

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2011-12**

**CALIFORNIA**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

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

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

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

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

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

## **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report          For          State Formula Grant Programs          under the          Elementary And Secondary Education Act          as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: California Department of Education		
Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Sonya Edwards		
Telephone: 916-327-2014		
Fax: 916-319-0971		
e-mail: sedwards@cde.ca.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Deb Sigman		
		_____ Wednesday, May 1, 2013, 3:55:32 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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	280,196	S	62
4	275,830	S	63
5	277,498	S	58
6	259,410	S	46
7	235,881	S	46
8	235,117	S	38
High School	176,953	S	50
Total	1,740,885	S	53

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	280,227	S	38
4	275,795	S	57
5	277,512	S	51
6	259,510	S	49
7	235,869	S	51
8	236,437	S	50
High School	176,350	S	46
Total	1,741,700	S	49

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	44,426	S	73
4	43,930	S	73
5	43,193	S	68
6	43,989	S	60
7	44,087	S	59
8	43,791	S	53
High School	44,159	S	58
Total	307,575	S	63
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	44,410	S	54
4	43,912	S	73
5	43,182	S	69
6	44,012	S	66
7	44,120	S	68
8	44,164	S	65
High School	44,122	S	57
Total	307,922	S	65
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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 SWP 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.

	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	378,007
Limited English proficient students	1,233,952
Students who are homeless	189,488
Migratory students	76,418
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	22,913
Asian	256,025
Black or African American	256,106
Hispanic or Latino	2,342,971
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	18,663
White	474,166
Two or more races	66,337
Total	3,437,181
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age 0-2					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	130		510		640
K	12,668	304,369	1,662	274	318,973
1	15,880	303,777	1,840	234	321,731
2	17,178	287,298	1,853	279	306,608
3	18,577	281,547	1,936	245	302,305
4	18,897	277,797	1,936	222	298,852
5	16,867	269,425	1,882	211	288,385
6	13,998	258,676	1,707	66	274,447
7	14,043	236,452	1,615	105	252,215
8	16,584	238,043	1,390	109	256,126
9	17,906	199,186	1,244	150	218,486
10	20,029	189,222	1,027	192	210,470
11	22,134	180,252	777	334	203,497
12	26,549	177,374	721	390	205,034
Ungraded	36	2,272	22	12	2,342
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>231,476</b>	<b>3,205,690</b>	<b>20,122</b>	<b>2,823</b>	<b>3,460,111</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

### 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	110,664
Reading/language arts	152,239
Science	13,659
Social studies	13,422
Vocational/career	5,144
Other instructional services	57,520
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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	5,495
Supporting guidance/advocacy	16,600
Other support services	43,317
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	1,169	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	746	
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	229	
Clerical support staff	15,909	
Administrators (non-clerical)	127	
<b>Comments:</b> We are attempting to resolve issues with data submitted by some of our LEAs. Until those data quality issues are resolved, we are unable to submit these data.		

FAQs on staff information

1. What is a "*paraprofessional*?" An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
  - (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
  - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
  - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
  - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
  - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
  - (6) Acting as a translator; or
  - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
2. What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
3. Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (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 been 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).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

<sup>2</sup> 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 <sup>3</sup>		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new system and limited staff resources, we will not be submitting these data until the revision window.		

### 2.1.4.1 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

	LEAs that Received an FY 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	989	370
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	407,526	26,180,359
Sum of LEAs' FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations	127,623,437	1,423,088,502
Percentage of LEA's FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.30	1.80

