

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 2009-10



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Arizona Department of Education		
Address: 1535 West Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85007		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Richard Valdivia		
Telephone: (602) 542-3270		
Fax: (602) 542-3050		
e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Richard Valdivia		
_____ Signature		_____ Wednesday, April 27, 2011, 3:01:00 PM

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	41,030	23,148	56.4
4	40,212	21,797	54.2
5	39,792	19,567	49.2
6	36,506	17,195	47.1
7	35,036	16,649	47.5
8	34,915	16,294	46.7
High School	22,963	10,869	47.3
Total	250,454	125,519	50.1

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	41,026	26,715	65.1
4	40,201	24,968	62.1
5	39,792	24,998	62.8
6	36,518	25,403	69.6
7	35,036	24,293	69.3
8	34,925	22,822	65.3
High School	23,360	15,807	67.7
Total	250,858	165,006	65.8

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	16,042	10,510	65.5
4	16,255	10,492	64.5
5	16,219	9,605	59.2
6	14,919	7,852	52.6
7	12,434	6,504	52.3
8	12,333	6,227	50.5
High School	10,170	4,880	48.0
Total	98,372	56,070	57.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	16,040	12,221	76.2
4	16,250	12,217	75.2
5	16,224	12,166	75.0
6	14,920	11,531	77.3
7	12,438	9,410	75.7
8	12,334	8,888	72.1
High School	10,258	7,293	71.1
Total	98,464	73,726	74.9
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	35,068
Limited English proficient students	53,990
Students who are homeless	12,795
Migratory students	2,441
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	13,951
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,430
Black, non-Hispanic	20,462
Hispanic	174,816
White, non-Hispanic	60,271
Total	274,930
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	N<10	68	N<10	13	81
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	3,068	N<10	23	3,092
K	2,274	23,646	222	114	26,256
1	2,576	25,321	275	119	28,291
2	2,568	24,840	276	117	27,801
3	2,559	25,445	231	118	28,353
4	1,987	24,432	252	117	26,788
5	1,873	24,301	210	108	26,492
6	1,068	21,840	173	117	23,198
7	726	19,686	148	175	20,735
8	702	19,727	127	213	20,769
9	995	11,519	183	365	13,062
10	455	10,798	150	351	11,754
11	471	10,330	113	383	11,297
12	578	10,997	80	488	12,143
Ungraded	N<10	73			79
TOTALS		256,091		2,821	280,191
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	8,631
Reading/language arts	15,153
Science	562
Social studies	551
Vocational/career	N<10
Other instructional services	22
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	
Supporting guidance/advocacy	
Other support services	
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	385	
Paraprofessionals ¹	325	97.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	25	
Clerical support staff	42	
Administrators (non-clerical)	45	
Comments:		

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	1,814.40	97.0
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, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	8
Comments:	

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2009. 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	364
2. Adults participating	368
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	268
4. Participating children	437
a. Birth through 2 years	39
b. Ages 3 through 5	339
c. Ages 6 through 8	59
c. Above age 8	N<10
Comments:	

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	233
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	239
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	217
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	206
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 th grade at the time of enrollment	136
Comments:	

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2010). 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	54
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	59
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	207
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	44
5. Total families enrolled	364
Comments:	

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

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

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

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	95	71	75% achieved gain of 1 level pre/post - There was a drop of 11.4% from last year. Programs believe this drop occurred because they were trying the on-line GED sessions. They had students meet with the instructors face to face once a month. They believe this was not enough. They have changed the system for this year and the instructors meet with the students weekly to better meet individual needs.
CASAS			
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	216	153	71% achieved gain of 1 level pre/post
CASAS			
BEST			
BEST Plus			
BEST Literacy			
Other			
Comments:			

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED			
Other			
Comments:			
Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma			
GED	13	11	85%
Other			
Comments:			

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	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	80% (only one program continues to use the PPVT-III)
PPVT-IV	117	105	95	12	90%
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	60% (only one program continues to use the PPVT-III)
PPVT-IV	117	105	80	13	76%
TVIP					
Comments:					

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

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

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2010 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	124	120	N<10	18.4	
Comments:					

