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

MISSISSIPPI

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 EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
___Part I, 2009-10 _X_Part II, 2009-10

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

Address:
P. O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Debbie Murphy

Telephone: 601-359-3499

Fax: 601-359-2587

e-mail: dmurphy@mde.k12.ms.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Tom Burnham

_____ Wednesday, April 27, 2011, 4:59:42 PM
Signature

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	33,404	18,978	56.8
4	33,245	18,862	56.7
5	31,063	17,419	56.1
6	24,934	12,879	51.7
7	21,128	11,610	55.0
8	20,530	11,281	54.9
High School	12,585	7,536	59.9
Total	176,889	98,565	55.7
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	33,427	15,687	46.9
4	33,271	16,761	50.4
5	31,083	15,065	48.5
6	24,944	12,044	48.3
7	21,144	9,980	47.2
8	20,555	8,352	40.6
High School	13,370	5,440	40.7
Total	177,794	83,329	46.9
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	1,218	803	65.9
4	1,278	853	66.7
5	1,045	719	68.8
6	564	353	62.6
7	593	394	66.4
8	502	313	62.4
High School	589	367	62.3
Total	5,789	3,802	65.7
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	1,220	739	60.6
4	1,281	852	66.5
5	1,045	669	64.0
6	566	344	60.8
7	593	343	57.8
8	501	260	51.9
High School	642	379	59.0
Total	5,848	3,586	61.3
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 (*IDEA*)	42,612
Limited English proficient students	4,454
Students who are homeless	7,499
Migratory students	1,092
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	634
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,136
Black, non-Hispanic	200,095
Hispanic	7,553
White, non-Hispanic	130,372
Total	340,790
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	N<10	N<10	N<10	56	
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	4,387	N<10	45	
K	30	39,572	144	23	39,769
1	52	39,030	174	24	39,280
2	75	38,649	160	32	38,916
3	73	37,950	181	37	38,241
4	30	37,573	176	26	37,805
5	N<10	35,648	130	41	
6	N<10	28,144	118	55	
7	N<10	26,195	70	55	
8	N<10	25,679	65	64	
9	47	20,777	53	98	20,975
10	229	18,201	40	85	18,555
11	85	16,168	21	57	16,331
12	54	14,629	12	23	14,718
Ungraded	N<10	7,947	N<10	35	
TOTALS				756	393,342

Comments: This data will be corrected during the time allotted for cleanup.

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	1,321
Reading/language arts	1,766
Science	N<10
Social studies	N<10
Vocational/career	N<10
Other instructional services	
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	N<10
Supporting guidance/advocacy	N<10
Other support services	
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	13	
Paraprofessionals[1]	44	
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	0	
Clerical support staff	0	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0	
Comments:		

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	1,129.00	
Comments:		

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

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	8
Comments:	

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2009. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	193
2. Adults participating	328
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	24
4. Participating children	193
a. Birth through 2 years	94
b. Ages 3 through 5	62
c. Ages 6 through 8	21
c. Above age 8	16
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	93
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	98
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	93
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	86
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	32
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	55
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	56
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	40
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	98
5. Total families enrolled	249
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	54	31	Two students passed only part of the GED exam. Many of the participating adults completed the locator and pre-test; however, many were not consistent in participating to complete a post-test.
CASAS			
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	14	10	One adult did not participate in the GED program, but made gains through home visit instruction.
CASAS			
BEST			
BEST Plus			
BEST Literacy			
Other			
Comments:			

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	32	16	Two participants dropped out of school. Two students moved from the district. Five students earned their diplomas.
GED	40	N<10	One participant left the GED program to work full-time. One parent earned her GED. GED for one student was not attainable at the time.
Other	14	N<10	The adults enrolled with a goal to advance their educational functioning level. With attendance and dedication, their goals were met.
Comments:			
Non-School-Age Adults	**# With Goal**	**# Who Met Goal**	**Explanation (if applicable)**
Diploma	N<10	N<10	Five participants are presently enrolled in college.
GED	40	N<10	Two students passed only part of the GED exam. GED for one student was not attainable at the time.
Other	28	25	
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	19	15	15	N<10	Students were exempt due to disability.
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	12	10	10	N<10	
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	12	12	0	12.0	
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	26	24	
1	14	12	STAR Reading
2	N<10	N<10	STAR Reading
3	14	14	MCT II
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	20	20	
PEP Scale II			
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other	146	119	Ninety percent of parents showed improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities. The home screening questionnaire was used to assess the parenting education. This test screens the home environment from birth to 6 years old. Parent training was used.
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	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	111
K	62
1	70
2	37
3	37
4	39
5	27
6	25
7	31
8	18
9	22
10	19
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	212
Total	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan.