	LEAs that Received an FY 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
<p><sup>1</sup> *The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocation. In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.</p>		
<p><b>In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.</b></p>		
<p>The following examples are from local districts and indicate the various ways the Title I, Part A, set-aside has been used to support parental involvement during SY 2012.</p>		
<p>BCCHS holds monthly informational meetings for parent support groups, monthly Parent Chairs meeting: inclusive of PTA, ELAC, School Site Council, and outreach to families to keep parents informed and updated. Family surveys are conducted to gather feedback and determine needs in areas of: food and shelter, higher education, job skills training, parenting classes, and counseling and family support services.</p>		
<p>Parents are involved in identifying the goals and strategies for parent involvement in the school. Through parent surveys, interviews, and other data collection methods, parents assess the extent to which parent involvement goals have been met and the efficacy of the strategies. This work is largely led by the Parent Leadership Council in collaboration with school administration.</p>		
<p>The participation of parents in regular, two-way, communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning; parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school; and that parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child</p>		
<p>Parents serve on KLA's board of directors, KLA also has a parent involvement team that meets weekly in our parent center. The parent involvement team elects a president that serves as a liaison between the school and KLA's community of parents. The president also coordinates volunteers and activities conducted by the team. The parent involvement team meets bi-yearly with KLA's Education Committee to evaluate the parent involvement policy.</p>		
<p>Every year the content and effectiveness of our parent involvement policy is reviewed and CNCA distributes a fourteen-question survey to parents of Camino Nuevo students to gather feedback. The questionnaire is presented in both English and Spanish and it gathers information on parents' perceptions of three key areas of our educational program; instruction, school environment and parent support. The data is collected and reviewed by the Principal and the Parent Coordinator at each site.</p>		
<p>The parent involvement policy is reviewed twice annually by the School Advisory Council (SAC), a body comprised of administrators, teachers, parents and students. The SAC creates a School-Parent-Student Compact that outlines what the school, parents, and students agree to do in order to ensure that our school meets its mission to prepare all students for college, leadership and life. The compact is signed by the principal, a parent and a student and then shared with the full school community.</p>		
<p>Throughout the year administration meets with parents to discuss feedback on current plan. In May a meeting is held with parent leadership to collaborate on a parent survey and procedures for improving communication of the plan for the following year. The collective feedback is used to improve the plan which is communicated to parents each school year through the parent handbook provided in two languages.</p>		
<p>Parents invited to meet with school leaders and staff to review school site council responsibilities, proposed expenditures of Title I, A funds. Goals for student achievement discussed including maintaining student well-being, training for staff, fieldtrips, intervention programs and means of student assessment.</p>		

<sup>3</sup> 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, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

**2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	10
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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, 2011. 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.

	<b># Participants</b>
1. Families participating	344
2. Adults participating	344
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	335
4. Participating children	426
a. Birth through 2 years	131
b. Ages 3 through 5	246
c. Ages 6 through 8	49
c. Above age 8	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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	152
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	152
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	120
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	118
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 <sup>th</sup> grade at the time of enrollment	83
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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, 2012). 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	3
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	18
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	121
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	202
5. Total families enrolled	344
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 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	0	0	N/A
CASAS	6	4	67 percent of eligible adults enrolled in ABE showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5-point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students a 3-point posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+ hours of ABE or who achieved significant gains in less than 100 hours.
Other	0	0	N/A
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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	0	0	N/A
CASAS	288	243	84.38 percent of eligible EL adults showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5-point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students and a 3-point posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+ hours of ESL or who achieved significant gains in less than 100 hours.
BEST	0	0	
BEST Plus	0	0	
BEST Literacy	0	0	
Other	0	0	
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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	0	0	N/A
GED	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	N/A
<b>Comments:</b>			

Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	5	5	100 percent of eligible non-school-age adults received a high school diploma.  An additional 2 non-school-age adults made progress toward their goal of a diploma by earning high school course credits.  Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include adults who attended high school classes for a minimum of 3 years and those who received a diploma in less than 3 years.
GED	N<	N<	67 percent of eligible non-school-age adults obtained an English GED certificate.  Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, include adults who attended GED preparation classes for a minimum of 2 years and adults who obtained their GED in less than two years.
Other	6	5	83 percent of non-school-age adults obtained a Spanish GED certificate.
<b>Comments:</b> Other: Vocational Education # With Goal is 4, # Who Met Goal is 4. 100 percent on non-school-age adults achieved their vocational education goal			

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 within the reporting year.

### 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. "Pre- and Post-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	118	107	84	11	78.5 percent of age-eligible children with matched scores achieved a significant learning gain of 4 standard scores on the PPVT III (mean posttest gain was 12.75 standard scores).  11 students were NATT (not able to be tested at pretest due to limited English proficiency)
PPVT-IV	0	0	0	0	n/a
TVIP	0	0	0	0	n/a
<b>Comments:</b>					

#### 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	118	109	79	0	72.48 percent of age-eligible children achieved a standard score of 85 or higher in the spring.
PPVT-IV	0	0	0	0	n/a
TVIP	0	0	0	0	n/a
<b>Comments:</b>					

### 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 2011 (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	118	112	0	20.50	The California average of 20.51 letters is based on an analysis of 112 individual student scores - this is not a weighted average.
<b>Comments:</b>					

### 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.

The following terms apply:

1. "# in Cohort" includes school-aged children who have participated in Even Start for at least 6 months.

