

**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**

MICHIGAN



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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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: Michigan Department of Education		
Address: PO Box 30008 Lansing MI 48909		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Ryan Starkweather		
Telephone: 517-373-4872		
Fax: 517-373-4872		
e-mail: starkweatherR1@michigan.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Ryan Starkweather		
		Friday, April 5, 2013, 11:05:13 AM
Signature _____		

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	51,442	S	27
4	50,547	S	29
5	49,531	S	29
6	40,032	S	26
7	35,970	S	23
8	34,787	S	18
High School	11,551	S	12
Total	273,860	S	25
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	51,471	S	52
4	50,552	S	57
5	49,565	S	58
6	40,072	S	55
7	35,961	S	45
8	34,826	S	48
High School	11,791	S	34
Total	274,238	S	52
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	36,004	S	41
4	35,769	S	45
5	35,436	S	45
6	24,424	S	43
7	21,743	S	43
8	22,227	S	35
High School	2,921	S	18
Total	178,524	S	42
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	35,985	S	68
4	35,717	S	73
5	35,414	S	74
6	24,414	S	72
7	21,711	S	66
8	22,214	S	67
High School	2,979	S	48
Total	178,434	S	70
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I 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.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	97,997
Limited English proficient students	52,435
Students who are homeless	20,014
Migratory students	1,801
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,966
Asian	10,179
Black or African American	218,710
Hispanic or Latino	57,706
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	447
White	311,689
Two or more races	14,909
Total	618,606
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	1	1,129	0	116	1,246
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	6	11,609	4	58	11,677
K	7,594	62,490	267	19	70,370
1	10,016	58,393	354	28	68,791
2	9,636	57,082	363	24	67,105
3	8,982	55,110	334	28	64,454
4	8,640	54,020	335	47	63,042
5	7,950	53,072	293	52	61,367
6	4,837	43,695	236	81	48,849
7	3,750	39,382	219	80	43,431
8	3,763	38,249	183	102	42,297
9	1,279	23,265	122	164	24,830
10	1,119	19,308	85	149	20,661
11	778	15,372	22	90	16,262
12	1,013	16,669	31	98	17,811
Ungraded	112	267	0	205	584
TOTALS	69,476	549,112	2,848	1,341	622,777
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	37,619
Reading/language arts	58,715
Science	10,944
Social studies	10,121
Vocational/career	377
Other instructional services	3,901
Comments:	

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	721
Supporting guidance/advocacy	13,711
Other support services	18,322
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	1,949	////////////////////
Paraprofessionals ¹	1,319	98.80
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	92	////////////////////
Clerical support staff	0	////////////////////
Administrators (non-clerical)	0	////////////////////
Comments:		

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>

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	2,973.90	99.30
Comments:		

2.1.4.1 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

Parental Involvement Reservation	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 *	615	176
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	308,406	9,671,852
Sum of LEAs' FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations	119,734,682	389,194,252
Percentage of LEA's FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.30	2.50

¹ *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.

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.

Following are some examples of how LEAs used their Title I, Part A set-aside for parental involvement during the SY 2011-2012: parent involvement coordinators; parent advocates; parent workshops and activity nights; speakers for presentations at parent involvement activities; supplies and materials for parent involvement activities; teachers for parent language classes for English Language Learners; technology purchases for training and communicating with parents; printing costs and supplies for informational packets and materials for parents; and books and supplies for extended day and summer outreach programs.

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

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)**2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	5
<p>Comments: Effective July 1, 2011, five programs operated with Even Start funds. These programs had been operating Even Start for multiple 4-year grant cycles. Not all of the programs were able to sustain through the entire year. Following is the list of programs, the date upon which the program originally started, and the date that the program closed. Allegan AESA/Allegan County RDC Head Start - began 10/96; ended 6/12; Charlevoix-Emmet ISD/Department of Human Services, began 10/99; ended 5/12; Flint Public Schools/Flint Children's Museum - began 10/96; ended 6/12; Calumet-Luaurium-Keewenaw Public Schools/Keweenaw Family Resource Center - began 10/01; ended 1/12; Wayne-Metro Community Action Agency/Hamtramck Public Schools - began 10/01; ended 12/11. Thus, only three projects reported full-year data, while the remaining two projects reported data collected July 1, 2011 through January 30, 2012.</p>	

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.