The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

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)	
K	
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	
7	N<10
8	
9	
10	N<10
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: The State experienced some issues in reporting data for the CSPR during the previous year. Since then, the State has developed a federal programs data division, strengthening its capacity for the collection and reporting of data. The division is continuously working to ensure that all data reported is an accurate representation of the Migrant Education Program.	

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	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	
11	
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	

Comments: The State experienced some issues in reporting data for the CSPR during the previous year. Since then, the State has developed a federal programs data division, strengthening its capacity for the collection and reporting of data. The division is continuously working to ensure that all data reported is an accurate representation of the Migrant Education Program.

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

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.

	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
Age/Grade	**12 Months**	**Previous 13 – 24 Months**	**Previous 25 – 36 Months**	**Previous 37 – 48 Months**
Age birth through 2	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	44	27	30	10
K	14	17	15	16
1	24	18	16	12
2	N<10	N<10	13	N<10
3	11	N<10	14	N<10
4	10	11	10	N<10
5	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
6	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
7	16	N<10	N<10	N<10
8	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
9	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
11	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
12	N<10		N<10	N<10
Ungraded				N<10
Out-of-school	140	24	29	19
Total				

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

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	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	101
K	46
1	58
2	29
3	30
4	31
5	22
6	21
7	29
8	14
9	20
10	17
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	193
Total	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

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	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	
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	0
Comments:	

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	189	189
4	157	157
5	30	30
6	42	42
7	37	37
8	54	54
HS	42	42
Ungraded		
Total	551	551
Comments: This data will be corrected during the time allotted for cleanup.		

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	189	188
4	157	157
5	30	30
6	42	42
7	37	37
8	54	53
HS	67	65
Ungraded		
Total	576	572
Comments: This data will be corrected during the time allotted for cleanup.		

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12
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	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This

presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

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

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

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	
4	
5	
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	
9	
10	N<10
11	
12	
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	
Total	

Comments: The State experienced some issues in reporting data for the CSPR during the previous year. Since then, the State has developed a federal programs data division, strengthening its capacity for the collection and reporting of data. The division is continuously working to ensure that all data reported is an accurate representation of the Migrant Education Program.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)			
K			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	N<10		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
Ungraded	N<10		
Out-of-school			
Total			

Comments: The State experienced some issues in reporting data for the CSPR during the previous year. Since then, the State has developed a federal programs data division, strengthening its capacity for the collection and reporting of data. The division is continuously working to ensure that all data reported is an accurate representation of the Migrant Education Program.

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	N<10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	
K	N<10	
1	N<10	
2	N<10	
3	N<10	
4	N<10	
5		
6	N<10	
7	N<10	
8		
9	N<10	
10	N<10	
11		
12	N<10	
Ungraded	N<10	
Out-of-school	N<10	
Total		

Comments: The State experienced some issues in reporting data for the CSPR during the previous year. Since then, the State has developed a federal programs data division, strengthening its capacity for the collection and reporting of data. The division is continuously working to ensure that all data reported is an accurate representation of the Migrant Education Program.

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

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation - Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	25
1	24
2	11
3	13
4	10
5	N<10
6	12
7	16
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	90
Total	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services -During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

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

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

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	N<10
K	14
1	11
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	
10	N<10
11	
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	27
Total	83

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.

6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	N<10	
K	12	12	
1	N<10	N<10	
2	N<10	N<10	
3	N<10	N<10	
4	N<10	N<10	
5			
6	N<10	N<10	
7	N<10	N<10	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	39	37	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	N<10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	25	N<10
K	25	N<10
1	24	N<10
2	11	
3	13	
4	10	
5	N<10	N<10
6	12	N<10
7	15	N<10
8	N<10	N<10
9	N<10	
10	N<10	N<10
11	N<10	
12	N<10	N<10
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	89	13
Total		

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	19
1	14
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	
10	N<10
11	
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

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	26
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	85
K	48
1	55
2	29
3	31
4	31
5	20
6	22
7	29
8	12
9	17
10	13
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	169
Total	

Comments: The state of Mississippi experienced a more than 10% increase in Child Count I Category as a result of strengthening the ID&R process, conducting an external reinterview, increasing professional development opportunities for recruiters/ID&R staff and participating in an intrastate coordination. These efforts resulted in the following changes for the statewide ID&R process:

1. Identified the specific areas of concentrations in which migrant students are present.
2. Canvassed the counties in which there had not been previously found migrant students to determine if migrants have recently entered these areas. The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) completed this task by visiting the areas, establishing new contacts, and conducting necessary research to establish a better mapping of the service area.
3. Presented the restructured MMESC to all school districts using a recently developed powerpoint presentation. This presentation ensures that all school personnel have accurate information concerning the Migrant Education Program and the MMESC.
4. Conducted five sweeps during the pick seasons in specific areas with the recruiter of the region leading the recruitment plan. The ID&R coordinator planned, coordinated, and facilitated the sweeps. The sweeps ensured that all areas in the specific region were covered with a team of recruiters recruiting in pairs for several days, resulting in a vast amount of COEs, therefore, a growth in the number of students enrolled in the program.
5. Built relationships with more farmers in their specific areas resulting in positive relationships that lead to many more COEs.
6. Covered all schools in the region. These visits were scheduled according to the typical influx time of the migrants, and in conjunction with the school district calendar for the particular area.
7. Been provided with Professional Development training for staff at the local, state, and national levels. There was an intrastate collaboration with the State of Pennsylvania Migrant Education Team which involved a week of shadowing recruiters and an exchange of recruiters during the last sweep conducted. Strategies and tips played an instrumental part in improving the technique the recruiters use in their day to day recruitment.

Overall, improvements were made to the Identification and Recruitment techniques by enhancing recruitment, networking, servicing of children and documenting quality and control.

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	95
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	335
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:	

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	0	
Regular school year – school day/extended day	4	26
Summer/intersession only	8	90
Year round	0	
Comments: The Mississippi Migrant Education program expanded its delivery of services offered to students and families (i.e. additional summer programs, additional after-school programs) during the 2009-2010 school year.		

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: The State has one full time staff person that administers the Migrant Education Program.	

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	4	0.21	18	7.26
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	1	0.07	5	1.83
Recruiters	8	8.00	8	8.00
Records transfer staff	1	1.00	1	1.00
Comments: The Mississippi Migrant Education program expanded its delivery of services offered to students and families (i.e. additional summer programs, additional after-school programs, Parental Advisory Council meetings) which increased the number of staff persons necessary to carry out the activities.				

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	0	0.00	0	0.00
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	1	120
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	1	146
Total	3	258

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	1
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	1
Juvenile Corrections	0
Adult Corrections	1
Other	1
Total	3
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		529		791	110
Long Term Students Served		529		791	25

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		N<10		N<10	N<10
Asian or Pacific Islander		N<10		N<10	N<10
Black, non-Hispanic		413		649	54
Hispanic		N<10		N<10	N<10
White, non-Hispanic		106		139	54
Total					

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		471		791	53
Female		58		N<10	57
Total		529			110

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		N<10		N<10	N<10
6		N<10		N<10	N<10
7		N<10		N<10	N<10
8		N<10		N<10	N<10
9		N<10		N<10	N<10
10		N<10		N<10	N<10
11		N<10		N<10	N<10
12		N<10		N<10	N<10
13		N<10		N<10	N<10
14		50		N<10	14
15		201		N<10	27
16		219		N<10	21
17		53		30	37
18		N<10		86	N<10
19		N<10		151	N<10
20		N<10		246	N<10
21		N<10		268	N<10
Total					

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits		27	N<10	32
Enrolled in a GED program		95	791	12
Comments:				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		N<10	N<10	N<10
Earned a GED		37	74	15
Obtained high school diploma		N<10	N<10	N<10
Were accepted into post-secondary education		N<10	N<10	N<10
Enrolled in post-secondary education		N<10	N<10	N<10
Comments:				

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education			N<10	N<10
Obtained employment			37	N<10
Comments:				

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		503	439	10
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		529	83	15

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		254	29	N<10
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		53	10	N<10
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		14	N<10	N<10
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		22	N<10	N<10
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		186	27	N<10
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		487	439	10
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		529	83	15

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		198	21	N<10
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		46	N<10	N<10
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		87	18	N<10
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		37	N<10	N<10
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		161	30	N<10
Comments:				

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	1	90
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	7	17
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	8	18

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	3
Comments:	

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	1
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	7
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	0
Total	8
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	23		3,203		
Total Long Term Students Served	23		72		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	N<10				
Asian or Pacific Islander			10		
Black, non-Hispanic	N<10		2,314		
Hispanic	N<10		N<10		
White, non-Hispanic	12		874		
Total					