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	20	15	75 percent of the 20 kindergarten children eligible to be included in this indicator were reading at or above grade level. Data Source: Students' end-of-year progress report cards. A determination of "at grade level" is based on the average rating of reading sub-skills listed on the student's report card. Grade appropriate reading skills are listed in the California Department of Education reading content standards for kindergarten.
1	15	4	27 percent of the 15 first-grade children eligible to be included in this indicator were reading at or above grade level. Data Source: Students' end-of-year progress report cards. A determination of "at grade level" is based on the average rating of reading sub-skills listed on the student's report card. Grade appropriate reading skills are listed in the California Department of Education reading content standards for first grade.
2	10	8	80 percent of second grade children eligible to be included in this indicator were reading at or above grade level. Data Source: California Star Test (CST), a standards-based test in English Language Arts is administered annually to students in grades 2+. The CST is correlated to the California Department of Education reading content standards for each grade level. Students who achieve scores of "Proficient" or "Advanced" are meeting the reading content standards for their grade level.
3	0	0	n/a
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 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	310	283	91.29 percent of eligible adults showed improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the four Scale I subscales. Eligible Cohort: Eligible parents, as defined by the CA Performance Indicator, includes all parents with pretest/posttest scores who received eight months of parent education and those who achieved the Indicator in less than eight months.
PEP Scale II	308	272	88.31 percent of eligible adults showed improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the three Scale II subscales.
PEP Scale III	0	0	Projects are not required to administer Scale III.
PEP Scale IV	0	0	Projects are not required to administer Scale IV.
Other	0	0	n/a
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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	5,604
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14,678
K	9,157
1	7,574
2	9,152
3	8,452
4	8,103
5	8,006
6	7,840
7	7,837
8	7,016
9	7,214
10	7,103
11	6,877
12	9,339
Ungraded	637
Out-of-school	15,001
Total	139,590
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	168
1	431
2	656
3	654
4	533
5	571
6	554
7	436
8	482
9	536
10	477
11	444
12	95
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	15
Total	6,054
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP)</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	6,926
1	5,980
2	6,809
3	5,846
4	5,324
5	4,817
6	4,097
7	3,391
8	3,057
9	3,035
10	2,724
11	2,324
12	1,345
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	55,675
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)</b>
Age birth through 2	20
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	267
K	194
1	249
2	340
3	375
4	457
5	492
6	556
7	520
8	528
9	537
10	544
11	514
12	510
Ungraded	16
Out-of-school	131
Total	6,250
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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, 2011. The totals are calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Last Qualifying Move Is within 12 months from the last day of the reporting period</b>	<b>Last Qualifying Move Is within previous 13 – 24 months from the last day of the reporting period</b>	<b>Last Qualifying Move Is within previous 25 – 36 months from the last day of the reporting period</b>	<b>Last Qualifying Move Is within previous 37 – 48 months from the last day of the reporting period</b>
Age birth through 2	2,894	2,136	574	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,621	4,449	3,614	2,988
K	2,210	2,861	2,389	1,693
1	1,440	2,133	2,031	1,968
2	1,828	2,525	2,547	2,247
3	1,738	2,535	2,279	1,898
4	1,633	2,368	2,227	1,872
5	1,590	2,266	2,190	1,958
6	1,557	2,283	2,176	1,823
7	1,589	2,253	2,213	1,779
8	1,303	2,025	1,985	1,696
9	1,513	2,061	1,912	1,724
10	1,344	2,099	2,011	1,647
11	1,199	2,009	1,996	1,669
12	1,204	2,824	3,047	2,257
Ungraded	128	146	146	217
Out-of-school	5,406	4,322	2,921	2,346
Total	32,197	41,295	36,258	29,782
<b>Comments:</b>				

**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, 2011. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Move During Regular School Year</b>
Age birth through 2	3,014
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,121
K	4,318
1	3,295
2	3,853
3	3,555
4	3,349
5	3,251
6	3,108
7	3,246
8	2,754
9	2,853
10	2,775
11	2,648
12	3,697
Ungraded	257
Out-of-school	7,287
Total	60,381
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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	25
8	21
9	35
10	57
11	80
12	461
Ungraded	
Total	679
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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 2010-11 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.

<b>Obtained a GED in your state</b>	228
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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	6,757	6,697
4	6,710	6,559
5	6,806	6,775
6	6,583	6,558
7	6,212	6,084
8	5,881	5,839
HS	5,840	5,644
Total	44,789	44,156
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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	6,757	6,709
4	6,710	6,569
5	6,806	6,783
6	6,583	6,557
7	6,212	6,085
8	5,881	5,786
HS	5,840	5,665
Total	44,789	44,154
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 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	750
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,562
K	5,362
1	5,745
2	5,684
3	5,238
4	5,174
5	5,241
6	5,036
7	4,780
8	4,633
9	5,184
10	5,053
11	4,692
12	4,670
Ungraded	241
Out-of-school	4,383
Total	79,428
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5	0
K	132
1	313
2	461
3	432
4	362
5	401
6	389
7	311
8	345
9	398
10	364
11	331
12	69
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	6
Total	4,316
<b>Comments:</b> Assessment data used for the determination of Priority for Services (PFS) students became available after the initial submission date had passed. The new, final numbers reflect the reduction in PFS students in correlation to the overall decrease in eligible children in California.	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Continuation of Services</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	2
11	2
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	8