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	33	29	87.8% are reading on or above grade level. The assessment tool used by the school districts is the DIBELS.
1	23	19	82.6% are reading on or above grade level. The assessment tool used by the school districts is the DIBELS
2	17	14	82.3% are reading on or above grade level. The assessment tool used by the school districts is the DIBELS
3	N<10	N<10	71.4% are reading on or above grade level. The assessment tool used by the school districts is the DIBELS
Comments:			

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

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

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

	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	220	158	72% achieved Mastery Level III
PEP Scale II	301	287	95% achieved .5 increase
PEP Scale III	57	43	75% achieved Mastery III
PEP Scale IV	24	24	>97% achieved Mastery Level III
Other	310	238	79% achieved Level III Mastery
Comments:			

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	316
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	838
K	456
1	536
2	541
3	541
4	493
5	494
6	577
7	535
8	535
9	597
10	574
11	562
12	772
Ungraded	55
Out-of-school	49
Total	8,471
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	39
1	53
2	51
3	53
4	48
5	35
6	47
7	37
8	36
9	57
10	53
11	40
12	38
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	589

Comments: The AZ MEP has been experiencing a reduction in eligible students and qualifying moves in which the academic school year is interrupted. Many of our families are returning to the State at the start of the school year and remaining in the State until close to the end of the school year. The reason for this is twofold: first, the political climate in the State causes parent to remain in the state once they have enrolled their children in school and second, school staff has stressed the importance of limiting the interruptions in children's academic careers. We are seeing a steady number of in district moves. This is further validated by the increase in students enrolled during the State testing window (2.3.2.3.1 and 2.3.2.3.2) as these numbers are on the rise as well and the State testing window falls outside of the natural crop cycles in the State. The Arizona MEP has also placed an emphasis on training staff about regarding Priority for Services to not only ensure that all staff understand completely the two components of PFS, but also that they are using truly reliable academic indicators.

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	220
1	373
2	397
3	342
4	309
5	249
6	270
7	205
8	198
9	198
10	160
11	135
12	113
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	3,179
Comments:	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	49
K	38
1	42
2	62
3	61
4	72
5	62
6	132
7	88
8	96
9	30
10	45
11	31
12	43
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	851
Comments:	

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2009. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	194	93	29	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	312	243	179	104
K	176	130	104	46
1	164	156	133	83
2	195	149	100	97
3	179	148	130	84
4	168	161	92	72
5	158	142	117	77
6	167	154	149	107
7	168	161	116	90
8	167	154	139	75
9	254	167	123	53
10	186	128	158	102
11	153	134	133	142
12	204	208	195	165
Ungraded	12	18	N<10	16
Out-of-school	27	10	N<10	N<10
Total	2,884	2,356	1,915	1,316
Comments:				

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2009. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	195
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	534
K	315
1	329
2	355
3	344
4	305
5	284
6	358
7	332
8	345
9	318
10	353
11	342
12	483
Ungraded	29
Out-of-school	41
Total	5,262

Comments: The State recently made a change to how this data is collected. Previously, data was collected using the time frame of Aug 15-May 15; however, with the trend of students returning earlier to limit the interruption in the school year, the ADE MEP had to expand the time frame to July 15- May 15. [Calculation rule: The program looks at enrollments marked as regular school year that occur during this date range. The date range is a reasonableness test. Even though the historical test used by the MEP is August 15 to May 15, and this works in most states, it does not work in Arizona. The data indicates that the "fall" enrollment period in Arizona began on July 20.] The result of collecting data for an extended timeframe produced a change of greater than 25% from the previous year.

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	14
8	37
9	13
10	20
11	21
12	50
Ungraded	
Total	155
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2008-09 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	1
Comments: Current GED information does not capture Migrant Program status of students. The ADE MEP can obtain this information only through follow up with the individual students. If a student does not provide this information to the ADE MEP we are not able to include that data in the count. The ADE MEP has been working diligently with the Dropout Prevention Unit to increase high school graduation through the use of various credit recovery systems therefore reducing the need for GEDs. This change is greater than 25% and could be a direct result of this work.	

