

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

CALIFORNIA



**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: California Department of Education		
Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Justin Lane		
Telephone: 916-319-0495		
Fax: 916-319-0971		
e-mail: jlane@cde.ca.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Deb Sigman		
_____ Signature		Thursday, June 2, 2011, 4:49:05 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	255,713	146,603	57.3
4	256,508	155,085	60.5
5	253,823	135,613	53.4
6	230,929	98,526	42.7
7	213,995	89,423	41.8
8	216,200	73,349	33.9
High School	153,119	67,731	44.2
Total	1,580,287	766,330	48.5

Comments:

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	255,743	83,839	32.8
4	256,613	132,289	51.6
5	253,779	119,632	47.1
6	230,966	100,332	43.4
7	213,936	91,012	42.5
8	217,569	91,708	42.2
High School	152,428	65,111	42.7
Total	1,581,034	683,923	43.3

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	67,065	45,172	67.4
4	67,649	46,876	69.3
5	66,438	40,751	61.3
6	69,149	37,679	54.5
7	67,818	36,206	53.4
8	67,292	31,874	47.4
High School	71,348	36,695	51.4
Total	476,759	275,253	57.7
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	67,025	31,108	46.4
4	67,628	44,182	65.3
5	66,434	40,743	61.3
6	69,173	40,485	58.5
7	67,826	40,470	59.7
8	67,956	39,750	58.5
High School	71,108	36,810	51.8
Total	477,150	273,548	57.3
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SW or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student 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>)	356,417
Limited English proficient students	1,161,043
Students who are homeless	192,591
Migratory students	92,255
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	30,371
Asian or Pacific Islander	270,295
Black, non-Hispanic	297,161
Hispanic	2,266,744
White, non-Hispanic	495,966
Total	3,417,906
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					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	101	8,225	34	544	8,904
K	12,331	288,451	1,168	639	302,589
1	15,580	291,475	1,484	768	309,307
2	16,145	282,953	1,618	736	301,452
3	17,763	281,425	1,569	745	301,502
4	18,238	279,885	1,586	720	300,429
5	16,226	275,691	1,469	743	294,129
6	17,119	251,903	1,352	853	271,227
7	17,766	235,557	1,132	1,071	255,526
8	18,296	239,955	966	1,491	260,708
9	28,300	199,678	706	2,199	230,883
10	29,211	185,771	455	2,349	217,786
11	28,665	168,218	293	2,257	199,433
12	27,764	158,519	198	2,084	188,565
Ungraded	234	32,576	N<10	62	32,881
TOTALS	263,739	3,180,282	14,039	17,261	3,475,321
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	169,238
Reading/language arts	219,686
Science	47,712
Social studies	46,031
Vocational/career	13,933
Other instructional services	13,556
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	30,648
Supporting guidance/advocacy	51,772
Other support services	2,397
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	1,361	
Paraprofessionals ¹	1,088	99.5
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	54	
Clerical support staff	179	
Administrators (non-clerical)	137	
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	15,136.30	98.0
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	58
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	2,141
2. Adults participating	2,158
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	1,898
4. Participating children	2,625
a. Birth through 2 years	893
b. Ages 3 through 5	1,233
c. Ages 6 through 8	401
c. Above age 8	98
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	1,201
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	1,216
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	922
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	972
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 th grade at the time of enrollment	583
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	82
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	283
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	832
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	944
5. Total families enrolled	2,141
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			
CASAS	37	19	51.35% of eligible adults enrolled in ABE showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5-point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students and a 3-point posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the CA performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+ hours of ABE or who achieved significant gains in less than 100 hours. Thirty-seven of the 51 ABE participants (73%) were eligible adults.
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			
CASAS	1,643	1,329	80.89% of eligible EL adults showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5- point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students and a 3- posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+hours of ESL or who achieved significant gains in less than 100 hours. 1,643 of the 1,839 ESL participants (89%) were eligible adults.
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	35	34	>97% of eligible school-age adults received a high school diploma. An additional 115 school-age adults made progress toward their goal of a diploma by earning high school course credits. Eligible Cohort: Eligible school-age adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include teen parents who attended high school classes for a minimum of 3 years and those who received a diploma in less than 3 years. Thirty-five of the 144 participants (24%) were eligible school-age adults.
GED			
Other			
Comments:			
Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<10	N<10	>97% of eligible non-school-age adults received a high school diploma. An additional 20 adults made progress toward their goal of a diploma by earning high school course credits. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the CA performance Indicator, include adults who attended high school classes for a minimum of 3 years and those who received a diploma in less than 3 years. Eight of the 29 diploma participants (28%) were eligible non-school-age adults.
GED	N<10	N<10	>97% of eligible non-school-age adults obtained English GED certificate. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include adults who attended GED preparation classes for a minimum of 2 years and adults who obtained their GED in less than 2 years. One of the 27 GED participants (3%) was an eligible non-school-age adult. Spanish GED # With Goal 1 - # Who Met Goal 1 100% of eligible non-school-age adults obtained a Spanish GED certificate.
Other	49	49	Vocational Ed. >97% of eligible non-school-age adults achieved their vocational education goal. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include adults who attended Voc.Ed preparation classes for a minimum of 2 years and adults who achieved their goal in less than two years. Forty-nine of the 58 Voc.Ed. participants (85%) were eligible non-school-age adults.
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	567	545	429	22	78.72% of age-eligible children achieved a significant learning gain of 4 standard scores on the PPVT III (mean posttest gain was 14 standard scores). *Number with pre/posttest scores includes 503 children who received 6 months of instruction from date of enrollment and 42 children who achieved 4 points gain with less than 6 months. 567 Of 637 age-eligible children (89%) were eligible for this Indicator. 22 children were Not able to be Tested (NATT) at pretest due to limited English language proficiency.
PPVT-IV					
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	567	503	347	N<10	347 (68.98) of age-eligible children achieved a standard score of 85 or higher in the spring. N<10 children were Not Able to be Tested (NATT) due to limited English language proficiency.
PPVT-IV					
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	567	519	N<10	20.2	91.53% of eligible children were tested in Spring 2009. One child was exempted. The California average of 20.2 letters is based on an analysis of 519 individual student scores- this is not a weighted average.
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	205	144	70.24% of the 205 children enrolled in kindergarten during 2009-10 were reading at or above grade level. CA Eligible Cohort: Eligible children, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, includes all children who received 100+ hours of supplemental academic support and children who are "reading at grade level" with less than 100 hours of academic support. Based on CA Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 178 K children were eligible to be included in this analysis; 144 of 178 eligible children (80.89%) were reading at or above grade level. Data Source: Students' end-of-year progress report cards. A determination of "at grade level" is based on the average rating of reading sub-skills listed on the students' report card. Grade appropriate reading skills are listed in the California Department of Education reading content standards for kindergarten.
1	116	80	68.97% of the 116 children enrolled in 1st grade during 2009-10 were reading at or above grade level. Based on CA Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 104 1st grade children were eligible to be included in this analysis; 80 of 104 eligible children (76.92%) were reading at or above grade level. See above for description of Data Source and CA Eligible Cohort.
2	80	45	56.25% of the 80 children enrolled in 2nd grade during 2009-10 were reading at or above grade level. Based on the CA Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 67 2nd grade children were eligible to be included in this analysis; 45 of 67 eligible children, (67.16%) were reading at or above grade level. Data Source: California Star Test (CST), a standards-based test in English Language Arts is administered annually to students in grades 2+. The CST is correlated to California Department of Education reading content standards for each grade level. Students who achieve scores of "Proficient" or "Advanced" are meeting the reading content standards for their grade level.
3			43.88% of the 98 children enrolled in 3rd grade during 2009-10 were reading at or above grade level.