**Comments:** The large variance is due primarily to the small number of students served. The variance in this file does not reflect a significant change in service delivery. There was a difference of two students, from 6 to 8 for a 33% variance.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	148
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4,589
K	3,050
1	3,578
2	3,472
3	3,217
4	3,218
5	3,196
6	2,970
7	2,582
8	2,366
9	2,091
10	2,244
11	2,188
12	2,317
Ungraded	103
Out-of-school	1,456
Total	42,785
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Reading Instruction</b>	<b>Mathematics Instruction</b>	<b>High School Credit Accrual</b>
Age birth through 2	51	10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,815	1,431	
K	1,358	798	
1	1,745	995	
2	1,773	1,056	
3	1,568	976	
4	1,551	949	
5	1,511	959	
6	1,343	877	
7	1,120	750	
8	921	654	
9	930	609	
10	1,008	600	
11	940	534	
12	935	558	
Ungraded	42	24	
Out-of-school	419	555	
Total	19,030	12,335	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	723	304
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6,491	2,328
K	4,699	2,399
1	5,035	2,470
2	4,962	2,514
3	4,624	2,288
4	4,579	2,313
5	4,613	2,373
6	4,571	2,516
7	4,297	2,822
8	4,255	2,988
9	5,063	3,803
10	4,992	3,862
11	4,619	3,683
12	4,591	3,809
Ungraded	233	130
Out-of-school	4,312	3,568
Total	72,659	44,170
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	78
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	895
K	942
1	1,158
2	1,246
3	1,127
4	1,107
5	1,123
6	1,162
7	1,257
8	1,252
9	1,271
10	1,295
11	1,120
12	1,254
Ungraded	33
Out-of-school	1,127
Total	17,447
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age Birth through 2	463
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8,264
K	4,166
1	4,712
2	5,034
3	4,825
4	4,578
5	4,509
6	4,509
7	4,102
8	3,578
9	3,551
10	3,662
11	3,392
12	1,659
Ungraded	96
Out-of-school	2,635
Total	63,735
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5	0
K	104
1	319
2	458
3	431
4	373
5	378
6	365
7	275
8	298
9	344
10	308
11	277
12	25
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	7
Total	3,963
<b>Comments:</b> Assessment data used for the determination of Priority for Services (PFS) students became available after the initial submission date had passed. The new, final numbers reflect the reduction in PFS students in correlation to the overall decrease in eligible children in California.	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Continuation of Services</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	15
1	18
2	26
3	15
4	19
5	21
6	19
7	13
8	10
9	13
10	19
11	4
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	204

**Comments:** Only one region contributed to the high variance. Data CDE gathered from this region indicates the increase in COS was due to an increase in services at the secondary level. MEP is working to verify the accuracy of the data reported by this one region.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	201
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,601
K	3,931
1	4,393
2	4,664
3	4,446
4	4,215
5	4,195
6	4,133
7	3,649
8	3,066
9	2,826
10	2,764
11	2,547
12	1,010
Ungraded	92
Out-of-school	1,383
Total	55,116
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Reading Instruction</b>	<b>Mathematics Instruction</b>	<b>High School Credit Accrual</b>
Age birth through 2	70	66	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,302	3,487	
K	2,289	2,365	
1	2,770	2,618	
2	3,044	2,668	
3	2,833	2,392	
4	2,655	2,243	
5	2,560	2,213	
6	2,283	2,276	
7	2,065	2,024	
8	1,688	1,435	
9	1,412	1,241	
10	1,327	1,122	
11	1,270	986	
12	433	284	
Ungraded	36	39	
Out-of-school	493	417	
Total	30,530	27,876	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	368	71
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,164	1,230
K	2,709	643
1	2,951	722
2	3,197	851
3	3,118	874
4	3,006	925
5	2,932	888
6	3,027	1,129
7	2,690	1,104
8	2,346	1,110
9	2,436	1,350
10	2,612	1,396
11	2,447	1,382
12	1,544	956
Ungraded	52	9
Out-of-school	2,320	1,770
Total	42,919	16,410

**Comments:** CDE gathered data from those regions with the highest variance. The reason for the high variance was due to the following reasons: errors in the mapping to the Federal Code, Regions not reporting counseling services provided by Classified Personnel, and a decrease in counseling services given to students.