Participating Groups	# Participants
1. Families participating	117
2. Adults participating	117
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	15
4. Participating children	153
a. Birth through 2 years	93
b. Ages 3 through 5	37
c. Ages 6 through 8	16
c. Above age 8	7
<p>Comments: The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 62 families enrolled. The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 62 adults enrolled. The 15 families were all enrolled in the project that ended December 2011.</p> <p>The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 71 children enrolled. The three projects that operated more than six months had 59 children in the birth through two years age category (equivalent of 83% of the children in these three projects). The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 9 children in the 3 through 5 year age category, the equivalent of 13% of the children enrolled more than six months. The three projects that operated more than six months had 3 children in the 6 through 8 age category, the equivalent of 4% of the children enrolled in programs operating more than six months. The three projects that operated more than six months had no children above age 8 enrolled.</p>	

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.

Enrolled families	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	55
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	55
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	52
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	54
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 th grade at the time of enrollment	9
Comments: The three projects that operated more than six months had 38 families that were considered newly enrolled in the 11-12 program year, representing 61% of the families in these three projects. The majority of the those (22 of 38) were in the Flint project, which targeted teen parents. One adult in each family enrolled during this service year. All of the newly enrolled families in the three projects that operated beyond six months were below poverty. All of the newly enrolled adults in the three projects that operated beyond six months had not achieved a diploma or GED. Two of the newly enrolled adults in the three projects operating more than six months had not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment, representing 5% of those newly enrolled adults in these three projects.	

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	12
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	28
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	30
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	47
5. Total families enrolled	117
Comments: The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 3 families enrolled fewer than 90 days, representing 5% of their enrollment. The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 16 families enrolled more than 90 days, but less than 180 days, representing 26% of their enrollment. The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 24 families enrolled more than 180 days, but less than 365 days, representing 39% of their enrollment. The three projects that operated more than six months had a total of 19 families enrolled more than 365 days, representing 31% of their enrollment.	

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.

Test	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	31	25	Michigan Even Start projects are asked to assess adults every 6 months in the areas in which they are receiving instruction, and report gain on each assessment. Thus the gain, or lack thereof, is over 6 months (different than Michigan's Adult Education, which reports through their data system to the NRS, with the educational functioning level (EFL) anchored upon the "lowest pre-test score and follows through to the post-test"). The displayed data represent only those who pre- and post-tested on the subscale of TABE that measures reading achievement. The three projects that operated more than six months had 19 of the 21 adults (90.5%) achieve the set goal. Thirty-eight (38) Even Start adults had pre- and post-tests on the reading measure. Of those, 27 had an EFL for the reading portion of the TABE.
CASAS	0	0	Even Start projects did not report using CASAS.
Other	0	0	Even Start projects did not report using other measures.
Comments: See Explanation above.			

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.

Test	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	0	0	TABE was not used with ESL adults.
CASAS	0	0	See Comments section.
BEST	0	0	See Comments section.
BEST Plus	0	0	BEST Plus was not used with ESL adults.
BEST Literacy	0	0	BEST Literacy was not used with ESL adults.
Other	0	0	Other measures were not used with ESL adults.
Comments: Even Start's indicator defines significance with the BEST as 10 scale points. While there were 15 ESL Adults enrolled, all of those adults were in the same project (Wayne), which closed out Even Start in December 2011. The project was required to report the number of adults who have completed 120 instructional hours OR one year of instruction during the reporting period (7/1/2011 - 1/30/2012). The other 5 ESL Adults included 2 who had not had 120 hours of instruction, and 3 who dropped out of the program prior to a post-test. Therefore, 10 of the adult ESL students were included in the count of those who completed the required amount of instruction. The project used both the CASAS and the BEST on these students. Even Start's indicator defines significance with the BEST as 10 scale points, and these results reflect that 8 of the 10 participants achieved that growth. These same 10 participants were measured with the CASAS, with 4 achieving a scale score that showed growth, and the remaining 6 decreasing in their scores.			

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	20	15	See Comments below.
GED	N<	N<	See Comments below.
Other	0	0	Other achievement measures were not used.

