diploma	311	199	N<10	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	52		N<10	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	46		N<10	
Comments: Phoenix Union High School District data from this time period has not yet been corroborated.				

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	145	29	32	
Comments: Phoenix Union High School District data from this time period has not yet been corroborated.				

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	N<10		N<10	
Obtained employment	109	11	26	
Comments: Phoenix Union High School District data from this time period has not yet been corroborated.				

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, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	297		13	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	274		N<10	

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	53			
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	192		N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<10		N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	22			
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	304		12	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	272		11	

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	46		N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	191		N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams				
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	12		N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	23			
Comments:				

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students that carried a weapon on school property on one or more of the past 30 days	2009 Arizona YRBS	Every two years	2009	2006-07: 5.0%	2006-07: 7%	5.8%	2002/2003
				2007-08:			
				2008-09: 6.5%			
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
Percentage of students that engaged in fights on school property during the past 12 months	2009 Arizona YRBS	Every two years	2009	2006-07: 11.0%	2006-07: 11.3%	11.7%	2001/2003
				2007-08:			
				2008-09: 12.0%			
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
Percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	2009 Arizona YRBS	Every two years	2009	2006-07: 27.0%	2006-07: 37.1%	28.6%	2001/2003
				2007-08:			
				2008-09: 34.6%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Number of persistently dangerous schools		Annually	2009	2006-07: 0%	2006-07: 0%	0%	2003/2004
				2007-08: 0%			
				2008-09: 0%			
Comments:							

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	The violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or use of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol. This includes being intoxicated at school, school-sponsored events, and school-sponsored transportation.
Illicit drug related	The unlawful use, cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, purchase, possession, transportation, or importation of any controlled drug or narcotic substance, or equipment and devices used for preparing or taking drugs or narcotics. This includes being under the influence of drugs at school, school-sponsored events, and on school-sponsored transportation. Category includes over-the-counter medications if abused by the student. This category does not include tobacco or alcohol.
Violent incident without physical injury	not available
Violent incident with physical injury	not available
Weapons possession	The possession of any instrument or object possessed or used to inflict harm on another person or to intimidate any person.
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: Arizona captures disciplinary actions for incidents of violent behavior but does not capture information about whether the incident did or did not result in physical injury.		

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: Arizona captures disciplinary actions for incidents of violent behavior but does not capture information about whether the incident did or did not result in physical injury.		

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: Arizona captures disciplinary actions for incidents of violent behavior but does not capture information about whether the incident did or did not result in physical injury.		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		

Comments: Arizona captures disciplinary actions for incidents of violent behavior but does not capture information about whether the incident did or did not result in physical injury.

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

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

The following sections collect data on 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: Arizona captures disciplinary data through an annual census that collects total incidents for the year regardless of the grade level. Currently, there is no way that Arizona can accurately report this data by grade level. However, Arizona is implementing a new incident and disciplinary action collection and tracking system, Az SAFE, which will accommodate this level of reporting in the future.

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: Arizona captures disciplinary data through an annual census that collects total incidents for the year regardless of the grade level. Currently, there is no way that Arizona can accurately report this data by grade level. However, Arizona is implementing a new incident and disciplinary action collection and tracking system, Az SAFE, which will accommodate this level of reporting in the future.

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: Arizona captures disciplinary data through an annual census that collects total incidents for the year regardless of the grade level. Currently, there is no way that Arizona can accurately report this data by grade level. However, Arizona is implementing a new incident and disciplinary action collection and tracking system, Az SAFE, which will accommodate this level of reporting in the future.

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: Arizona captures disciplinary data through an annual census that collects total incidents for the year regardless of the grade level. Currently, there is no way that Arizona can accurately report this data by grade level. However, Arizona is implementing a new incident and disciplinary action collection and tracking system, Az SAFE, which will accommodate this level of reporting in the future.

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: Arizona captures disciplinary data through an annual census that collects total incidents for the year regardless of the grade level. Currently, there is no way that Arizona can accurately report this data by grade level. However, Arizona is implementing a new incident and disciplinary action collection and tracking system, Az SAFE, which will accommodate this level of reporting in the future.

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		
<p>Comments: Arizona captures disciplinary data through an annual census that collects total incidents for the year regardless of the grade level. Currently, there is no way that Arizona can accurately report this data by grade level. However, Arizona is implementing a new incident and disciplinary action collection and tracking system, Az SAFE, which will accommodate this level of reporting in the future.</p>		

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

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
Yes	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
Yes	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
Yes	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.

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

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

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

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

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

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

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

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

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	122	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	122	
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	400,089	99.1
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	403,618	
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	73	25
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	19	6
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	30	18
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	122	49
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	13
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	7
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	2
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	3
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
Comments:	

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.

Fiscal years listed below are Arizona's fiscal years 2008-2009. The following list includes the name of the LEA, the use of funds and the Results.

- 1 Benson Unified School District-Received funds for 2009 for Educational technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 71% to 65%. Reading decreased from 74% to 71%.
- 2 Camp Verde Unified District-Received funds for 2009 to support Title II activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 58% to 50%. Reading decreased from 62% to 61%.
- 3 Douglas Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Teacher recruitment and retention, Educational technology, and for Title I activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 57% to 58%. Reading increased from 54% to 56%.
- 4 Globe Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Teacher Recruitment and retention. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 56% to 49%. Reading decreased from 67% to 61%.
- 5 Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Teacher retention and recruitment. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 32% to 28%. Reading decreased from 41% to 34%.
- 6 Miami Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Title I activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 56% to 48%. Reading increased from 61% to 62%.
- 7 Nogales Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Teacher recruitment and retention, Teacher professional development, Educational technology and Parent Involvement activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 59% to 63%. Reading increased from 58% to 64%.
- 8 Quartzsite Elementary District-Received funds for 2009 for Teacher recruitment and retention. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 57% to 54%. Reading increased from 47% to 58%.
- 9 San Carlos Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Parent Involvement activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 31% to 28%. Reading decreased from 28% to 26%.
- 10 Tombstone Unified District-Receive funds for 2009 for Teacher recruitment and retention. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 58% to 64%. Reading remained the same at 69%.
- 11 Kingman Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Parent involvement. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 52% to 57%. Reading increased from 58% to 63%.
- 12 Riverside Elementary District-Received funds for 2009 for Title I activities. The AIMS results are as follows: Math decreased from 52% to 45%. Reading decreased from 53% to 46%.
- 13 Wilcox Unified District-Received funds for 2009 for Teacher recruitment and retention and Educational technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 56% to 60%. Reading increased from 56% to 61%.

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 2008-09?	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).	14
Comments:	

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	11	1
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	3	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	1
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	3	1
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		14

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2009 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	209,634.00	1,059.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	679.20	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	130,000.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	1,816.20	18,622.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		62,448.40
Total	212,129.40	212,129.40
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.