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

CALIFORNIA

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:

- o Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- o Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- o Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- o Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- o Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- o Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- o Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- o Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- o 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:
California Department of Education
Address:
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814 Person to contact about this report:

Name: Justin Lane
Telephone: 916-319-0495
Fax: 916-319-0971
e-mail: jlane@cde.ca.gov

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

Deb Sigman

Friday, April 23, 2010, 4:09:49 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	263,067	148,375	56.4
4	258,082	147,736	57.2
5	258,948	126,911	49.0
6	235,071	90,900	38.7
7	218,325	79,454	36.4
8	219,412	68,868	31.4
High School	147,731	65,413	44.3
Total	1,600,636	727,657	45.5
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	263,106	85,845	32.6
4	258,021	127,922	49.6
5	258,933	109,473	42.3
6	235,178	96,064	40.8
7	218,341	92,368	42.3
8	221,294	81,012	36.6
High School	148,568	59,760	40.2
Total	1,603,441	652,444	40.7
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	62,317	41,654	66.8
4	62,350	42,177	67.6
5	62,539	36,680	58.6
6	60,340	31,357	52.0
7	59,117	29,547	50.0
8	59,094	27,222	46.1
High School	64,623	33,776	52.3
Total	430,380	242,413	56.3
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	62,261	30,461	48.9
4	62,294	40,775	65.5
5	62,506	36,528	58.4
6	60,348	34,319	56.9
7	59,110	35,486	60.0
8	59,627	32,231	54.0
High School	65,084	33,114	50.9
Total	431,230	242,914	56.3
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 <u>only once</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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)	342,779
Limited English proficient students	1,193,194
Students who are homeless	157,572
Migratory students	95,576
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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	26,829
Asian or Pacific Islander	253,889
Black, non-Hispanic	299,949
Hispanic	2,195,181
White, non-Hispanic	433,787
Total	3,209,635
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	231	5,787	16	398	6,432
K	14,974	270,516	1,206	591	287,287
1	19,428	273,591	1,427	602	295,048
2	20,871	268,838	1,634	682	292,025
3	22,289	267,261	1,599	663	291,812
4	22,735	261,293	1,627	697	286,352
5	20,483	260,444	1,391	894	283,212
6	20,574	234,931	1,221	1,080	257,806
7	21,257	222,763	943	1,369	246,332
8	22,350	226,698	789	1,750	251,587
9	37,046	188,145	514	2,440	228,145
10	33,567	168,147	314	2,454	204,482
11	32,450	148,301	175	2,224	183,150
12	29,444	141,277	133	1,897	172,751
Ungraded	3,764	37,980	N<11	359	42,108
TOTALS	321,463	2,975,972	12,994	18,100	3,328,529
Comments: California does not collect data age 0-2.					

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	224,960
Reading/language arts	268,245
Science	67,519
Social studies	65,537
Vocational/career	18,708
Other instructional services	21,096
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	34,929
Supporting guidance/advocacy	61,723
Other support services	5,406
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	1,304	
Paraprofessionals[1]	1,509	95.7
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	56	
Clerical support staff	264	
Administrators (non-clerical)	70	
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
Paraprofessionals3	15,545.00	95.7
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	55
Comments: None	

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	2,124
2. Adults participating	2,148
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	1,942
4. Participating children	2,692
a. Birth through 2 years	879
b. Ages 3 through 5	1,199
c. Ages 6 through 8	518
c. Above age 8	96
Comments: None	

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	1,029
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	1,035
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	791
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	842
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	488
Comments: None	

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	91
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	274
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	718
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	1,041
5. Total families enrolled	2,124
Comments: None	

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			Not Applicable.
CASAS	34	22	64.71% of eligible adults enrolled in Adult Basic Education showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5-point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students and a 3-point posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+ hours of Adult Basic Education or who achieved the Indicator in less than 100 hours.
Other			Not Applicable.
Comments: None			

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			Not Applicable.
CASAS	1,621	1,341	82.73% of eligible English Learners Adults showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5-point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students and a 3-point posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults,as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+ hours of English as a Second Language or who achieved the Indicator in less than 100 hours.
BEST			Not Applicable.
BEST Plus			Not Applicable.
BEST Literacy			Not Applicable.
Other			Not Applicable.
Comments: None			