Comments: These data reflect that students to the age of 19 are counted as "school age," regardless of setting. Of the 3 projects that operated the entire year, 20 young adults who had sufficient credits to graduate within the year were enrolled, and 15 of them were able to reach this goal with Even Start supports. These same three projects enrolled just one adult who had sufficient credits to graduate within the year and was older than school-age, and that individual did not receive a diploma.

Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<	N<	See Comments below.
GED	N<	N<	See Comments below.
Other	N<	N<	Other achievement measures were not used.

Comments: These data reflect that students 20 years and over are counted as "non-school age," regardless of setting. The 3 projects operating the entire year enrolled 2 school-aged adults in GED learning programs, and they both achieved the GED during this year. For the older adults, of the three who worked toward a GED and actually took the GED assessments, one individual succeeded in the goal of receiving the GED.

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.

Language Development Measure	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	0	0	0	0	PPVT-III was not used.
PPVT-IV	4	N<	N<	N<	See Comments below.
TVIP	0	0	0	0	TVIP was not used.
Comments: Children must be 5 years old on or before 12/1/12 and enrolled at least 6 months and not exempt from testing to be reported. One additional 4-year-old child was enrolled for approximately 2 months.					

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.

Language Development Measures	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	0	0	0	0	PPVT-III was not used.
PPVT-IV	4	N<	N<	N<	See Comments above in
TVIP	0	0	0	0	TVIP was not used.
Comments: See Comments above in 2.2.2.4.					

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.

Letter Identification Measure	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	N<	N<	0	14.70	See Comments.

Comments: Two of the three programs still operating in the spring only served children birth to three years old. Children must be 5 years old on or before 12/1/12 and enrolled at least 6 months, not exempt from testing and available to be assessed during the spring testing window of 5/1/12 - 6/30/12. Two additional age-eligible children exited the program prior to the Spring testing window.

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	0	0	See comments below.
1	0	0	See comments below.
2	N<	N<	See comments below.
3	0	0	See comments below.

Comments: Local control state, therefore assessments used vary district-to-district. Only one of the three projects that operated the entire year included school-aged children. Their total school-age enrollment was 4, with only 2 of those children being enrolled at least six months and available for assessment at the end of the year. Of these 2 children, the DIBELS showed that only 1 was reading on grade level. Number in the five projects operating in 11-12 (21) is lower than those enrolled in 2.2.1.2 - 4c (32) due to the fact that 2.2.1.2 includes all children enrolled and disenrolled or those that enrolled less than six months prior to the end of the program over the course of the entire year, and 2.2.2.6 reports only those children who were enrolled at least six months.

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.

Measure of Parental Support	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	20	17	See comments below.
PEP Scale II	20	18	See comments below.
PEP Scale III	20	17	See comments below.
PEP Scale IV	20	18	See comments below.
Other	0	0	Other assessments were not employed.

Comments: Improvement was defined as the number of participants with greater than .30 gain from baseline to 2nd followup, with 6 month intervals between assessments. Baseline is typically done within the first 2 months of enrollment. As noted in 2.2.1.4 (4), 47 families were enrolled for more than 365 days (those that are enrolled sufficient amount of time to be reflected in this report). HOWEVER, the 365 days+ enrollment in the three projects that operated the entire year totaled 19. Discrepancy of one parent may be due to rolling assessment window and a project implementing the assessment just prior to program closure.

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	718
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,051
K	578
1	517
2	442
3	392
4	373
5	340
6	324
7	323
8	281
9	311
10	248
11	217
12	108
Ungraded	107
Out-of-school	191
Total	6,521
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	405
K	394
1	424
2	361
3	332
4	295
5	250
6	262
7	259
8	219
9	244
10	170
11	149
12	67
Ungraded	97
Out-of-school	18
Total	3,946
Comments:	