	98	43	Based on CA Performance Indicator eligibility criteria, 59 3rd grade children were eligible to be included in this analysis; 43 of 59 eligible children (72.88%) were reading at or above grade level. See above for description of Data Source and CA Eligible Cohort.
--	----	----	---

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	1,814	1,556	86.77% of eligible adults showed improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the four Scale I subscales. Eligible Cohort: Eligible parents, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, includes all parents with pretest/posttest scores who received 8 months of parent education and those who achieved the Indicator in less than eight months. 1,814 of the 2,158 adults (84.06%) enrolled in 2009-10 were eligible for this Indicator. CA Scale I Indicator Target: Eligible parents show improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the four Scales I subscales.
PEP Scale II	1,814	1,478	81.47% of eligible adults showed improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the three Scale II subscales. CA Scale II Indicator Target: Eligible parents show improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the three Scale II subscales.
PEP Scale III			Projects are not required to administer Scale III.
PEP Scale IV			Projects are not required to administer Scale IV.
Other			
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	7,278
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	18,735
K	10,339
1	8,991
2	11,062
3	10,320
4	10,364
5	10,039
6	9,790
7	9,596
8	9,819
9	9,082
10	9,207
11	9,240
12	12,115
Ungraded	283
Out-of-school	27,019
Total	183,279
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	22
1	475
2	531
3	869
4	865
5	786
6	783
7	745
8	762
9	725
10	763
11	749
12	728
Ungraded	19
Out-of-school	115
Total	8,937
Comments: Complete data were not available. The Final count of PFS children will be uploaded during the CSPR Part I Correction Period in February-March 2011.	