#### 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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	927
K	158
1	221
2	234
3	238
4	230
5	248
6	256
7	231
8	209
9	219
10	301
11	281
12	166
Ungraded	11
Out-of-school	615
Total	4,551

**Comments:** CDE gathered data from those regions with the highest variance. Reduction of referral services was due to regions providing less services during the summer. One region with the largest variance indicated that last summer the migrant camps were mostly empty and therefore less referrals were made.

**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.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Program Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	999
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,092
K	6,822
1	7,158
2	6,955
3	6,457
4	6,323
5	6,399
6	6,105
7	5,669
8	5,376
9	5,903
10	5,709
11	5,225
12	4,793
Ungraded	287
Out-of-school	5,633
Total	96,905
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.3.4 School Data

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

#### 2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	3,788
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	93,985
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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	
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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	502	46,916
Regular school year – school day/extended day	541	75,582
Summer/intersession only	717	77,372
Year round	514	41,948
<b>Comments:</b> There was an increase of children served during the regular school year and extended day as a result of the new District Service Agreement and Regional Application to serve the greatest number of children.		

#### 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.

<b>State Director FTE</b>	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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 Headcount	Regular School Year FTE	Summer/Interession Term Headcount	Summer/Interession on Term FTE
Teachers	1,220	177	1,819	1,108
Counselors	237	106	155	48
All paraprofessionals	1,194	513	1,545	1,112
Recruiters	428	203	343	179
Records transfer staff	171	55	153	63
Administrators	252	111	178	92
<b>Comments:</b> CDE gathered data from those regions that contributed to the variances above the 25% threshold. It was discovered that several regions reported data incorrectly, one region misunderstood the FTE calculation for 2011-2012 and one region erroneously reported counselors as teachers.				

**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.
- g. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

### 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 Headcount	Regular School Year FTE	Summer/Intersession Term Headcount	Summer/Intersession Term FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	747	384.74	953	751.02
<b>Comments:</b> The increase of Qualified Paraprofessional FTEs during the Regular School Year is due to an increase in number of migrant children being served during this period. Students are being served before school, after school and on Saturdays.				

#### 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, 2011 through June 30, 2012.
- 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.
  - **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. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	5	244
Adult corrections	7	123
Other		
Total	12	
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.		

**FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:**

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

**2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1**

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	
Juvenile Detention	
Juvenile Corrections	5
Adult Corrections	7
Other	
Total	12
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.	

**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.

<b># of Students Served</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Total Unduplicated Students Served			1,060	754	
Long Term Students Served			781	377	

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
American Indian or Alaskan Native			6	5	
Asian			32	8	
Black or African American			313	249	
Hispanic or Latino			627	436	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			6	3	
White			76	53	
Two or more races					
Total			1,060	754	

<b>Sex</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Male			1,027	683	
Female			33	71	
Total			1,060	754	

<b>Age</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15			16		
16			80		
17			195		
18			350	61	
19			219	245	
20			151	448	
21			49		
Total			1,060	754	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

**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 Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits			1,060	32	
Enrolled in a GED program			192	272	

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school			N<		
Earned a GED			56	35	
Obtained high school diploma			137	7	
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education			41	14	

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

**2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes –Subpart 1**

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

**2.4.1.5.2 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.

<b># of Students Who</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention Facilities</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections Facilities</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Enrolled in job training course/programs			102	N<	
Obtained employment			13	22	
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.					

**2.4.1.6 Academic Performance –Subpart 1**

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

**2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1**

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, 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. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			699	98	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			452	242	

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			103	85	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			81	18	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			N<	14	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			N<	30	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			207	95	
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.					

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

**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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			673	33	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			433	154	

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			75	43	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			84	15	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			N<	9	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			N<	20	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			210	67	
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Neglected Programs or Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds.					

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

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

**2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students.

Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. 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	135	
Neglected programs	197	
Juvenile detention	134	
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total	466	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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	41
Neglected programs	19
Juvenile detention	55
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	115
<b>Comments:</b> The data in this field represents the number of LEA's who reported. Next year the data in this field will align with the current instructions.	

**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.

<b># of Students Served</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Total Unduplicated Students Served	25,654	6,052	46,067		
Total Long Term Students Served	9,016	3,079	13,837		

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	498	76	548		
Asian	740	154	961		
Black or African American	3,483	1,900	10,109		
Hispanic or Latino	15,149	2,753	26,278		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	230	46	301		
White	4,952	993	7,080		
Two or more races	602	130	790		
Total	25,654	6,052	46,067		

<b>Sex</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Male	17,188	3,518	35,353		
Female	8,466	2,534	10,714		
Total	25,654	6,052	46,067		

<b>Age</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10	663	878	80		
11					
12					
13					
14					
15	6,519	1,434	9,564		
16					
17					
18	16,318	3,578	33,323		
19	2,154	162	3,100		
20					
21					
Total	25,654	6,052	46,067		

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, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

**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 Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	19,805	2,267	23,958		
Enrolled in a GED program	846	265	1,495		
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.					