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	163
K	400
1	392
2	323
3	311
4	266
5	230
6	226
7	195
8	170
9	190
10	127
11	114
12	46
Ungraded	88
Out-of-school	8
Total	3,249
Comments:	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	19
1	26
2	26
3	24
4	20
5	20
6	23
7	18
8	21
9	22
10	15
11	7
12	10
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	4
Total	280
<p>Comments: The Michigan MEP investigated the significant (136%) increase in migrant students identified as Children with Disabilities. We discovered that a former Michigan MEP team member had implemented a change to the business rules without the approval of the Migrant State Director. This rule change added Special Health Needs to the count of Children with Disabilities. Thus, students with acute and chronic illnesses such as asthma and allergies who did not have IEPs were included in the 2011-12 N121 count. The counts for Children with Disabilities were re-run after removing this additional category. The total count for Children with Disabilities for 2011-12 is 280. The Michigan MEP has created the following action plan to address this issue: (A) Revisions to the N121 Business Rule (B) Change in Michigan MEP Staff (C) Enforcement of procedures regarding Migrant State Director Approval of all business rule changes. C121 adn CSPR II were updated in March 2013.</p>	

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.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within 12 months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within previous 13 – 24 months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within previous 25 – 36 months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within previous 37 – 48 months from the last day of the reporting period
Age birth through 2	470	225	22	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	614	311	92	34
K	323	195	37	23
1	264	161	58	34
2	221	134	46	41
3	211	119	39	23
4	199	121	28	25
5	183	101	35	21
6	151	116	38	19
7	191	92	28	12
8	156	80	32	13
9	174	101	27	9
10	109	87	40	12
11	108	76	27	6
12	32	46	20	10
Ungraded	60	44	3	
Out-of-school	97	87	5	2
Total	3,563	2,096	577	285
Comments: Michigan experienced significant shifting between the first two columns (12 months; previous 1-24 months). The overall state count has decreased slightly, less than 10% from year-to-year over the last three years (7398 in 2009-10; 6668 in 2010-11; and 6521 in 2011-12).				
The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.				

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.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	317
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	493
K	281
1	238
2	212
3	184
4	171
5	158
6	149
7	166
8	137
9	164
10	118
11	114
12	49
Ungraded	58
Out-of-school	54
Total	3,063
Comments:	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	
8	
9	7
10	42
11	5
12	9
Ungraded	
Total	63

Comments: The data used for N032 (Dropouts) that feeds CSPR 2.3.2.1 changed from 10/11 to 11/12 in that the carry forward rule for Migrant students was NOT utilized in the 10/11 data but was in the 11/12. The carry forward rule was implemented in student data so that characteristics of the student including migrant eligible were applied to EACH of the district records in which a student was enrolled and not just for the district that actually submitted the migrant component for a student. The Michigan MEP is investigating this information to ensure accuracy.

The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.

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.

Obtained a GED in your state	N<
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	227	223
4	206	205
5	171	168
6	209	202
7	153	149
8	145	142
HS	75	69
Total	1,186	1,158
Comments:		

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	214	209
4	195	193
5	155	150
6	198	188
7	144	142
8	134	130
HS	75	67
Total	1,115	1,079
Comments:		

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58
K	395
1	369
2	333
3	282
4	246
5	220
6	244
7	213
8	186
9	217
10	171
11	133
12	78
Ungraded	43
Out-of-school	1
Total	3,189
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	16
K	178
1	262
2	229
3	207
4	170
5	148
6	166
7	148
8	133
9	159
10	111
11	86
12	41
Ungraded	41
Out-of-school	
Total	2,095

Comments: In previous years, Michigan had added a subcategory to NPFS, PFS~~M~~ for migrant students who were at risk but did not have an educational interruption in the preceding 12 months. This created confusion and was removed in the 2011-12 data reporting period. Additional guidance was provided to local MEP programs regarding PFS and NPFS. Following the OME visit in Summer 2012, the Michigan MEP provided specific interpretations regarding PFS. In the winter of 2012-13, common documentation, Priority for Services: Determination Worksheet, was created and local MEP staff who make PFS determinations received training. A guidance document was paired with the worksheet to ensure staff had ample resources for applying the statewide common interpretations.

The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	2
1	4
2	6
3	5
4	3
5	2
6	4
7	3
8	4
9	4
10	3
11	1
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	43

Comments: The Michigan MEP investigated the significant (55%) decrease in migrant students identified for Continuation of Services (COS). We discovered that misinformation had been shared with the field regarding COS eligibility. A former Michigan MEP team member, without approval of the Michigan Migrant director, had actively discouraged local MEPs from identifying students as COS and providing services through the COS provision. The Michigan MEP has created the following action plan to address this issue: (A) Change in Michigan MEP Staff (B) Clarification on COS determinations at spring migrant trainings including Priority for Services Webinar on February 13, 2013; and the Recruiter and Data Entry Trainings on March 1 and June 3, 2013 (C) clarification in Spring 2013 Memo to local MEP directors.