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	442	437
4	355	349
5	401	398
6	457	454
7	383	382
8	414	411
HS	425	415
Ungraded		
Total	2,877	2,846

Comments: The increase in the number of eligible migrant students enrolled during the State's testing window can be attribute to the fact that many of our families are returning to the State at the start of the school year and remaining in the State at least until the State testing has been completed. The reason for this is twofold: first, the political climate in the State causes parent to remain in the state once they have enrolled their children in school and second, because school staff has stressed the importance of limiting the interruptions in children academic careers. The State does require that a student "meet" or "exceed" the standards on the State assessment to be eligible to receive a high school diploma. The AZ MEP has been working with the COEstar system and the State SAIS system to ensure that the crosswalk between the two systems is working correctly. The SAIS system, which houses the assessment data, relies on the COEstar system to send information about eligible migrant program students. The blank values for grades 9-12 result because the ADE reports these as high school and not as individual grades 9-12. This is consistent with our accountability workbook which states that assessment is given in the second year of high school, not in a specific grade.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	442	436
4	355	349
5	401	397
6	457	454
7	383	382
8	414	410
HS	417	406
Ungraded		
Total	2,869	2,834

Comments: The increase in the number of eligible migrant students enrolled during the State's testing window can be attribute to the fact that many of our families are returning to the State at the start of the school year and remaining in the State at least until the State testing has been completed. The reason for this is twofold: first, the political climate in the State causes parent to remain in the state once they have enrolled their children in school and second, because school staff has stressed the importance of limiting the interruptions in children academic careers. The State does require that a student "meet" or "exceed" the standards on the State assessment to be eligible to receive a high school diploma. The AZ MEP has been working with the COEstar system and the State SAIS system to ensure that the crosswalk between the two systems is working correctly. The SAIS system, which houses the assessment data, relies on the COEstar system to send information about eligible migrant program students. The blank values for grades 9-12 result because the ADE reports these as high school and not as individual grades 9-12. This is consistent with our accountability workbook which states that assessment is given in the second year of high school, not in a specific grade.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	292
K	306
1	334
2	319
3	364
4	320
5	322
6	400
7	353
8	379
9	358
10	373
11	340
12	307
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	4,788
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	N<10
K	39
1	55
2	51
3	52
4	48
5	35
6	47
7	36
8	36
9	57
10	54
11	39
12	38
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	589

Comments:

- The correct number is 53. Due to the overlap in the reporting period 2 students were duplicated in this count. All the other numbers have been double checked to ensure that this did not happen on them as well.
- The correct number is 53. Due to the overlap in the reporting period 1 student was duplicated in this count. All the other numbers have been double checked to ensure that this did not happen on them as well.
- The AZ MEP has been experiencing a reduction in eligible students and qualifying moves in which the school year is interrupted. Many of our families are returning to the State at the start of the school year and remaining in the State until close to the end of the school year; therefore, there is no interrupted move and are not eligible for priority for services. This reason is twofold: first, the political climate in the State is causing parents to remain in the State once they have enrolled their children in school and second, school staff has stressed the importance of limiting the interruptions in children's academic careers. We are seeing a steady number of in district moves. This is further validated by the increase in students enrolled during the State testing window (2.3.2.3.1 and 2.3.2.3.2) as these numbers are on the rise as well and the State testing cycle falls outside the natural crop cycles in the State.

The AZ MEP has also placed an emphasis on training staff regarding Priority for Service to not only ensure that all staff understand completely the two components of PFS, but also that they are using truly reliable indicators.

- This is a data error. The correct number for Continuation of Services should be 0. TROMIK has documented the issue and is working on investigating how 84 students were inadvertently picked up in the query.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	17
11	17
12	39
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	84

Comments:

- The correct number is 53. Due to the overlap in the reporting period 2 students were duplicated in this count. All the other numbers have been double checked to ensure that this did not happen on them as well.
- The correct number is 53. Due to the overlap in the reporting period 1 student was duplicated in this count. All the other numbers have been double checked to ensure that this did not happen on them as well.
- The AZ MEP has been experiencing a reduction in eligible students and qualifying moves in which the school year is interrupted. Many of our families are returning to the State at the start of the school year and remaining in the State until close to the end of the school year; therefore, there is no interrupted move and are not eligible for priority for services. This reason is twofold: first, the political climate in the State is causing parents to remain in the State once they have enrolled their children in school and second, school staff has stressed the importance of limiting the interruptions in children's academic careers. We are seeing a steady number of in district moves. This is further validated by the increase in students enrolled during the State testing window (2.3.2.3.1 and 2.3.2.3.2) as these numbers are on the rise as well and the State testing cycle falls outside the natural crop cycles in the State.