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	8,745	2,421	14,619		
Earned a GED	77	31	741		
Obtained high school diploma	1,607	308	786		
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	626	172	354		
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.					

**2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes –Subpart 2**

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

**2.4.2.5.2 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.

<b># of Students Who</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	1,626	274	3,139		
Obtained employment	510	66	354		
<b>Comments:</b> CA does not serve students in Other Programs with Title I, Part D Subpart 2 funds.					

**2.4.2.6 Academic Performance –Subpart 2**

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

**2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2**

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, 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. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	3,227	458	7,124		
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	3,402	552	8,353		

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	1,030	124	2,029		
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	589	70	593		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	438	84	795		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	436	80	1,001		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	796	194	2,802		

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

Regarding the discrepancy between these two tables: In 2011-12, the Title I Part D data were collected in a new data system. The system had a data validation check that ensured the LEA provide counts for each of the grade level change categories that, when summed, would be less than or equal to the long-term students. For 2012-13, we will revise the validation check to ensure that LEAs are forced to provide counts for the categories of grade level changes that will equal the total long term students.

**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, 2011, through June 30, 2012.

**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.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	3,365	479	6,650		
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	3,376	547	7,106		

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	995	118	1,746		
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	591	53	590		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	412	64	768		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	323	97	963		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	1,008	214	2,518		

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

Regarding the discrepancy between these two tables: California was in the first year of developing and testing a new data collection platform for the CSPR. During this year it has been noted that some tables need to be reconfigured in order to accurately collect the required data. Repairs to this table are being made. The data for next year for this table will accurately indicate that the number of long term students who demonstrated results in all three programs will be equal to the number with complete pre- and post-tests for each service location.

**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 (TITLE IV, PART A).

### 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
1. The percentage of students that think frequent use of marijuana is extremely harmful.	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: +1%; 9th grade: +1%; 11th grade: +1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 58%; 9th grade: 47.7%; 11th grade: 42.8%	7th grade: 51%; 9th grade: 49%; 11th grade: 42%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade: 58.0%; 9th grade: 47.7%; 11th grade: 42.8%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: +1%; 9th grade: +1%; 11th grade: +1%	2011-12: 7th grade: 51%; 9th grade: 49%; 11th grade: 42%		
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: +1%; 9th grade: +1%; 11th grade: +1%			
<p><b>Comments:</b> A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).</p>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2009-10: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 66.5%; 9th grade: 67.5%; 11th grade: 77.2%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade: 66.5%; 9th grade: 67.5%; 11th grade: 77.2%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%;	2011-12: 7th grade: 62%; 9th grade: 71%; 11th		

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
2. The percentage of students that think frequent use of cigarettes is extremely harmful.	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	11th grade: -1%	grade: 77%	7th grade: 62%; 9th grade: 71%; 11th grade: 77%	2011-12
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%			

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
3. The percentage of students that have used marijuana in the last 30 days	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: -2%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 5.9%; 9th grade: 13.6%; 11th grade: 24.2%	7th grade: 5%; 9th grade: 14%; 11th grade: 21%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10			
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -1%			
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%			

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
4. The percentage of students that have used alcohol in the last 30 days	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: -2%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 15.3%; 9th grade:23.5%; 11th grade: 37.3%	7th grade:10%; 9th grade:20%; 11th grade:30%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same as 2009-10 rates	2010-11: 7th grade:15.3%; 9th grade: 23.5%; 11th grade: 37.3%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -2%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%	2011-12: 7th grade:10%; 9th grade:20%; 11th grade: 30%		
				2012-13: Same as 2011-12 rates			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -2%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%			

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade:4.1%; 9th grade:8.2%; 11th grade: 15.4%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade:4.1%; 9th grade: 8.2%; 11th grade: 15.4%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade:3%; 9th grade:7%; 11th grade: 10%		
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
5. The percentage of students that have used cigarettes in the last 30 days	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%		7th grade:3%; 9th grade:7%; 11th grade:10%	2011-12
<b>Comments:</b> A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
6. The percentage of students that have used smokeless cigarettes in the last 30 days	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade:1.3%; 9th grade:3.9%; 11th grade: 3.9%	7th grade:2%; 9th grade:3%; 11th grade:4%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade:1.3%; 9th grade:3.9%; 11th grade: 3.9%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade:2%; 9th grade:3%; 11th grade: 4%		
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: 1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%			
<b>Comments:</b> A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
7. The percentage of students that have ever used marijuana	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade:8.1%; 9th grade: 26.5%; 11th grade: 40.6%	7th grade:9%; 9th grade:26%; 11th grade: 41%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same as the 2009-10 rates	2010-11: 7th grade:8.1%; 9th grade: 26.5%; 11th grade: 40.6%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade:9%; 9th grade:26%; 11th grade: 41%		
				2012-13: Same as the 2011-12 rates			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%			