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	46	26	56.52% of eligible school-age adults received a high school diploma. An additional 108 school-age adults made progress toward their goal of a dipolma by earning high school course credits. Eligible Cohort: Eligibie school-age adults, as defined by the California performance Indicator, include teen parents who attended high schools classes for a minimum of 3 years and those who received a diploma in less than 3 years.
GED			Not Applicable.
Other			Not Applicable.
Comments: None			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	16	13	81.25% of eligible non-school-age adults received a high school diploma. An additional 14 adults made progress toward their goal of a diploma by earning high school course credits. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults,as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended high school classes for a minimum of 3 years and those whose received a diploma in less than 3 years.
GED	16	16	100% of eligible non-school-age adults obtained an English General Education Development certificate. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended General Education Development preparation classes for a mininum of 2 years and adults who obtained the Genaral Education Development in less than two years.
Other	N<11	N<11	100% of eligible non-school-age adults obtained a Spanish General Education Development certificate.
Comments: None			

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	546	515	458	30	88.93% of transitioning children achieved a significant learning gain of 4 standard scores on the Peabody Piture Vocalbulary Test III (mean posttest gain of 14.6 standard scores). * Number of age-eligible does not include 30 English Learner children. Data are currently not available to determine their length of time in the program. In 201011, California will collect Peabody Pictice Vocalbulary Test data with child enrollment dates. The age-eligible children reported in this table include children who have pre/post scores. The California expectation is that children with pre/post scores have been in the program for 6 months. ** Number with pre/posttest scores includes 404 children who received 6 months of instruction between pretest/posttest and 111 children who achieved 4 points gains with less than 6 months. 30 children were Not Able to be Tested at the pretest due to limited English language proficiency.
PPVT-IV					Not Applicable.
TVIP					Not Applicable.
Comments: None					

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					65.60% of age-eligible children achieved a standard score of 85 or higher in the spring. 87.85% of age-eligible children were tested in Spring 2009. Five children were Not Able to be Tested (NATT) due to limited English language proficiency.
	642	564	370	N<11	
PPVT IV					Not Applicable
TVIP					Not Applicable
Comments: None					

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	642	562		21.1	87.83% of age-eligible children were tested in Spring 2009. None of the children were exempted. The California average of 21 letters is based on an analysis of 562 individual student scores this is not a weighted average.
Comments: None					

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	215	166	77% of the 215 kindergarten enrolled in 2008-09 were reading at or above grage level. Based in California Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 189 kindergarten children were eligible to be included in this analysis. According to California criteria, the cohort consists of 189 children, 166 (88%) were reading at or above grade level. California Eligible Cohort: Eligibe children, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include all children who received 100+ hours of supplemental academic support and children who are "reading at grade level" with less than 100 hours of academic support. Data Source: Students' end-of-year progress report cards. A determination of "at grade level" is based on the average rating of reading sub-skills listed on the student's report card. Grade appropriate reading skills are listed in the California Department of Education reading content standards for kindergarten.
1	170	115	67.64% of the 170 1st grade children enrolled in 2008-09 were reading at or above grade level. Based on California Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 145 1st grade children were eligible to be included in this analysis. According to California criteria, the cohort consists of 145 children, 115 (79%) were reading at or above grade level. See above for description of Data Source and California Eligible Cohort.
2	133	71	53.34% of the 133 2nd grade children enrolled in 2008-09 were at or above grade level. Based on California Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 108 2nd grade children were eligible to be included in this analysis. According to California criteria, the cohort consists of 108 children, 71 (66%) were reading at or above grade level. Data Source: California Star test, a standards based test in English Language Arts is administered annually to students in grades 2+. The California Star Test is correlated to the California Department of Education reading content standards for each grade level. Students who achieve scores of " proficient" or "Advanced" are meeting the reading content standards for their grade level.
3	96	32	33.33% of the 96 3rd grade children enrolled in 2008-09 were reading at or above grade level. Based on California Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 67 3rd grade children were eligibe to be included in this analysis. according to California criteria, the cohort consists of 67 children, 32 (48%) were reading at or above grade level. See above for description of Data Source and California Eligible Cohort
Comments: None			

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	1,836	1,652	89.99% of eligible adults showed improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the four Scale I subscales. Adults made an average +.75 posttest gain on the four Scale I subscales. Eligible Cohort: Eligible parents, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, includes all parents eith pretest/posttest scores who received 8 months of parent education and those who achieved the indicator in less than eight months. California Scale I Indicator target: Eligible parent show improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the four Scale I subscales.
PEP Scale II	1,836	1,634	88.99% of eligible adults showed improvement by advancing one of the three Scale II subscales. Adults made an average +80 posttest gain on the three Scale II subscales. California Scale II Indicator Target: Eligible parents show improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the three Scale II subbscales.
PEP Scale III			Projects are not required to administer Scale III.
PEP Scale IV			Projects are not required to administer Scale IV.
Other			Not aplicable.
Comments: None			

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	8,796
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	20,853
K	11,408
1	10,158
2	12,322
3	12,073
4	11,699
5	11,362
6	11,034
7	11,379
8	11,415
9	10,769
10	11,265
11	10,738
12	13,732
Ungraded	416
Out-of-school	32,091
Total	211,510
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	14
1	391
2	567
3	841
4	854
5	742
6	768
7	745
8	721
9	723
10	689
11	758
12	691
Ungraded	11
Out-of-school	115
Total	8,630
Comments: The State Assessment data used to identify students that are failing, or at risk of failing were not available at the time that this file was submitted.	