The AZ MEP has also placed an emphasis on training staff regarding Priority for Service to not only ensure that all staff understand completely the two components of PFS, but also that they are using truly reliable indicators.

- This is a data error. The correct number for Continuation of Services should be 0. TROMIK has documented the issue and is working on investigating how 84 students were inadvertently picked up in the query.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	66
1	56
2	35
3	38
4	41
5	57
6	72
7	73
8	88
9	65
10	112
11	76
12	59
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	838

Comments: Arizona continues to experience a drop in the number of eligible Migrant Students. This results in lower allocations to the LEAs. The LEAs have needed to find other funding sources to provide instructional services for their migrant students. The ADE MEP has also been working with the school districts to ensure that they are able to provide documentation for these services. If they cannot provide the backup documentation then it is not reported.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)			
K	37		
1	33	19	
2	22		
3	20	N<10	
4	29	14	
5	37	22	
6	50	N<10	
7	49	N<10	
8	44	N<10	
9	11	11	27
10	N<10	19	38
11	N<10	14	46
12	N<10	N<10	90
Ungraded			N<10
Out-of-school			N<10
Total	351	118	204

Comments: Arizona continues to experience a drop in the number of eligible Migrant Students. This results in lower allocations to the LEAs. The LEAs have needed to find other funding sources to provide instructional services for their migrant students. The ADE MEP has also been working with the school districts to ensure that they are able to provide documentation for these services. If they cannot provide the backup documentation then it is not reported.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	10	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	292	N<10
K	271	N<10
1	300	N<10
2	299	27
3	348	19
4	298	12
5	295	14
6	387	98
7	343	102
8	349	99
9	334	79
10	349	122
11	324	145
12	285	124
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10
Total	4,495	865

Comments: Arizona continues to experience a drop in the number of eligible Migrant Students. This results in lower allocations to the LEAs. The LEAs have needed to find other funding sources to provide instructional services for their migrant students. The ADE MEP has also been working with the school districts to ensure that they are able to provide documentation for these services. If they cannot provide the backup documentation then it is not reported.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	13
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	170
K	93
1	121
2	106
3	128
4	90
5	101
6	138
7	134
8	118
9	37
10	50
11	31
12	35
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	76
Total	1,441
<p>Comments: Our LEAs document the referred educational and educationally related services to eligible Migrant Students; however, our LEAs are not always able to show that the service was received. Without evidence that the referred service has been received, the service is not formally documented within the COEstar system. The reason for the sharp decrease in the amount of referred services during the regular school year is due to the fact that students may not be eligible for services outside of the school because current state laws prohibit agencies from providing some services to individuals that cannot show proof of legal residency. Also, because of the anti-illegal immigration political climate in the state, students are afraid to go to providers to receive the referred services.</p>	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation - Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	67
K	67
1	108
2	99
3	122
4	90
5	106
6	171
7	101
8	59
9	45
10	36
11	48
12	12
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,134
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	N<10

Comments: The ADE MEP experienced a decrease in summer school enrollment due to LEA budget constraints in FY09. Many LEAs did not deliver summer school services under the Title I-A summer school programs which served many of our MEP students. Therefore, in order to serve our MEP students the State had a large increase in the number of MEP students who participated in Migrant funded Summer School. In FY10, the availability of Title I-A ARRA funds allowed school districts, who chose to, to go back to holding a district-wide Title I-A summer school that included all Title I-A eligible students. This included MEP students.

In recent years, many of our families who follow the Migrant Stream from Yuma to Salinas have adapted their moving times to coincide with the school year. These families will return from the Salinas area in late August to start the school year on time, with the worker joining the family in November. The students will stay until mid-May, with the worker leaving in April. This means that large populations of our students are not in the State to receive Summer School services. Some families left the State after the end of the school year as a result of Arizona's anti-immigration laws. Some families moved to other states while others returned to their country of origin.

In addition the ADE MEP has been working with the school districts on using reliable data sources in determining priority for services. This has led to the decrease in students being identified as priority for services during the summer term.

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

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

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	28
K	53
1	99
2	89
3	106
4	81
5	87
6	94
7	64
8	35
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	752

Comments: The ADE MEP experienced a decrease in summer school enrollment due to LEA budget constraints in FY09. Many LEAs did not deliver summer school services under the Title I-A summer school programs which served many of our MEP students. Therefore, in order to serve our MEP students the State had a large increase in the number of MEP students who participated in Migrant funded Summer School. In FY10, the availability of Title I-A ARRA funds allowed school districts, who chose to, to go back to holding a district-wide Title I-A summer school that included all Title I-A eligible students. This included MEP students.