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	4,577
1	5,963
2	7,738
3	7,547
4	6,701
5	5,909
6	5,109
7	4,871
8	4,319
9	4,062
10	3,919
11	3,492
12	1,889
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	66,096
Comments: Complete data were not available. The Final count of LEP children will be uploaded during the CSPR Part I Correction Period in February-March 2011.	

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	34
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	341
K	298
1	377
2	442
3	570
4	577
5	602
6	601
7	662
8	604
9	634
10	639
11	561
12	585
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	162
Total	7,696

Comments: Complete data were not available. The Final count of children with disabilities will be uploaded during the CSPR Part I Correction Period in February-March 2011.

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	3,634	2,681	963	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,962	6,022	5,370	3,381
K	2,368	3,272	2,817	1,882
1	1,465	2,663	2,562	2,301
2	1,860	3,039	3,570	2,593
3	1,827	2,989	3,073	2,431
4	1,807	3,057	3,193	2,307
5	1,799	2,918	3,030	2,292
6	1,644	2,816	3,042	2,288
7	1,610	2,684	3,016	2,286
8	1,573	2,961	3,031	2,254
9	1,606	2,600	2,758	2,118
10	1,476	2,636	2,857	2,238
11	1,334	2,625	2,999	2,282
12	1,382	3,660	4,416	2,657
Ungraded	42	90	93	58
Out-of-school	8,701	7,935	6,345	4,038
Total	38,090	54,648	53,135	37,406
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	4,678
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,202
K	6,253
1	4,995
2	6,253
3	5,804
4	5,914
5	5,752
6	5,595
7	5,359
8	5,762
9	5,085
10	5,244
11	5,359
12	7,491
Ungraded	153
Out-of-school	15,085
Total	105,984
Comments:	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	39
8	29
9	60
10	78
11	151
12	544
Ungraded	
Total	901
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	259
Comments: The increase is due to a concentrated effort by a group of Regions to work with out-of-school youth to obtain a GED or complete the state's high school exit exam.	

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	8,152	8,104
4	8,159	8,132
5	8,000	7,969
6	7,948	7,916
7	7,909	7,868
8	7,689	7,655
HS	7,358	7,065
Ungraded		
Total	55,215	54,709

Comments:

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	8,151	8,126
4	8,159	8,128
5	8,000	7,971
6	7,948	7,915
7	7,909	7,866
8	7,688	7,610
HS	7,358	7,099
Ungraded		
Total	55,213	54,715

Comments:

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	1,050
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8,969
K	6,347
1	7,133
2	6,895
3	6,796
4	6,664
5	6,406
6	6,354
7	6,067
8	5,903
9	6,450
10	6,782
11	6,363
12	6,043
Ungraded	147
Out-of-school	7,067
Total	101,436
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	22
1	396
2	425
3	671
4	672
5	606
6	606
7	554
8	555
9	566
10	593
11	583
12	568
Ungraded	15
Out-of-school	61
Total	6,893
Comments: Complete data were not available. The Final count of PFS children will be uploaded during the CSPR Part II Correction Period in April 2011.	

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)	28
K	16
1	35
2	27
3	29
4	24
5	26
6	20
7	22
8	19
9	16
10	16
11	17
12	10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	10
Total	315

Comments: The increase in the number of students that received Continuation of Services is due to the decrease in comparable services available through school district and other community sources as a result budgetary cutbacks.