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the underlined underscored 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)	
K	3,531
1	6,241
2	10,211
3	8,828
4	8,069
5	7,078
6	6,481
7	6,064
8	5,376
9	5,136
10	4,862
11	4,234
12	2,167
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	78,278
Comments: The complete results of the California English Language Development Test were not available when this file was submitted.	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the underlined underscored 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)	209
K	188
1	284
2	350
3	424
4	480
5	494
6	506
7	591
8	493
9	548
10	551
11	505
12	532
Ungraded	N<11
Out-of-school	119
Total	6,278
Comments:	

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	12 Months	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period		
		Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	4,634	3,251	911	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,083	6,718	5,423	3,629
K	2,919	3,625	2,827	2,037
1	1,887	3,116	2,586	2,569
2	2,455	3,431	3,406	3,030
3	2,495	3,639	3,190	2,749
4	2,404	3,487	3,201	2,607
5	2,348	3,322	3,123	2,569
6	2,235	3,257	2,907	2,635
7	2,310	3,337	3,102	2,630
8	2,283	3,371	3,228	2,533
9	2,157	3,161	2,854	2,597
10	2,246	3,436	3,114	2,469
11	1,944	3,092	3,044	2,658
12	2,086	4,354	4,367	2,925
Ungraded	56	132	130	98
Out-of-school	10,449	10,092	6,777	4,773
Total	49,991	64,821	54,190	42,508
Comments:				

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	5,241
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,061
K	5,911
1	4,796
2	5,811
3	5,769
4	5,533
5	5,424
6	5,042
7	5,426
8	5,399
9	5,021
10	5,327
11	4,964
12	6,719
Ungraded	223
Out-of-school	17,696
Total	105,363
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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of eligible migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	
Comments: The dropout data for migrant students is not available until later this year. This is the initial year of collecting data through our new longitudinal data system and we have needed to extend the deadline for data submission.	

FAQ on Dropouts:

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

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	154
Comments: The GED data for migrant students is not available until later this year. This is the initial year of collecting data through our new longitudinal data system and we have needed to extend the deadline for data submission.	

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

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	9,170	9,116
4	9,154	9,099
5	9,198	9,154
6	9,356	9,292
7	9,206	9,154
8	9,092	9,033
9		
10	8,342	8,069
11		
12		
Total	63,518	62,917
Comments: The total for the previous year included grades 9, 11 and 12.		

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	9,170	9,113
4	9,154	9,108
5	9,198	9,153
6	9,356	9,307
7	9,206	9,157
8	9,092	8,957
9		
10	8,343	8,006
11		
12		
Total	63,519	62,801
Comments: The total for the previous year included grades 9, 11 and 12.		

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 underduplicated 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	1,124
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9,315
K	6,654
1	7,199
2	7,443
3	7,126
4	6,804
5	6,626
6	6,652
7	6,516
8	6,351
9	6,965
10	6,810
11	6,570
12	6,283
Ungraded	143
Out-of-school	10,424
Total	109,005
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	
K	11
1	311
2	425
3	621
4	654
5	545
6	582
7	551
8	559
9	596
10	566
11	602
12	535
Ungraded	N<11
Out-of-school	63
Total	6,628
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	N<11
K	N<11
1	
2	
3	N<11
4	N<11
5	N<11
6	N<11
7	N<11
8	N<11
9	N<11
10	N<11
11	N<11
12	N<11
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	27
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	411
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,790
K	3,987
1	4,749
2	4,970
3	4,812
4	4,462
5	4,224
6	3,792
7	3,305
8	3,116
9	2,622
10	2,744
11	2,870
12	3,067
Ungraded	47
Out-of-school	3,543
Total	58,511
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	176	50	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,264	1,170	
K	1,736	1,127	
1	2,129	1,373	
2	2,219	1,576	
3	2,142	1,516	
4	1,904	1,393	
5	1,837	1,260	
6	1,622	1,178	
7	1,477	1,172	
8	1,372	1,078	
9	797	521	571
10	890	493	972
11	973	524	1,475
12	1,062	530	1,651
Ungraded	28	N<11	
Out-of-school	797	551	
Total	23,425	15,514	4,669
Comments:			