In recent years, many of our families who follow the Migrant Stream from Yuma to Salinas have adapted their moving times to coincide with the school year. These families will return from the Salinas area in late August to start the school year on time, with the worker joining the family in November. The students will stay until mid-May, with the worker leaving in April. This means that large populations of our students are not in the State to receive Summer School services. Some families left the State after the end of the school year as a result of Arizona's anti-immigration laws. Some families moved to other states while others returned to their country of origin.

These reasons stated above have led to the decrease in students receiving instructional services during the summer.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	28	28	
K	49	28	
1	90	63	
2	75	49	
3	89	61	
4	67	43	
5	72	40	
6	75	59	
7	63	42	
8	35	35	
9	N<10	N<10	29
10	N<10	N<10	32
11		N<10	50
12			32
Ungraded			N<10
Out-of-school	N<10	N<10	N<10
Total	655	464	143

Comments: The increase in high school credit accrual services can be attributed to the decreased instructional services that are available to migrant students in summer school. As our schools budgets have decreased across the board they have had to limit summer school for students and therefore have increased the demand for alternative ways to make up credit deficiencies.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	25	
K	43	
1	84	
2	82	
3	101	
4	70	
5	89	
6	100	
7	63	
8	38	
9	N<10	
10	N<10	
11	N<10	
12		
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	N<10	
Total	721	

Comments: Reasons previously stated explaining the decline in summer enrollment, play a part in the decreased number of counseling services provided to students during the summer term. In addition, as the number of eligible Migrant Students has continued to drop in the state of Arizona; resulting in lower allocations to the LEAs, the LEAs have needed to find other sources to provide counseling services for their migrant students. The ADE MEP has also been working with the school districts to ensure that they are able to provide documentation for these services. If they cannot provide the backup documentation then it is not reported.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	66
K	26
1	25
2	22
3	20
4	15
5	26
6	30
7	24
8	24
9	11
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	298

Comments: Our LEAs document the referred educational and educationally related services to eligible Migrant Students; however, our LEAs are not always able to show that the service was received. Without evidence that the referred service has been received, the service is not formally documented within the COEstar system. The reason for the sharp decrease in the amount of referred services during the summer school session is due to the fact that students may not be eligible for services outside of the school because current state laws prohibit agencies from providing some services to individuals that cannot show proof of legal residency. Also, because of the anti-illegal immigration political climate in the state, students are afraid to go to providers to receive the referred services.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	317
K	306
1	366
2	349
3	401
4	335
5	348
6	461
7	370
8	398
9	375
10	385
11	349
12	314
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	5,098
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	239
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	6,384
<p>Comments: The CSRP Part II for FY 09 report included a comment indicating the numbers reported (182 schools that eligible children were enrolled in and 3,090 eligible children enrolled in those schools) was in fact not correct. As indicated in the comment section of that report, the correct numbers should have been 237 schools and 9,097 migrant students enrolled in those schools. Therefore, the increase from 237 schools reported last year to 239 schools reported this year is not an increase greater than 25%. The number of students enrolled in the 239 schools reported this year is 6,384. This is an accurate count. The decrease in the number of students enrolled in schools is a result of the revisions made to the process of collecting and sorting the data (explained below) as well as the continued decrease in overall eligible migrant students identified in the State. An explanation of how the data is currently collected and the reason for the discrepancy in the numbers submitted in the CSRP Part II for FY 09 is listed below.</p> <p>The increase in schools (and thus the number of students in those schools) is because of greater accuracy by TROMIK to correctly code NCES and CTDS codes for this the report. This provides more accurate counts in the 132 EDEN report, in other CSRP LEA reports and in reporting to the Arizona Student Accountability Information System (SAIS.) An analysis of the latest SAIS update indicates that the MEP/SAIS correlation is very close with only a few school coding errors remaining to be fixed. SAIS uses the CTDS codes, MSIX uses the NCES assigned codes and EDEN uses the State assigned codes reported to EDEN.</p>	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