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	336
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,405
K	3,689
1	4,401
2	4,287
3	4,292
4	3,871
5	3,672
6	3,601
7	3,086
8	2,822
9	2,459
10	2,685
11	2,877
12	3,007
Ungraded	39
Out-of-school	1,877
Total	52,406
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by 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	98	21	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,211	1,164	
K	1,593	907	
1	1,902	1,234	
2	1,898	1,316	
3	1,865	1,292	
4	1,781	1,188	
5	1,661	1,146	
6	1,402	1,088	
7	1,219	958	
8	1,118	806	
9	683	464	416
10	818	563	971
11	889	540	1,442
12	927	552	1,700
Ungraded	N<10	N<10	
Out-of-school	697	236	
Total	20,765	13,477	4,529
Comments:			

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "*high school credit accrual*"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a 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	998	482
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,603	3,463
K	5,352	2,647
1	6,069	2,903
2	5,821	2,804
3	5,742	2,723
4	5,633	2,690
5	5,436	2,676
6	5,429	2,873
7	5,310	3,160
8	5,223	3,354
9	6,151	4,335
10	6,582	4,782
11	6,125	4,476
12	5,765	4,540
Ungraded	147	86
Out-of-school	6,842	5,590
Total	90,228	53,584
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	104
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,505
K	1,294
1	1,529
2	1,540
3	1,476
4	1,451
5	1,417
6	1,402
7	1,302
8	1,263
9	1,279
10	1,468
11	1,182
12	1,216
Ungraded	38
Out-of-school	1,468
Total	20,934
Comments:	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation - Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	961
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,415
K	4,844
1	5,825
2	6,156
3	6,232
4	6,171
5	5,845
6	5,563
7	5,674
8	5,186
9	4,893
10	5,095
11	4,907
12	2,434
Ungraded	111
Out-of-school	4,551
Total	85,863
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	20
1	370
2	417
3	663
4	651
5	579
6	574
7	526
8	560
9	504
10	515
11	530
12	160
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	6,073
Comments: Complete data were not available. The Final count of PFS children will be uploaded during the CSPR Part II Correction Period in April 2011.	

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)	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	16

Comments: Fewer students were served under Continuation of Services due to increased emphasis on serving PFS students during Summer and Intersession.

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	461
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9,742
K	4,297
1	5,109
2	5,325
3	5,413
4	5,411
5	5,054
6	4,779
7	4,839
8	4,225
9	3,493
10	3,586
11	3,484
12	1,757
Ungraded	82
Out-of-school	2,593
Total	69,650
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by 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	83	77	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,675	2,995	
K	2,077	1,792	
1	2,601	2,153	
2	2,905	2,219	
3	2,878	2,236	
4	2,794	2,203	
5	2,618	2,147	
6	2,288	2,007	
7	2,367	2,263	
8	1,995	1,692	
9	1,477	1,149	718
10	1,259	1,053	952
11	1,322	1,021	1,063
12	671	303	782
Ungraded	18	11	
Out-of-school	795	642	
Total	31,823	25,963	3,515

Comments: The decrease in the number of students that received math instruction during the year was due to the decrease in the number of eligible migrant students.

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	708	108
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6,155	2,372
K	2,808	801
1	3,409	1,131
2	3,772	1,341
3	3,813	1,367
4	3,777	1,380
5	3,702	1,385
6	3,591	1,396
7	3,506	1,641
8	3,167	1,559
9	3,465	2,120
10	3,785	2,473
11	3,635	2,431
12	2,147	1,461
Ungraded	84	51
Out-of-school	3,728	2,896
Total	55,252	25,913
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the 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	49
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,983
K	911
1	956
2	945
3	999
4	960
5	959
6	855
7	852
8	748
9	745
10	784
11	740
12	520
Ungraded	35
Out-of-school	1,392
Total	14,433

Comments: The decrease in the number of students that received a Referral Service is due to the decrease in the number eligible migrant students and the decrease in the number of services available services through community agencies.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	1,631
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	13,919
K	7,259
1	8,092
2	8,470
3	8,456
4	8,298
5	7,918
6	7,701
7	7,779
8	7,369
9	7,380
10	7,743
11	7,469
12	7,566
Ungraded	195
Out-of-school	9,834
Total	127,079
Comments:	

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	3,912
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	118,202
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: There are no schools where MEP funds are consolidated in an SWP.	

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	530	77,374
Regular school year – school day/extended day	436	34,648
Summer/intersession only	558	60,441
Year round	1,061	103,064
Comments: Some Migrant Regional Offices and School Districts have expanded their extended day and year round intervention strategies to better serve the students.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	875	340.34	1,262	913.56
Counselors	132	85.32	88	60.31
All paraprofessionals	1,050	473.49	1,202	824.02
Recruiters	356	270.03	276	205.60
Records transfer staff	118	70.41	113	76.12
Comments: The CDE MEP is researching the differences in staffing levels at all classifications.				