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received <u>any</u> MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	957	375
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,725	2,706
K	5,735	2,351
1	6,184	2,469
2	6,401	2,513
3	6,127	2,331
4	5,901	2,314
5	5,731	2,291
6	5,772	2,514
7	5,743	2,796
8	5,699	3,041
9	6,665	4,536
10	6,579	4,604
11	6,339	4,568
12	6,005	4,588
Ungraded	141	75
Out-of-school	10,073	6,918
Total	97,777	50,990
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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. <u>Do not include children who were referred, but received no services</u>. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	201
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,087
K	1,415
1	1,805
2	1,801
3	1,816
4	1,745
5	1,549
6	1,494
7	1,638
8	1,694
9	1,489
10	1,602
11	1,338
12	1,321
Ungraded	21
Out-of-school	2,167
Total	25,183
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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do <u>not</u> count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	1,011
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12,015
K	5,829
1	6,731
2	7,477
3	7,357
4	7,131
5	6,899
6	6,530
7	6,578
8	5,621
9	6,342
10	5,717
11	5,316
12	2,561
Ungraded	143
Out-of-school	6,185
Total	99,443
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	
K	10
1	326
2	470
3	663
4	691
5	593
6	589
7	569
8	499
9	479
10	460
11	491
12	167
Ungraded	N<11
Out-of-school	36
Total	6,047
Comments: The State assessment data used to identify students that are failing, or at risk of failing were not available at the time this file was submitted.	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<11
K	N<11
1	N<11
2	N<11
3	N<11
4	N<11
5	N<11
6	N<11
7	N<11
8	N<11
9	N<11
10	N<11
11	
12	N<11
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<11
Total	32
Comments: The decrease in the total of students served under continuation of services decreased due to better utilization of other educational and community resources.	

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 underlined 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	434
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	10,532
K	5,172
1	5,857
2	6,515
3	6,400
4	6,189
5	5,959
6	5,636
7	5,422
8	4,608
9	4,510
10	4,149
11	3,913
12	1,886
Ungraded	102
Out-of-school	3,259
Total	80,543
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	162	119	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,048	4,368	
K	2,510	2,337	
1	3,107	2,866	
2	3,494	3,179	
3	3,483	3,022	
4	3,361	3,001	
5	3,181	2,860	
6	2,820	2,810	
7	2,598	2,610	
8	2,307	2,265	
9	2,105	1,881	529
10	1,920	1,621	709
11	1,849	1,526	894
12	985	616	712
Ungraded	48	25	
Out-of-school	930	720	
Total	39,908	35,826	2,844
Comments:			

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	820	191
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,617	2,338
K	3,091	888
1	3,805	1,261
2	4,205	1,384
3	4,186	1,431
4	4,271	1,503
5	4,194	1,518
6	3,866	1,470
7	4,045	1,729
8	3,372	1,851
9	4,260	2,338
10	3,883	2,263
11	3,747	2,228
12	2,207	1,454
Ungraded	108	61
Out-of-school	5,227	3,187
Total	62,904	27,095
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	89
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,231
K	1,271
1	1,411
2	1,574
3	1,508
4	1,510
5	1,528
6	1,435
7	1,469
8	1,150
9	1,139
10	1,124
11	1,063
12	635
Ungraded	28
Out-of-school	1,721
Total	21,886
Comments:	

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	1,736
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14,680
K	8,151
1	8,837
2	9,757
3	9,524
4	9,134
5	8,905
6	8,616
7	8,695
8	7,935
9	9,172
10	8,552
11	8,154
12	7,716
Ungraded	228
Out-of-school	14,252
Total	144,044
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	3,974
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	132,849
Comments: *	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	1
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	99
Comments: One school was incorrectly identified as having MEP funds consolidated in a Schoolwide Program.	

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	567	103,939
Regular school year – school day/extended day	335	61,826
Summer/intersession only	462	72,749
Year round	642	123,764
Comments: Some Migrant Regional Offices and School Districts have adopted a year round intervention strategy and reduced summer/intersession only programs.		

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

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

a. How is the FTE calculated for the State director? Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.

b. Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	1,083		1,216	
Counselors	78		60	
All paraprofessionals	796		1,219	
Recruiters	436		358	
Records transfer staff	173		167	
Comments: The validation warning message is an error in the EDFacts system. The FTEs are not percentages. It appears that the Records transfer staff Headcount and FTE were underreported the previous year. The increase in the Teacher FTE for the Regular School year reflects an increase in student/teacher contact hours. The increase in the Summer/Intersession Term headcount and FTE reflects an increase in guidance services and counseling services.				

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	722	442.80	1,017	793.00
Comments: More Qualified Paraprofessionals were employed to assist certificated staff in providing instructional services.				

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		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	7	138
Adult corrections	7	125
Other		
Total	14	

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.	

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	
Juvenile Detention	
Juvenile Corrections	7
Adult Corrections	7
Other	
Total	2
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.	