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

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	28	2,756
Regular school year – school day/extended day	4	2,055
Summer/intersession only	17	987
Year round	9	1,510
Comments: • While the type of projects may have been reclassified this year, due in part to budget cuts restricting school availability, the numbers are still in line with the submitted regular school year and summer school numbers.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	0.50
Comments:	

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	30	10.67	97	93.10
Counselors	20	7.15	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	31	19.81	70	64.60
Recruiters	46	30.21	11	10.00
Records transfer staff	30	15.48	11	9.15

Comments:

- Last year we had one site that ran only an MEP funded summer school; therefore State funds were not available to fund counselors at that site. This reporting year, regular summer school and MEP funded summer school ran concurrently and therefore State funds were used to fund counseling positions.
- Last year we had one site that ran only an MEP funded summer school; therefore State funds were not available to fund counselors at that site. This reporting year, regular summer school and MEP funded summer school ran concurrently and therefore State funds were used to fund counseling positions.
- The increase in the headcount of paraprofessionals for the regular school year can be attributed to the need of the migrant students for more individualized academic attention.
- The increase in the FTEs of paraprofessionals for the regular school year is directly related to the increase in the headcount of paraprofessionals.
- The increase in the headcount of paraprofessionals for summer/ intersession can be attributed to the need of the migrant students for more individualized academic attention.
- The increase in the FTEs of paraprofessionals for summer/ intersession is directly related to the increase in the headcount of paraprofessionals.
- The decrease in the headcount for recruiters during the summer/ intersession is directly related to the decrease in the number of sites who held summer school sites. .

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 CSRP as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 - 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.
 - 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.
- Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. *IMw 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	29	17.81	64	59.35
Comments:				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	14	30
Juvenile corrections	3	210
Adult corrections	10	90
Other	0	0
Total	27	42

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments:	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	14
Juvenile Corrections	3
Adult Corrections	10
Other	0
Total	27
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served		9,519	410	974	
Long Term Students Served		N<10	410	974	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		644	22	56	
Asian or Pacific Islander		49	N<10	1	
Black, non-Hispanic		1,091	68	142	
Hispanic		4,224	219	533	
White, non-Hispanic		3,434	101	242	
Total		9,442	410	974	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		7,372	362	932	
Female		2,147	48	42	
Total		9,519	410	974	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		N<10	N<10	N<10	
6		N<10	N<10	N<10	
7		N<10	N<10	N<10	
8		N<10	N<10	N<10	
9		N<10	N<10	N<10	
10		28	N<10	N<10	
11		73	N<10	N<10	
12		194	N<10	N<10	
13		484	N<10	N<10	
14		1,006	10	N<10	
15		1,796	40	15	
16		2,483	85	50	
17		3,395	145	120	
18		N<10	129	227	
19		N<10	N<10	358	
20		N<10	N<10	202	
21		N<10	N<10	N<10	
Total		9,469	410	974	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The counts do not match because not all reported students fit into the ethnic subgroups.

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, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	15	0	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	3	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	15	10	0
Comments:				

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits		1,532	N<10	
Enrolled in a GED program		N<10	213	
Comments:				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		410	N<10	
Earned a GED		360	141	
Obtained high school diploma		16	N<10	
Were accepted into post-secondary education		52	66	
Enrolled in post-secondary education		52	66	
Comments:				

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		N<10	66	
Comments:				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education		39	N<10	
Obtained employment		39	123	
Comments:				

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, 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 tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		354	472	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		324	828	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		78	N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		33	355	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		N<10	N<10	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		25	18	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		183	443	
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		359	671	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		320	828	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		51	N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		19	159	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		37	N<10	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		47	18	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		166	638	
Comments:				

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	53	107
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	2	11
Juvenile corrections	1	160
Other	0	0
Total	56	57

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	44
Comments:	

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	51
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	2
Juvenile corrections	1
Other	0
Total	54
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	2,221		323	598	
Total Long Term Students Served	1,332		308	480	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	248		108	13	
Asian or Pacific Islander	N<10		N<10	N<10	
Black, non-Hispanic	211		N<10	142	
Hispanic	1,133		65	341	
White, non-Hispanic	623		142	99	
Total	2,221		323	598	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,344		265	556	
Female	877		58	42	
Total	2,221		323	598	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	N<10		N<10		
6	N<10		N<10		
7	N<10		N<10		
8	11		N<10		
9	11		N<10		
10	21		N<10		
11	16		N<10		
12	36		N<10		
13	67		N<10		
14	119		15	24	
15	268		79	48	
16	456		94	120	
17	536		115	288	
18	415		N<10	35	
19	187		N<10	34	
20	52		N<10	32	
21	10		N<10	17	
Total	2,221		323	598	