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	750	365.80	876	614.80
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	0	0
Juvenile corrections	5	143
Adult corrections	8	101
Other	0	0
Total	13	126

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	0
Juvenile Corrections	5
Adult Corrections	8
Other	0
Total	13
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			1,159	816	
Long Term Students Served			599	161	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			N<10	N<10	
Asian or Pacific Islander			34	14	
Black, non-Hispanic			379	237	
Hispanic			629	458	
White, non-Hispanic			109	104	
Total			1,159	816	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,128	723	
Female			31	93	
Total			1,159	816	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14			N<10		
15			39		
16			134		
17			292		
18			313	69	
19			196	304	
20			136	443	
21			40		
Total			1,159	816	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention, or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.

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:

IMJat 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)		N<10	N<10	
Awarded high school diploma(s)		N<10	N<10	
Awarded GED(s)		N<10	N<10	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.				

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		1,042	30	
Enrolled in a GED program		582	258	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		10	N<10	
Earned a GED		82	45	
Obtained high school diploma		116	N<10	
Were accepted into post-secondary education		N<10	27	
Enrolled in post-secondary education		N<10	23	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.				

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		721	70	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.				

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		115	N<10	
Obtained employment		N<10	N<10	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.				

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		550	127	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		599	161	

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		202	37	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		84	19	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		27	16	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		57	20	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		229	69	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.				

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		589	61	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		569	109	

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		146	29	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		64	N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		36	12	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		98	18	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		225	41	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.				

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	182	
Neglected programs	177	
Juvenile detention	184	
Juvenile corrections	N<10	
Other	N<10	
Total	543	

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	48
Comments: California does not collect the Average Length of Stay.	

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. 55The 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	46
Neglected programs	22
Juvenile detention	55
Juvenile corrections	N<10
Other	N<10
Total	123
Comments: This data represents the number of CA LEAs that reported data on Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk students in accordance with the instructions. Individual facilities do not report student data.	

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	29,002	3,821	56,241		
Total Long Term Students Served	12,435	1,959	12,134		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	535	88	728		
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,164	125	1,665		
Black, non-Hispanic	3,479	1,337	13,254		
Hispanic	16,913	1,466	30,260		
White, non-Hispanic	6,343	674	9,569		
Total	28,922	3,798	56,218		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	19,589	2,126	45,678		
Female	9,413	1,695	10,563		
Total	29,002	3,821	56,241		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10	935	611	16		
11					
12					
13					
14					
15	8,379	1,415	13,612		
16					
17					
18	17,971	1,612	40,681		
19	1,717	183	1,932		
20					
21					
Total	29,002	3,821	56,241		

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

Comments: 345 students in At-Risk Programs did not report their Race/Ethnicity and 223 students are multi-racial; 101 students in Neglected Programs did not report their Race/Ethnicity and 30 students are multi-racial; and 197 students in Juvenile Detention Programs did not report their Race/Ethnicity and 568 are multi-racial.

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)	134	33	143	
Awarded high school diploma(s)	111	24	97	
Awarded GED(s)	26	N<10	73	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.				

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	19,577	1,340	38,644	
Enrolled in a GED program	390	21	2,996	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.				

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	5,346	1,066	13,680	
Earned a GED	127	N<10	1,071	
Obtained high school diploma	2,159	166	699	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	509	45	682	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	425	40	524	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.				

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	863	68	7,094	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.				

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	502	147	383	
Obtained employment	741	121	658	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.				

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	6,197	916	9,337	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	4,680	548	6,882	

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	1,492	126	1,974	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	730	53	535	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	927	137	787	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	437	88	862	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	1,078	144	2,724	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds. Also, not all programs are successful at conducting post-tests for reading and math before students exit the program.				

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	5,338	864	6,965	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	3,844	503	5,409	

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	1,373	117	1,645	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	510	35	513	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	727	154	666	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	289	73	690	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	929	124	1,895	
Comments: CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds. Also, not all programs are successful at conducting post-tests for reading and math before students exit the program.				