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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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			970	989	
Long Term Students Served			495	414	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			N<11	N<11	
Asian or Pacific Islander			28	33	
Black, non-Hispanic			378	325	
Hispanic			469	505	
White, non-Hispanic			94	123	
Total			970	989	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			954	849	
Female			16	140	
Total			970	989	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14			N<11		
15			23		
16			94		
17			194	N<11	
18			272	94	
19			186	362	
20			126	532	
21			65		
Total			970	989	

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

response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.

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

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

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)		N<11	N<11	
Awarded high school diploma(s)		N<11	N<11	
Awarded GED(s)		N<11	N<11	
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits		928	41	
Enrolled in a GED program		452	163	
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		12	N<11	
Earned a GED		44	80	
Obtained high school diploma		77	11	
Were accepted into post-secondary education		28	43	
Enrolled in post-secondary education		19	41	
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.				

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

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		672	116	
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education		77		
Obtained employment		39	N<11	
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.				

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of <u>long-term</u> 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 <u>together</u> 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		431	150	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		495	414	

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		66	71	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		39	40	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		34	22	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		44	24	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		277	133	
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.				

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		410	111	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		459	151	

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		52	27	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		37	18	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		34	12	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		57	15	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		279	79	
Comments: Subpart I programs do not operate Neglected or Other programs.				

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	179	
Neglected programs	207	
Juvenile detention	194	
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total	580	

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: LEAs receiving Subpart 2 funds to not operate Other Programs. Additionally, CA will begin collecting the Average Lenth of Stay and the number of multiple purpose facilities during FY 2009-10.	

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	39
Neglected programs	24
Juvenile detention	59
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	122
Comments: LEAs in CA operate multiple programs at different sites. LEAs receiving Subpart 2 funds do not operate Other Programs.	

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 <u>only</u> students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	81,894	14,004	185,570		
Total Long Term Students Served	5,715	656	7,863		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	384	42	795		
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,184	115	2,100		
Black, non-Hispanic	3,535	1,344	15,804		
Hispanic	15,977	2,008	31,953		
White, non-Hispanic	6,146	1,141	11,100		
Total	27,226	4,650	61,752		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	18,231	2,542	51,652		
Female	9,103	2,135	10,257		
Total	27,334	4,677	61,909		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10	255	831	120		
11					
12					
13					
14					
15	8,966	1,841	17,562		
16					
17					
18	16,890	1,914	43,160		
19	1,223	91	1,067		
20					
21					
Total	27,334	4,677	61,909		

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

Comments: California does not collect student data on individual age levels. 108 At-Risk students declined to state their ethnicity, as well as 45 students in Neglected Programs and 157 studnets in Juvenile Detention Programs. CA will begin collecting the number of long-term students served during FY 2009-109.

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

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

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	141	72	152	
Awarded high school diploma(s)	122	64	94	
Awarded GED(s)	34	38	69	
Comments: LEAs do not operate Other Programs.				

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	17,610	2,669	40,378	
Enrolled in a GED program	307	44	1,850	
Comments: LEAs do not operate Other Programs.				

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	7,229	1,539	17,530	
Earned a GED	101	23	811	
Obtained high school diploma	2,003	197	595	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	581	121	308	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	458	95	232	
Comments: LEAs do not operate Other Programs.				

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	1,023	90	7,591	
Comments: LEAs do not operate Other Programs.				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	290	98	243	
Obtained employment	370	47	484	
Comments: LEAs do not operate Other Programs.				

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	5,622	1,057	8,397	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	5,715	656	7,863	

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	1,482	80	2,690	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	1,664	189	688	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	823	156	952	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	774	104	1,039	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	972	127	2,494	
Comments: LEAs do not operate Other Programs.				

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	4,615	1,031	8,289	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	4,301	595	7,760	

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	1,795	86	2,705	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	894	167	698	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	486	112	903	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	383	112	1,064	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	743	118	2,390	
Comments: LEAs do not operate Other Programs.				

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
The percentage of students that think frequent use of marijuana is extremely harmful.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708	2006-07: 7th grade: +1% 9th grade: +1% 11th grade: +1%	2006-07: 7th grade: 81.9% 9th grade: 66% 11th grade: 56.9%	7th grade:56% 9th grade:54% 11th grade: 44.1%	2007-08
				2007-08: 7th grade:56% 9th grade:54% 11th grade: 44.1%			
				2008-09: 7th grade:56% 9th grade:54% 11th grade: 44.1%			

Comments: Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09. A new baseline was established in 2007-08. The prior perceived harm question was replaced by a new SAMHSA NOMs question in the 2007-08 California Student Survey "How much do people risk harming themselves physically or in other ways when they smoke marijuana once or twice per week?" Data collected prior to 2007-08 are not comparable to that of data collected in and after 2007-08.