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

Comments:

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, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	28		N<10	
Awarded high school diploma(s)	24		N<10	
Awarded GED(s)	N<10		N<10	
Comments:				

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	654		599	N<10
Enrolled in a GED program	N<10		215	N<10
Comments:				

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	1,766		319	
Earned a GED	10		71	
Obtained high school diploma	437		24	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	85		N<10	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	79		N<10	
Comments:				

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	261		25	
Comments:				

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	191		N<10	
Obtained employment	50		N<10	
Comments:				

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, 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. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	990		609	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	687		411	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	105		N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	386		44	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	129		21	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	52		N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	15		N<10	
Comments: The totals do not match because not all facilities reported data for students with complete pretests and post tests.				

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, 2009, through June 30, 2010.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	420		635	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	516		414	

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	84		N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	375		41	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	44		24	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10		N<10	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10		N<10	
Comments: The totals do not match because not all facilities reported data for students with complete pretests and post tests.				

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students that carried a weapon on school property on one or more of the past 30 days	2009 Arizona YRBS	Every 2 years	2008/2009	2007-08:	2007-08:	5.8%	2002/2003
				2008-09: 5.0%	2008-09: 6.5		
				2009-10:	2009-10:		
				2010-11:			
				2011-12:			
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students that engaged in fights on school property during the past 12 months	2009 Arizona YRBS	Every 2 years	2008/2009	2007-08:	2007-08:	11.7%	2002/2003
				2008-09: 11.0%	2008-09: 12.0%		
				2009-10:	2009-10:		
				2010-11:			
				2011-12:			
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	2009 Arizona YRBS	Every 2 years	2008/2009	2007-08:	2007-08:	28.6%	2002/2003
				2008-09: 27.0%	2008-09: 34.6%		
				2009-10:	2009-10:		
				2010-11:			
				2011-12:			
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 0%	2007-08: 0%		

Number of persistently dangerous schools	Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.	Annual	2009/2010	2008-09:0%	2008-09:0%	0%	2002/2003
				2009-10:0%	2009-10: 0%		
				2010-11:			
				2011-12:			

Comments:

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	The violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession or use of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol. This includes being intoxicated at school, school-sponsored events and on school-sponsored transportation.
Illicit drug related	The unlawful use, cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, purchase, possession, transportation or importation of any controlled drug or narcotic substance or equipment and devices used for preparing or taking drugs or narcotics. Includes being under the influence of drugs at school, school-sponsored events and on school-sponsored transportation. Category includes over-the-counter medications if abused by the student. This category does not include tobacco or alcohol. "Drug" means any narcotic drug, dangerous drug, marijuana or peyote (A.R.S. §13-3415).
Violent incident without physical injury	See * below
Violent incident with physical injury	See ** Below
Weapons possession	The possession of any device, instrument, material, or substance, animate or inanimate, that is used for, or is readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury, except that such a term does NOT include a pocket knife with a blade of less than 2½ inches in length (18 U.S.C. Section 930(g) (2)).
<p>Comments: * The following are considered by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) as violent: Arson of structure or property, Arson of an occupied structure, Burglary or Breaking and Entering (First, Second or Third Degree), Extortion, Robbery, Armed robbery, Bullying, Threat or Intimidation, Hazing, Fighting, Assault, Aggravated assault, Fire alarm misuse, Bomb threat, Chemical or biological threat, Other school threat, Harassment(Sexual and Non-Sexual, with and without contact), Sexual Abuse or Sexual Conduct with a Minor or Child Molestation, Sexual Assault or Rape, Vandalism of school property, Vandalism of personal property, and Kidnapping, Homicide, Endangerment, and Harassment</p>	
<p>**Physical injury is defined as Serious Bodily (physical) Injury: A bodily (physical) injury that involves a substantial risk of death; extreme physical pain; protracted and obvious disfigurement; or protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ or faculty (18 U.S.C. Section 1365(3)(h)).</p>	