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that think frequent use of marijuana is extremely harmful.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: +1% 9th grade: +1% 11th grade: +1%	2007-08: 7th grade:56% 9th grade:54% 11th grade: 44.1%	7th grade:56% 9th grade:54% 11th grade: 44.1%	2007-08
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade:56% 9th grade:54% 11th grade: 44.1%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: +1% 9th grade: +1% 11th grade: +1%	2009-10: 7th grade:58.01% 9th grade:47.70% 11th grade: 42.78%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: +1% 9th grade: +1% 11th grade: +1%			

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2007-08: 7th grade: 6.6% 9th grade: 15.4% 11th grade: 23.9%		
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 6.6% 9th grade: 15.4% 11th grade: 23.9%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -2% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 5.87% 9th grade: 13.46% 11th grade: 23.36%		
				2010-11: Same			

The percentage of students that have used marijuana in the last 30 days	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	rates as 2009-10	7th grade: 4% 9th grade: 13.4% 11th grade: 23%	2001-02
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -1%		

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have been drunk or high at school.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -2%	2007-08: 7th grade: 5.7% 9th grade: 13.1% 11th grade: 24.5%	7th grade: 3.3% 9th grade: 13.5% 11th grade: 27%	2001-02
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 5.7% 9th grade: 13.1% 11th grade: 24.5%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 3.78%; 9th grade: 15.43%; 11th grade: 23.55%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have used alcohol in the last 30 days	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -2%	2007-08: 7th grade: 14.8% 9th grade: 27.3% 11th grade: 41.9%	7th grade: 10.4% 9th grade: 29.3% 11th grade: 40.7%	2001-02
				2008-09: Same as 2007-08 rates	2008-09: 7th grade: 14.8% 9th grade: 27.3% 11th grade: 41.9%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -2% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 15.3%; 9th grade: 24.28%; 11th grade: 37.67%		
				2010-11: Same as 2009-10 rates			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -2%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have ever used marijuana	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -2%	2007-08: 7th grade: 9.4% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th grade: 41.6%	7th grade: 8.5% 9th grade: 24.1% 11th grade: 44%	2001-02
				2008-09: Same as the 2007-08 rates	2008-09: 7th grade: 9.4% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th grade: 41.6%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 8.10%; 9th grade: 26.31%; 11th grade: 40.77%		
				2010-11: Same as the 2009-10 rates			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have ever used inhalants	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2007-08: 7th grade: 11.5% 9th grade: 14.1% 11th grade: 15.2%	7th grade: 6.3% 9th grade: 9.4% 11th grade: 12.6%	2001-02
				2008-09: Same as 2007-08 rates	2008-09: 7th grade: 11.5% 9th grade: 14.1% 11th grade: 15.2%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -2% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 10.21%; 9th grade: 13.80% 11th grade: 13.10%		
				2010-11: Same as 2009-10 rates			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -	2007-08: 7th grade;		

The percentage of students that have ever used smokeless tobacco	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	0.5%	4.1%	7th grade: 2.4% 9th grade: 4.8% 11th grade: 8.6%	2001-02
				11th grade: -0.5%	9th grade: 6.1% 11th grade: 10.1%		
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 4.1% 9th grade: 6.1% 11th grade: 10.1%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 2.86% 9th grade: 6.87% 11th grade: 8.63%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that think frequent use of cigarettes is extremely harmful.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2007-08: 7th grade: 64.4% 9th grade: 72% 11th grade: 77.7%	7th grade: 64.4% 9th grade: 72% 11th grade: 77.7%	2007-08
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 64.4% 9th grade: 72% 11th grade: 77.7%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 66.54%; 9th grade: 67.51% and 11th grade: 77.21%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2007-08: 7th grade: 5.6% 9th grade: 11.1% 11th grade: 17.4%		
				2008-09: Same	2008-09: 7th grade: 5.6%		

The percentage of students that have used cigarettes in the last 30 days	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	rates as 2007-08	9th grade: 11.1% 11th grade: 17.4%	7th grade: 4.3% 9th grade: 11.1% 11th grade: 18.9%	2001-02
				2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 4.13%; 9th grade: 8.58%; 11th grade: 15.02%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have used smokeless tobacco in the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: -0.1% 9th grade: -0.2% 11th grade: -0.3%	2007-08: 7th grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 5.3% 11th grade: 6.3%	7th grade: 0.8% 9th grade: 1.4% 11th grade: 2.8%	2001-02
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 5.3% 11th grade: 6.3%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 1.34%; 9th grade: 4.09% and 11th grade: 4.19%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -0.5% 11th grade: -0.5%	2007-08: 7th grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 7% 11th grade: 7.4%		
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 2.8% 9th grade: 7% 11th grade: 7.4%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -	2009-10: 7th grade: 1.64%; 9th grade: 3.12% and 11th grade: 4.43%		