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
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1%	2006-07: 7th grade: 4.7% 9th grade: 12.6% 11th grade: 19.2%		

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1%	grade: 6.6% 9th grade: 15.4% 11th grade: 23.9%		
				2008-09: 7th 09: Same rates as 2007-08	grade: 6.6% 9th grade: 15.4% 11th grade: 23.9%		
The percentage of students that have used marijuana in the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708			7th grade: 4% 9th grade: 13.4% 11th grade: 23%	2001-02

Comments: In 2007-08, response categories 1 or 2 days were made separate. This may have affected survey results and accounted for the increase in the 30-day use rates among students. Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 2%	2006-07: 7th grade: 4.5% 9th grade: 12.8% 11th grade: 23.2%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 5.7% 9th grade: 13.1% 11th grade: 24.5%			
				2008-09: 7th grade: 5.7% 9th grade: 13.1% 11th grade: 24.5%			
The percentage of students that have been drunk or high at school.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708			7th grade: 3.3% 9th grade: 13.5% 11th grade: 27%	2001-02

Comments: Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09. In 200708, the response categories were expanded from four to six, which may have affected survey results.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: 2%	2006-07: 7th grade: 12% 9th grade: 23.8% 11th grade: 35.8%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 14.8% 9th grade:			
				2% 11th grade: 2%	27.3% 11th grade: 41.9%		
				2008-09: 7th grade: 14.8% 9th grade: 27.3% 11th grade: 41.9%			
The percentage of students that have used alcohol in the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708			7th grade: 10.4% 9th grade: 29.3% 11th grade: 40.7%	2001-02

Comments: In 2007-08, response categories 1 or 2 days were made separate. This may have affected survey results and accounted for the increase in the 30-day use rates among students. Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 2%	2006-07: 7th grade: 7.9% 9th grade: 22.3% 11th grade: 38.2%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 9.4% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th grade: 41.6%		7th grade: 8.5% 9th grade: 24.1% 11th grade: 44%	
The percentage of students that have ever used marijuana.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708	2008-09: 7th grade: 9.4% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th			2001-02

				grade: 41.6%			

Comments: Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09. In 200708, the response categories were expanded from four to six, which may have affected survey results and partially accounted for the increase in lifetime use rates among students.

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
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade:	2006-07: 7th grade: 7.8% 9th grade:		
				0.5% 11th grade: 0.5%	10.2% 11th grade: 9.5%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 11.5% 9th grade: 14.1% 11th grade: 15.2%			
				2008-09: 7th grade: 11.5% 9th grade: 14.1% 11th grade: 15.2%			
The percentage of students that have ever used inhalants	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708			7th grade: 6.3% 9th grade: 9.4% 11th grade: 12.6%	2001-02

Comments: Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09. In 200708, the response categories were expanded from four to six, which may have affected survey results and partially accounted for the increase in lifetime use rates among students.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 0.5% 11th grade: 0.5%	2006-07: 7th grade: 2.7% 9th grade: 5.2% 11th grade: 8.3%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 4.1% 9th grade: 6.1% 11th grade: 10.1%			
				2008-09: 7th grade: 4.1% 9th grade: 6.1% 11th grade: 10.1%			
The percentage of students that have ever used smokeless tobacco.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708			7th grade: 2.4% 9th grade: 4.8% 11th grade: 8.6%	2001-02
Comments: Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09. In 200708, the response categories were expanded from four to six, which may have affected survey results and partially accounted for the increase in lifetime use rates among students.							

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
				2006-07: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: 1%	2006-07: 7th grade: 67.5% 9th grade: 56.8% 11th grade: 59%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 64.4% 9th grade: 72% 11th grade: 77.7%			
The percentage of students that think frequent use of cigarettes is extremely harmful.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708	2008-09: 7th grade: 64.4% 9th grade: 72% 11th grade: 77.7%		7th grade: 64.4% 9th grade: 72% 11th grade: 77.7%	2007-08

Comments: Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09. A new baseline was established in 2007-08. The prior perceived harm question was replaced by a new SAMHSA NOMs question in the 2007-08 California Student Survey "How much do people risk harming themselves physically or in other ways when they smoke 1-2 packs cigarettes every day?" Data collected prior to 2007-08 are not comparable to that of data collected in and after 200708.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
_				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1%	2006-07: 7th grade: 5.1% 9th grade: 10% 11th grade: 15.2%		
			2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1%	2007-08: 7th grade: 5.6% 9th grade: 11.1% 11th grade: 17.4%			
_			2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 5.6% 9th grade: 11.1% 11th grade: 17.4%			
_● ● ● 2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1% The percentage of students that have used cigarettes in the last 30 days. _California Student Survey (CSS) ● Biennial ● 12th biennial CSS: 2007-08 Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 2007-08	2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1% 2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10				7th grade: 4.3% 9th grade: 11.1% 11th grade: 18.9%	2001-02