The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	50
K	395
1	367
2	329
3	282
4	246
5	219
6	243
7	212
8	186
9	214
10	171
11	131
12	76
Ungraded	42
Out-of-school	1
Total	3,164

Comments: The increase in children receiving an instructional service is due to an increase in "MEP funded" reporting. The Michigan MEP has created several data quality reports that are available on the Migrant Education Data System for use by local Migrant Program Directors, local Data Entry Staff as well as the state office. Before data was verified, the Title I, Part C Instructional Services report was run by each program and by the state to ensure qualifying migrant students receiving MEP services were accurately reported.

The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	28	28	////////////////////
K	225	204	////////////////////
1	231	221	////////////////////
2	200	190	////////////////////
3	182	177	////////////////////
4	156	146	////////////////////
5	132	136	////////////////////
6	160	159	////////////////////
7	124	122	////////////////////
8	117	120	////////////////////
9	117	116	28
10	101	103	32
11	88	88	29
12	35	33	19
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	1,896	1,843	108

Comments: The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.

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		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	24	0
K	149	6
1	136	6
2	117	3
3	92	6
4	91	5
5	82	3
6	95	2
7	72	2
8	75	7
9	90	2
10	64	3
11	59	3
12	25	1
Ungraded	1	0
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	1,172	49

Comments: The Michigan MEP has seen a decrease in the use of migrant funds allocated in local MEP budgets for counseling during the regular school year. We believe that districts allocated more of the migrant funds toward direct instruction of students versus pupil support services such as counseling, and are likely utilizing more general funds for counseling.

The Michigan MEP The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	46
1	40
2	38
3	34
4	27
5	26
6	27
7	18
8	21
9	17
10	27
11	18
12	4
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	0
Total	345
Comments: The Michigan MEP dThe Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation ~~Summer/Intersession Term~~

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	31
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	623
K	400
1	367
2	281
3	284
4	241
5	217
6	196
7	204
8	154
9	147
10	86
11	98
12	16
Ungraded	52
Out-of-school	19
Total	3,416
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services -During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	369
K	310
1	292
2	233
3	234
4	204
5	173
6	158
7	170
8	132
9	114
10	68
11	73
12	15
Ungraded	50
Out-of-school	6
Total	2,601
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

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

Comments: The Michigan MEP investigated the significant (55%) decrease in migrant students identified for Continuation of Services (COS). We discovered that misinformation had been shared with the field regarding COS eligibility. A former Michigan MEP team member had actively discouraged local MEPs from identifying students as COS and providing services through the COS provision. The Michigan MEP has created the following action plan to address this issue: (A) Change in Michigan MEP Staff (B) Clarification on COS determinations at spring migrant trainings including Priority for Services Webinar on February 13, 2013; and the Recruiter and Data Entry Trainings on March 1 and June 3, 2013 (C) Clarification in Spring 2013 Memo to local MEP directors.

ED responded to an inquiry from Michigan regarding this collection. We received the following response: "The program office states it appears that Michigan has discovered a discrepancy in the C-124 file specifications. C-124 collects MEP Students Served - Summer/Intersession data, and it appears that this excerpt under 2.4 Guidance, page 5, is incorrect. They advise MI to review the rest of the information in the file specifications, especially Table 2.3-1 Required Categories and Totals, and confirm that the SEA reports data in 2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services - During the Summer/Intersession Term with File C-124, using Table 2.3-1 as a guide." Michigan MEP has reviewed the data and it is accurate.