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	23		2,262		
Female			941		
Total	23		3,203		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10			13		
11			13		
12			41		
13	N<10		91		
14			279		
15	N<10		634		
16	N<10		825		
17	N<10		1,018		
18	N<10		287		
19			N<10		
20					
21					
Total					

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

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	0	4	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	0	3	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	0	5	0
Comments:				

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	N<10		21	
Enrolled in a GED program	N<10		65	
Comments:				

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	23		N<10	
Earned a GED	N<10		13	
Obtained high school diploma	N<10		N<10	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	N<10		N<10	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	N<10		N<10	
Comments:				

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

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

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

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

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.
Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	23		25	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	19		21	

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	11		N<10	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10		N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10		N<10	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10			
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10		17	
Comments:				

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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	23		21	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	17		18	

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	N<10			
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10		N<10	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<10			
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			16	
Comments: This data will be corrected during the time allotted for cleanup.				

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 number of Persistently Dangerous Schools as defined by the state.	MSIS	Daily	2009-2010	2007-08: 0 2008-09: 0 2009-10: 0 2010-11: 0 2011-12: 0	2007-08: 0 2008-09: 0 2009-10: 0		2002-2003
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 not offered, sold or given illegal drugs on school property.	Smart Track Surveys	Annually	2009-2010	2007-08: 2008-09: 2009-10: 2010-11: 2011-12:	2007-08: 81.24% 2008-09: 81.80% 2009-10: 81%		2004-2005
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 engaged in a physical fight on school property.	Smart Tracks Surveys	Annually	2009-2010	2007-08: 2008-09: 2009-10: 2010-11: 2011-12:	2007-08: 39.16% 2008-09: 42.13% 2009-10: 40%	30%	2004-2005
Comments:							

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	The solicitation to purchase, sale, use or the possession of an alcoholic beverage on a school campus.
Illicit drug related	The solicitation to purchase, use or the possession of a controlled substance or paraphernalia without a prescription. Example: Possession of any drug of abuse such as marijuana, cocaine, crack, methaphetamine, etc. Does not include non-prescription medications.
Violent incident without physical injury	Currently, the State does not have a definition.
Violent incident with physical injury	Currently, the State does not have a definition.
Weapons possession	Possession of any weapons other than a firearm. Example: Possession of knives, edged weapons, blunt weapons or any device carried with the obvious intent to be a weapon such as clubs, ax handles, screw drivers other than in a shop environment.
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	1,610	152
6 through 8	4,390	152
9 through 12	6,894	152
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	152
6 through 8	31	152
9 through 12	83	152
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	152
6 through 8	N<10	152
9 through 12	11	152
Comments:		

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	N<10	152
6 through 8	N<10	152
9 through 12	N<10	152
Comments:		

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	121	152
6 through 8	156	152
9 through 12	187	152
Comments:		

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	12	152
6 through 8	23	152
9 through 12	45	152
Comments:		

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	N<10	152
6 through 8	35	152
9 through 12	160	152
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	152
6 through 8	N<10	152
9 through 12	N<10	152
Comments:		

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	N<10	152
6 through 8	88	152
9 through 12	539	152
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	152
6 through 8	30	152
9 through 12	61	152
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	0
Comments:	

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

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

Purpose	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	9
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	32
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	54
Parental involvement activities	14
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	27
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	63
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	9
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.

The Mississippi Department of Education has adopted five (5) goals and corresponding indicators designed to increase student achievement and reduce the number of high school dropouts. The state ensures during the application process that funds are utilized in a manner that supports the intended goals of the grant program. Currently, the state has experienced a slight decrease in the graduation rate from 72% to 71.6% while experiencing an increase in its dropout rate from 16% to 16.8%. Unofficial baseline data had been established that indicate the following: 95 of the 152 local educational agencies were served by Title VI funds using a formula based on the local educational agencies average daily attendance. The 164 local educational agencies count includes 152 local educational agencies and 12 schools governed by the Mississippi State Board of Education. The 12 schools governed by our board are not considered for eligibility for the funding process. The link listed below provides academic performance data on the state assessments for the state and the 95 LEAs served by Title VI funds.

Click on the following link for AYP results for districts and schools:
http://orsap.mde.k12.ms.us/MAARS/index.jsp

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).	10
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)	10	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	3
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		6

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)	680,903.90	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	144,243.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	263,820.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		272,840.90
Total	680,903.90	680,903.90
Comments:		

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