Comments: In 2007-08, response categories 1 or 2 days were made separate. This may have affected survey results and accounted for the increase in the 30-day use rates among students. Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.1% 9th grade: 0.2% 11th grade: 0.3%	2006-07: 7th grade: 1.8% 9th grade: 2.7% 11th grade: 3.2%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 5.3% 11th grade: 6.3%			
				2008-09: 7th grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 5.3% 11th grade: 6.3%			
The percentage of students that have used smokeless tobacco in the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708			7th grade: 0.8% 9th grade: 1.4% 11th grade: 2.8%	2001-02
Comments: In 2007-08, response categories 1 or 2 days were made separate. This may have affected survey results and accounted for the increase in the 30-day use rates among students. Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09.							

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
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 0.5% 11th grade: 0.5%	2006-07: 7th grade: 2.4% 9th grade: 4.6% 11th grade: 6%		
				grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 0.5% 11th grade: 0.5%	2007-08: 7th grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 7% 11th grade: 7.4%		
				2008-09: 7th 09: Same rates as	grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 7%		

					2007-08	11th grade: 7.4%		
					2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1%			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have used cigarettes at school in the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708	11th grade: 1%		7th grade: 1.8% 9th grade: 4.3% 11th grade: 6.1%	2001-02

Comments: In 2007-08, response categories 1 or 2 days were made separate. This may have accounted for the increase in the 30-day use rates among students. Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 2%	2006-07: 7th grade: 7.5% 9th grade: 16% 11th grade: 28%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: 7.1% 9th grade: 20.4% 11th grade: 33.6%			
				2008-09: 7th grade: 7.1% 9th grade: 20.4% 11th grade: 33.6%			
The percentage of students that have ever used cigarettes.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 200708			7th grade: 6.9% 9th grade: 20.7% 11th grade: 35.7%	2001-02

Comments: The percentage of students referred to here are those students who have smoked a whole cigarette. It does not include students that may have taken a puff or two from a cigarette. In 2007-08, the response categories were expanded from four to six, and may have affected the survey results. Since the California Student Survey is conducted biennially, the 2007-08 rates are the same as 2008-09.

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
				2006-07: 7th	2006-07: 7th		

				grade: -1% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1%	grade: 32% 9th grade: 25.1% 11th grade: 20%		
				2007-08: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: 1% 11th grade: 1%	grade: 32.2% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th grade: 22.8%		
				2008-09: 7th			
				09: Same rates as 2007-08	grade: 32.2% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th grade: 22.8%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: 1%			
The percentage of students that have ever been in a physical fight in the past 12 months.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th biennial CSS: 2007 08	11: Same rates as 2009-10		7th grade: 27.2% 9th grade: 23.7% 11th grade: 19%	2001-02
Comments:							

12.7.2 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	California does not differentiate suspensions and expulsions related to alcohol and illicit drugs. The following two Education Code (EC) sections include incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs: EC 48900c (unlawfully possessed, used, sold, or otherwise furnished, or been under the influence of any controlled substance, alcoholic, or intoxicants); and 48900d (unlawfully offered, arranged, or negotiated to sell any controlled substance, alcohol, or intoxicants). To avoid over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are reported in 2.7.2.6.
Illicit drug related	California's student suspension and expulsion laws authorize alcohol disciplinary actions in Education Code (EC) sections that include both alcohol and illicit drugs. These include EC sections 48900c (unlawfully possessed, used, sold, or otherwise furnished, or been under the influence of any controlled substance, alcoholic, or intoxicants); and 48900d (unlawfully offered, arranged, or negotiated to sell any controlled substance, alcohol, or intoxicants). Also included are EC sections 48900j (possession or sale of drug paraphernalia); 48900p (offer to sell prescription drug Soma); 48915a3 (unlawful possession of any controlled substance); 48915c3 (unlawful selling of controlled substance).
Violent incident without physical injury	Included are EC sections 48900a2 (willfully used force or violence); 48900e (committed or attempted to commit robbery or extortion); 48900n (committed or attempt to commit sexual assault); 48900o (intimidation to a witness); 48900.3 (caused or attempt to cause hate violence); 48900.4 (harassment or intimidation against school district personnel or students); 48900.7 (terroristic threats); 48915a4 (robbery or extortion); 48915a5 (assault or battery upon school employee); 48915c4 (sexual assault or battery)
Violent incident with physical injury	Included are EC sections 48900a1 (physical injury to other person); 48900s (physical injury to another person); 48915a1 (serious physical injury to another person, except in self defense);
Weapons possession	A weapon is a firearm, knife, explosive or other dangerous object. Included are student suspensions and expulsions due to violations of EC sections 48900b (possessed, sold, or otherwise furnished any weapons defined above); 48900m (possessed an imitation firearm); 48915a2 (possession of any knife or other dangerous object); 48915c1 (possessing, selling or furnishing a firearm); 48915c2 (brandishing a knife); and 48915c5 (possession of an explosive).
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	15,930	883
6 through 8	21,228	508
9 through 12	18,342	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.		