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
8. The percentage				2009-10: 7th grade: -2%; 9th grade: -2%; 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 10.2%; 9th grade: 13.5%; 11th grade: 12.4%	7th grade:10%;	
				2010-11: Same as 2009-10 rates	2010-11: 7th grade: 10.2%; 9th grade: 13.5%; 11th grade: 12.4%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade:10%; 9th grade: 12%; 11th grade: 12%		
				2012-13: Same as 2011-12 rates			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
of students that have ever used inhalants	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%		9th grade: 12%; 11th grade: 12%	2011-12

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
9. The percentage of students that have ever used smokeless tobacco	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 2.9%; 9th grade: 6.9%; 11th grade: 8.2%	7th grade:4%; 9th grade:6%; 11th grade:9%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade: 2.9%; 9th grade: 6.9%; 11th grade: 8.2%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade:4%; 9th grade: 6%; 11th grade: 9%		
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%			

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
10. The percentage of students that have ever use cigarettes	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: -0.5%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -2%	2009-10: 7th grade: 5.1%; 9th grade: 16.1%; and 11th grade: 29.2%	7th grade:5%; 9th grade: 16%; and 11th grade: 24%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade: 5.1%; 9th grade: 16.1%; and 11th grade: 29.2%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -2; 11th grade: -2%	2011-12: 7th grade:5%; 9th grade: 16%; and 11th grade: 24%		
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -2; 11th grade: -2%			

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2009-10: 7th grade: 1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade:3.8%; 9th grade:15.6%; 11th grade: 23.8%		
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade:3.8%; 9th grade:15.6%; 11th grade: 23.8%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: 1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade:5%; 9th grade:14%; 11th grade: 22%		

11. The percentage of students that have been drunk or high at school.	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2012-13: Sa rates as 2011-12	7th grade:5%; 9th grade:14%; 11th grade: 22%	2011-12
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade:-1%		

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
12. The percentage of students that have used cigarettes at school in the last 30 days	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: 0.5%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade:1.6%; 9th grade:3.2%; 11th grade: 4.3%	7th grade:2%; 9th grade:3%; 11th grade:3%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade:1.6%; 9th grade:3.2%; 11th grade: 4.3%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -0.5%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade:2%; 9th grade:3%; 11th grade: 3%		
				2012-13: Sa rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%			

**Comments:** A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
13. The percentage of students that have ever been in a physical fight in the past 12 months.	California Healthy Kids Survey statewide administration	Biennial	2011-12	2009-10: 7th grade: 1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2009-10: 7th grade: 28.5%; 9th grade: 23.3%; and 11th grade: 15.4%	7th grade: 22%; 9th grade: 17%; 11th grade: 12%	2011-12
				2010-11: Same rates as 2009-10	2010-11: 7th grade: 28.5%; 9th grade: 23.3%; and 11th grade: 15.4%		
				2011-12: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%	2011-12: 7th grade: 22%; 9th grade: 17%; 11th grade: 12%		
				2012-13: Same rates as 2011-12			
				2013-14: 7th grade: -1%; 9th grade: -1%; 11th grade: -1%			
<p><b>Comments:</b> A new baseline was established in 2011-12 and prior data are not comparable to the 2011-12 data. Beginning in 2011-12, a new survey instrument was used to collect the statewide students' alcohol and drug use, and school safety data in a two-year period. Instead of a separate biennial California Student Survey (CSS), California now incorporates the CSS as a module into the California Healthy Kids Survey. A random statewide sample was drawn in which half the sample schools administered the CSS module in 2011-12 and the remaining half will administer the CSS module in 2012-13. A representative statewide report will be generated based on combining two years data. Since the 2011-12 survey data only covers our first year of the biennial administration, it is NOT representative of the entire state. The 2011-12 statewide CHKS administration includes data from 266 districts (7th grade), 166 districts (9th grade), and 157 districts (11th grade).</p>							