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	89	34
6 through 8	113	37
9 through 12	107	35
Comments: NA # Suspensions = 16 - # LEAs Reporting = 8		

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	N<10	N<10
6 through 8	N<10	N<10
9 through 12	N<10	N<10
Comments: NA # Expulsions = 0 - # LEAs Reporting = 0		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	2
6 through 8	57	8
9 through 12	N<10	3
Comments: NA # Suspensions = 0 - # LEAs Reporting = 0		

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

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

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

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	303	77
6 through 8	486	89
9 through 12	300	63
Comments: NA # Suspensions = 28 - # LEAs Reporting = 15		

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	N<10	2
6 through 8	N<10	2
9 through 12	N<10	4
Comments: NA # Expulsions = 0 - # LEAs Reporting = 0		

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	18	12
6 through 8	452	72
9 through 12	979	85
Comments: NA # Suspensions = 30 - # LEAs Reporting = 9		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	0
6 through 8	N<10	2
9 through 12	N<10	5
Comments: NA # Expulsions = 0 - # LEAs Reporting = 0		

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	54	24
6 through 8	1,332	97
9 through 12	2,778	112
Comments: NA # Suspensions = 37 - # LEAs Reporting = 13		

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	N<10	0
6 through 8	24	9
9 through 12	57	25
Comments: NA # Expulsions = 2 - # LEAs Reporting = 2		

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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	2
Comments:	

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	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	9
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	7
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	9
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Fiscal years listed below are Arizona's fiscal year 2009-2010. The following list includes the name of the LEA, the use of funds and the Results.

1. Altar Valley Elementary District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 55% to 52%. Reading increased from 57% to 62%.
2. Benson Unified School District-Received funds for 2010 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 65% to 63%. Reading increased from 71% to 82%.
3. Bisbee Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Professional Development and Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 69% to 39%. Reading increased from 67% to 68%.
4. Bonita Elementary District-Received funds for 2010 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 61% to 63%. Reading increased from 78% to 79%.
5. Camp Verde Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Title II Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math was level at 50%. Reading increased from 61% to 72%.
6. Career Development, Inc.-Received funds for 2010 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 18% to 4%. Reading increased from 30% to 35%.
7. Chinle Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Professional Development and Title I Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 42% to 25%. Reading increased from 46% to 48%.
8. Destiny School, Inc.-Received funds for 2010 for Title I Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 78% to 67%. Reading decreased from 76% to 69%.
9. Douglas Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention and Teacher Professional Development. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 58% to 46%. Reading increased from 56% to 62%.
10. E.Q.Scholars, Inc.-Received funds for 2010 for Title I Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 39% to 38%. Reading decreased from 61% to 59%.
11. Indian Oasis-Baboquivari Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention. The AIMS results are as follows: Math decreased from 28% to 15%. Reading decreased from 34% to 33%.
12. Mexicayotl Academy, Inc-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention, Teacher Professional Development and Educational Technology. The AIMS results are as follows: Math decreased from 37% to 33%. Reading increased from 33% to 51%.
13. Miami Unified District-received funds for 2010 for Title I Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 48% to 46%. Reading increased from 62% to 69%.
14. Nadaburg Unified School District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Professional Development, Educational Technology and Title I Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 53% to 45%. Reading increased from 68% to 72%.
15. Nogales Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention, Teacher Professional Development, Educational Technology and Parent Involvement Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 63% to 56%. Reading increased from 64% to 73%.
16. Quartzsite Elementary District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 54% to 32%. Reading increased from 58% to 61%.
17. San Carlos Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention and Teacher Professional Development. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 28% to 14%. Reading remained level at 26%.
18. Santa Cruz Valley Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Professional Development, Educational Technology and Title I Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 69% to 53%. Reading increased from 66% to 69%.
19. St. Johns Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 64% to 53%. Reading increased from 74% to 77%.
20. Tombstone Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 63% to 43%. Reading increased from 69% to 72%.
21. Visions Unlimited Academy, Inc.-Received funds for 2010 for Title I Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 59% to 26%. Reading decreased from 51% to 38%.
22. Willcox Unified District-Received funds for 2010 for Teacher Recruitment and Retention, Educational Technology and Title III Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 60% to 42%. Reading decreased from 61% to 60%.

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 2009-10?	No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	4
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2010 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)	190,456.50	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	250.50	183,000.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		7,707.00
Total	190,707.00	190,707.00
Comments:		

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