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	274	883
6 through 8	917	508
9 through 12	2,161	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12		

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 <u>violent incident with physical injury</u>.

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 <u>violent incident with physical injury</u> by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>violent incident with physical injury</u>, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	59,178	883
6 through 8	65,732	508
9 through 12	53,649	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12		

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 <u>violent incident with physical injury</u> by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>violent incident with physical injury</u>, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	286	883
6 through 8	1,083	508
9 through 12	2,679	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12		

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	7,304	883
6 through 8	7,391	508
9 through 12	5,495	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12		

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	464	883
6 through 8	1,138	508
9 through 12	1,796	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12		

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 <u>alcohol-related</u> 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 <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>alcohol-related</u> 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: California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in the illicit-drug related incidents in 2.7.2.6. Last year, the number of suspensions for alcohol and illicit-drug related incidents were reported twice in both 2.7.2.5 and 2.7.2.6.		

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 <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>alcohol-related</u> 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: California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in the illicit-drug related incidents in 2.7.2.6. Last year, the number of expulsions for alcohol and illicit-drug related incidents were reported twice in both 2.7.2.5 and 2.7.2.6.		

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	1,660	883
6 through 8	10,276	508
9 through 12	32,811	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12. California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in this section. Last year, the number of suspensions related to alcohol and illicit-drug related incidents were reported twice in both 2.7.2.5 and 2.7.2.6.		

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	123	883
6 through 8	1,172	508
9 through 12	4,104	447
Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California: K through 5 -elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8. 6 through 8 -middle school: grades 6 -8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9. 9 through 12 -high school: grades 9 -12; occasionally grades 10 through 12. California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in this section. Last year, the number of expulsions related to alcohol and illicit-drug were reported twice in both 2.7.2.5 and 2.7.2.6.		

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 <u>most common</u> 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
No Response	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
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
Yes	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	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
Yes	Other Specify 1
No Response	Other Specify 2

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

About 400+ local education agencies also recruited parents to help as classroom volunteers or other volunteers in school based prevention activities.

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	1,132	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	1,132	
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 <u>expended</u> 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	8,361,355	94.2
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	8,876,284	
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 <u>used</u> **at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).**
2. That did <u>not</u> use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

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

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	1,032	404
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	100	30
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities		
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	1,132	434
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	273
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	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	14
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	8
Parental involvement activities	3
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	21
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	5
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.

For the 2008-09 school year, the State Education Agency (SEA) participated in the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program by awarding subgrants to 32 local educational agencies (LEAs) using a formula allocation driven by each district's average daily attendance. The CDE informs the recipient LEAs about the specific state criteria and annual targets to increase the academic performance and achievement of all students. California's accountability system monitors progress toward ensuring that all students are achieving the state's academic content standards and meeting those targets. The measure of such student achievement is the determination of whether Title I schools and LEAs make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as required under NCLB. Following are the four components used to make AYP determinations in California:

1) Meeting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) regarding student proficiency in English-language arts and mathematics

2) Achieving a 95 percent student participation rate on assessments in English-language arts and mathematics

3) Making or exceeding the specified growth target on the state's Academic Performance Index (API)

4) Increasing the high school graduation rate

In reviewing data of the 32 LEAs that received a FY 2008-09 RLIS grant, six were in Program Improvement (PI) status. Two LEAs had moved into Year 2 of PI; two LEAs had moved into Year 3 of PI; and two LEAs are continuing in Year 3 of PI status.

When identified for PI, LEAs in California are required to 1) conduct a self-assessment using materials and criteria based on current research; 2) use specific state-developed self-assessment tools to verify the fundamental teaching and learning needs in its schools and identify the specific academic problems of low-achieving students; 3) determine why the prior LEA plan failed to bring about increased student achievement; 4) revise the LEA plan according to the identified needs; and 5) work with an external entity to ensure that the district is using funds appropriately to improve student achievement.

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).	154
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)	124	12
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	3	25
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	59	10
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	1	45
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		77

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)	6,092,140.00	54,995.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	9,426.00	529,603.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	432,853.00	534,499.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	7.00	4,309,414.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		1,105,915.00
Total	6,534,426.00	6,534,426.00
Comments:		

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

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