The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	28
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	584
K	399
1	366
2	281
3	283
4	242
5	217
6	196
7	203
8	153
9	147
10	86
11	98
12	16
Ungraded	52
Out-of-school	19
Total	3,370
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	//////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	310	310	//////
K	323	321	//////
1	300	298	//////
2	235	234	//////
3	239	238	//////
4	192	193	//////
5	180	179	//////
6	166	166	//////
7	171	171	//////
8	130	130	//////
9	130	129	28
10	75	74	19
11	81	81	36
12	11	11	4
Ungraded	50	51	1
Out-of-school	17	16	0
Total	2,610	2,602	88
Comments:			

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 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	29	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	365	28
K	215	14
1	197	21
2	153	30
3	152	46
4	115	37
5	114	27
6	100	31
7	76	32
8	74	17
9	56	9
10	31	7
11	35	10
12	6	0
Ungraded	51	3
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	1,769	312

Comments: The Michigan MEP has seen an increase in the number of students receiving support services through counseling during the summer program. Michigan has one large consortium summer program that allocates funding for counseling services. This program provided counseling services to more migrant students this year by incorporating group counseling and group career counseling services.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	30
K	53
1	33
2	34
3	43
4	27
5	21
6	24
7	9
8	21
9	15
10	12
11	12
12	0
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	2
Total	338
Comments:	

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	31
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	651
K	540
1	499
2	429
3	379
4	331
5	303
6	305
7	302
8	254
9	273
10	208
11	185
12	89
Ungraded	94
Out-of-school	20
Total	4,893

Comments: The change in the number of migrant children receiving an instructional or support service is due to an increase in focus on "MEP funded" reporting. The Michigan MEP has hosted significant discussion on data accuracy and created several data quality reports that are available on the Migrant Education Data System for use by local Migrant Program Directors, local Data Entry Staff as well as the state office. Before data was verified for 2011-12 program year, the Title I, Part C Instructional Services report was run by each program and by the state to ensure qualifying migrant students receiving MEP services were accurately reported.

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.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	279
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,750
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: The Michigan MEP has confirmed that the blank fields are true zeros.	

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	4	437
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	2	208
Year round	24	5,958
Comments: There was an error in the 2010/11 data in the count of regular school year school day only count. 5 MEP projects were submitted in 2010/11. However, only 4 existed: Coopersville Public Schools, Kenowa Hills Public Schools, Sparta Area Schools and Watervliet School District. There were no changes in the number of MEP projects for 2011/12 and these four projects continued in 2011/12.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.40
Comments: This includes a full time Migrant Education Consultant and a .35 fte Migrant State Director who oversees multiple Special Populations programs.	

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/Intersession Term Headcount	Summer/Intersession Term FTE
Teachers	42	25	172	94
Counselors	0	0	1	0
All paraprofessionals	66	42	107	85
Recruiters	26	14	12	7
Records transfer staff	6	1	1	1
Administrators	12	7	8	4

Comments: The changes in the staffing headcounts and fte's are related to an increase in direct instructional services with teachers and paraprofessionals. More money was allocated by local MEP projects for personnel.

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.

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year Headcount	Regular School Year FTE	Summer/Intersession Term Headcount	Summer/Intersession Term FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	66	42.00	107	85.00
Comments: The changes in the staffing headcounts and fte's are related to an increase in direct instructional services with teachers and paraprofessionals. More money was allocated by local MEP projects for personnel. All paraprofessionals working with the Migrant programs are required to be highly qualified.				

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	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	3	280
Adult corrections	4	270
Other	0	0
Total	7	
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	3
Adult Corrections	4
Other	0
Total	7
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	121	247	0
Long Term Students Served	0	0	121	247	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	5	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	69	182	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	3	9	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	42	56	0
Two or more races	0	0	2	0	0
Total	0	0	121	247	0

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	92	0	0
Female	0	0	29	0	0
Total	0	0	121	0	0

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	1	0	0
15	0	0	9	0	0
16	0	0	22	0	0
17	0	0	27	15	0
18	0	0	28	53	0
19	0	0	21	88	0
20	0	0	10	76	0
21	0	0	3	15	0
Total	0	0	121	247	0

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The number of male/female for adult corrections was not submitted by the agency.

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	0	0	105	N<	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	N<	247	0

Comments:

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	0	45	N<	0
Earned a GED	0	0	10	55	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	4	N<	0
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	0	0	N<	N<	0

Comments:

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes Subpart 1

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in job training course/programs	0	0	30	75	0
Obtained employment	0	0	N<	N<	0
Comments:					

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 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.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	0	61	151	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	0	36	52	0

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	N<	12	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	14	24	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	14	N<	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	6	N<	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	N<	10	0
Comments: The number submitted for Adult Correction will be verified as this was the number reported.					