## 2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

### 2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	<p>California does not differentiate between suspensions and expulsions related to alcohol and illicit drugs.</p> <p>The following two Education Code (EC) sections include incidents caused by alcohol or illicit drugs: EC48900c (unlawfully possessed, used, sold, or otherwise furnished, or been under the influence of any controlled substance, alcoholic, or intoxicants); and 48900d (unlawfully offered, arranged, or negotiated to sell any controlled substance, alcohol, or intoxicants). To avoid over-reporting, alcohol related incidents are reported in 2.7.2.6.</p>
Illicit drug related	<p>California's student suspension and expulsion laws authorize alcohol disciplinary actions in Education Code (EC) sections that include both alcohol and illicit drugs. These include EC sections 48900c (unlawfully possessed, used, sold, or otherwise furnished, or been under the influence of any controlled substance, alcoholic, or intoxicants); and 48900d (unlawfully offered, arranged, or negotiated to sell any controlled substance, alcohol, or intoxicants). Also included are EC sections 48900j (possession or sale of drug paraphernalia); 48900p (offer to sell prescription drug Soma); 48915a3 (unlawful possession of any controlled substance); 48915c3 (unlawful selling of controlled substance).</p>
Violent incident without physical injury	<p>Included are EC sections 48900a1 (caused, attempted or threatened physical injury); 48900j (obscene acts, profanity and vulgarity); 48900o (intimidation to a witness); 48900.2 (sexual harassment); 48900r (bullying); 48900t (aided or abetted physical injury); 48900.4 (harassment or intimidation against school district personnel or students); 48900.7 (terroristic threats);</p>
Violent incident with physical injury	<p>Included are EC sections 48900a2 (used force or violence); 48915a1 (caused physical injury); 48915a5 (assault or battery on a school employee); 48900c4 (sexual battery or assault); 48900.3 (hate violence); and 48900q (hazing)</p>
Weapons possession	<p>A weapon is a firearm, knife, explosive or other dangerous object. Included are student suspensions and expulsions due to violations of EC sections 48900b (possessed, sold, or otherwise furnished any weapons defined above); 48915a2 (possession of any knife or other dangerous object); 48915c1 (possessing, selling or furnishing a firearm); 48915c2 (brandishing a knife); and 48915c5 (possession of an explosive).</p>
<p><b>Comments:</b> This is a new baseline since different California Education Codes are used to match the federal offense categories. Current year data not comparable to prior year submissions.</p>	

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

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

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

**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.

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

### 2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

### 2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

## 2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

### 2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
<b>Comments:</b> Due to a new source system and limited staff resources, these data will be submitted in the revision window.		

**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
No Responses	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 Responses	Other Specify 1
No Responses	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.

**2.9.2 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	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	16
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	20
Parental involvement activities	9
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	30
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	9
<b>Comments:</b> Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A) is not applicable. 2.9.2 data extracted from Consolidated Application Reporting System (CARS) - 2/7/13.	

### 2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2011-12 school year, the State Education Agency (SEA) participated in the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) program (a subgrant of the Title VI, Part B "Rural Education Achievement Program" or "REAP") by awarding these RLIS subgrants to 48 local educational agencies (LEAs) using a formula allocation driven by each district's average daily attendance (ADA). The California Department of Education (CDE) informs the recipient LEAs about the specific state criteria and annual targets in order to increase the academic performance and achievement of all students.

California's accountability system monitors progress toward ensuring that all students are achieving the state's academic content standards and meeting those targets. The measure of such student achievement is the determination of whether Title I schools and LEAs make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as required under ESEA.

The following are the four components used to make AYP determinations in California:

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

In reviewing data of the forty-eight LEAs that received a FY 2011-12 RLIS grant, twenty-nine were in Program Improvement (PI) status. Of those twenty-nine, ten LEAs were in Year 1 of PI, four LEAs were in Year 2 of PI and fifteen LEAs were in Year 3 of PI.

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

## 2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

### 2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2011-12?	_____No
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	61
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### 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 <u>FROM</u> Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds <u>TO</u> Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	57	3
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	5	17
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		44

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2012 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred <u>FROM</u> Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred <u>TO</u> Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	752,304.00	632,804.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	650,404.00	226,156.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		543,748.00
Total	1,402,708.00	1,402,708.00

**Comments:**

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

## 2.11 Graduation Rates

This section collects graduation rates.

### 2.11.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2011-12). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	72
Asian	91
Black or African American	66
Hispanic or Latino	73
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	77
White	86
Two or more races	74
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	62
Economically disadvantaged	73

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate? For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** We will not be submitting these until the revision window opens.

## 2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States granted ESEA Flexibility should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to ED Facts.

### 2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

#### 2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

**Instructions for States that identified reward schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 :** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to reward (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the school was identified as a high progress or high performing reward school
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(g).

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

### 2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

**Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 :** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

### 2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

**Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 :** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific designation (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

## 2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

### 2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

**Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13:** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement v Year 1, School Improvement v Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

### **2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States**

#### **2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses**

**Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13:** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific status for SY 2012-13 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

## 2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

### 2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

**Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13:** Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.