The percentage of students that have used cigarettes at school in the last 30 days	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	1%		7th grade: 1.8% 9th grade: 4.3% 11th grade: 6.1%	2001-02
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have ever used cigarettes.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	13th biennial CSS: 2009-10	2007-08: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -2%	2007-08: 7th grade: 7.1% 9th grade: 20.4% 11th grade: 33.6%	7th grade: 6.9% 9th grade: 20.7% 11th grade: 35.7%	2001-02
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 7.1% 9th grade: 20.4% 11th grade: 33.6%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 5.09%; 9th grade: 16.55% and 11th grade: 29.54%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -2% 11th grade: -2%			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have ever been in a physical	California Student		13th biennial	2007-08: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2007-08: 7th grade: 32.2% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th grade: 22.8%	7th grade: 27.2% 9th grade: 23.7%	
				2008-09: Same rates as 2007-08	2008-09: 7th grade: 32.2% 9th grade: 24.6% 11th grade: 22.8%		
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1% 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 28.5%; 9th grade: 25.44% and 11th grade: 15.66%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1% 9th grade: -1%			

fight in the past 12 months.	!Survey (CSS) I	ICSS: 2009-	11th grade: -	11th grade: I	
	I	!Biennial	110	19%	12001-02

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

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	16,936	884
6 through 8	19,645	503
9 through 12	17,393	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.
 6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.
 9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

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	258	884
6 through 8	759	503
9 through 12	1,898	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.
 6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.
 9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

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	59,465	884
6 through 8	59,990	503
9 through 12	48,159	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.
 6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.
 9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

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	272	884
6 through 8	1,031	503
9 through 12	2,516	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.
 6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.
 9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	7,132	884
6 through 8	6,969	503
9 through 12	5,463	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.
 6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.
 9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

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	485	884
6 through 8	1,044	503
9 through 12	1,791	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.
 6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.
 9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		

Comments: California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in the illicit-drug related incidents in 2.7.2.6.1

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		

Comments: California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in the illicit-drug related incidents in 2.7.2.6.2

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	3,245	884
6 through 8	11,969	503
9 through 12	37,138	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.

6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.

9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in this section.

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	185	884
6 through 8	1,575	503
9 through 12	4,953	444

Comments: The above suspensions by grade are reported in a slightly different grade span in California:

K through 5 - elementary: kindergarten through grade 6; occasionally K through 8.

6 through 8 - middle school: grades 6 - 8; occasionally 7 through 8, or 7 through 9.

9 through 12 - high school: grades 9 - 12; occasionally grades 10 through 12.

California does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs. To prevent over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are included in this section.

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.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

436 districts in California involved parents in prevention planning committees; and 323 school districts involved parents as classroom volunteers in school based prevention programs.

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	280
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	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	11
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	6
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	21
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	5
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.

For the 2009-10 school year, the State Education Agency (SEA) participated in the rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program by awarding subgrants to 34 local educational agencies (LEAs) using a formula allocation driven by each district's average daily attendance. The CDE informs the recipient LEAs about the specific state criteria and annual targets to increase the academic performance and achievement of all students. California's accountability system monitors progress toward ensuring that all students are achieving the state's academic content standards and meeting those targets. The measure of such student achievement is the determination of whether Title I schools and LEAs make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as required under ESEA. Following are the four components used to make AYP determinations in California:

- 1) Meeting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) regarding student proficiency in English-language arts and mathematics
- 2) Achieving a 95 percent student participation rate on assessments in English-language arts and mathematics
- 3) Making or exceeding the specified growth target on the state's Academic Performance Index (API)
- 4) Increasing the high school graduation rate

In reviewing data of the 34 LEAs that received a FY 2009-10 RLIS grant, nine were in Program Improvement (PI) status. Three LEAs have entered Year 1 of PI, two LEAs have moved into Year 3 of PI; and four LEAs are continuing in Year 3 of PI status.

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

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).	117
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)	84	15
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	1	27
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	51	11
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		68

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)	2,350,112.00	88,684.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	335.00	883,678.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	244,201.00	597,154.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		1,025,132.00
Total	2,594,648.00	2,594,648.00

Comments:

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