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.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	0	76	49	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	0	47	55	0

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	14	21	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	14	16	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	N<	13	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	N<	N<	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	9	N<	0
Comments: The number submitted by Adult Corrections will be verified.					

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	3	87
Neglected programs	1	365
Juvenile detention	27	43
Juvenile corrections	32	117
Other	2	208
Total	65	
Comments:		

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	3
Neglected programs	1
Juvenile detention	27
Juvenile corrections	32
Other	2
Total	65
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	471	77	5,645	7,853	268
Total Long Term Students Served	47	70	1,076	2,339	250

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	17	4	86	58	2
Asian	0	0	10	44	1
Black or African American	37	25	2,118	4,622	149
Hispanic or Latino	7	5	272	477	17
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	10	3	0
White	395	41	3,006	2,507	91
Two or more races	15	2	143	142	8
Total	471	77	5,645	7,853	268

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	326	37	3,848	5,680	192
Female	145	40	1,797	2,173	76
Total	471	77	5,645	7,853	268

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	0	0	0	1	0
6	0	0	0	3	0
7	0	0	0	6	0
8	0	0	0	10	0
9	0	0	1	13	0
10	0	0	16	23	0
11	0	2	68	61	1
12	8	6	219	175	3
13	17	11	470	364	9
14	49	8	962	746	26
15	96	15	1,395	1,360	60
16	139	16	1,698	1,879	77
17	144	13	692	1,414	71
18	12	6	122	715	20
19	3	0	1	436	1
20	1	0	0	332	0
21	2	0	1	315	0
Total	471	77	5,645	7,853	268

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	62	42	1,406	3,173	225
Enrolled in a GED program	15	N<	86	967	28
Comments:					

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	13	77	2,781	3,421	22
Earned a GED	N<	N<	43	235	10
Obtained high school diploma	N<	N<	19	96	12
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	N<	N<	38	143	33
Comments:					

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes Subpart 2

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	N<	N<	6	48	N<
Obtained employment	N<	N<	16	42	N<
Comments:					

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 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.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	26	44	589	1,372	184
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	17	26	622	1,164	156

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	6	9	99	198	18
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	4	N<	86	135	26
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	4	8	90	137	18
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<	N<	138	337	50
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<	6	209	357	44
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	26	51	634	1,577	195
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	24	8	618	1,136	184

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	5	N<	98	214	43
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	4	N<	91	130	45
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<	4	86	132	48
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	11	N<	124	370	34
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<	N<	219	290	14
Comments:					

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. Expulsions for violent incidents with/out physical injury 2. Expulsions for weapons possessions 3. Alcohol related expulsions 4. Illicit drug related expulsions 5. Parent involvement in Title IV, Part A programs 6. Early onset of drug use 7. Past 30-day use of alcohol 8. Past 30-day use of tobacco 9. Past 30-day use of marijuana 10. Students in a physical fight in the past 12 months	1. Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) 2. CEPI 3. CEPI 4. CEPI 5. Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) 6. Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) 7. YRBS 8. YRBS 9. YRBS 10. YRBS	See Comments	1. 2012 2. 2012 3. 2012 4. 2012 5. 2011 6. 2011 7. 2011 8. 2011 9. 2011 10. 2011	2009-10: See comments	2009-10: 1. 52 2. 343 3. 8 4. 334 5. See section 2.7.3 in this 2009-10 report 6. See comments Cigarette 11.1% Alcohol 18.8% Marijuana 7.9% 7. 37.0% 8. 18.8% 9. 20.7% 10. 31.6%	see comments	see commen
				2010-11: see comments	2010-11: 1. 58 2. 354 3. 13 4. 366 5. 9350 6. See comments: Cigarette 8.2% Alcohol 15.6% Marijuana 6.8% 7. 30.5% 8. 19.6% 9. 18.6% 10. 27.4%		
				2011-12: see comments	2011-12: 1. 33 2. 385 3. 14 4. 493 5. 9350 6. See comments- Cigarette: 8.2% Alcohol: 15.6% Marijuana: 6.8% 7. 30.5% 8. 19.6% 9. 18.6% 10. 27.4%		
				2012-13: see comments			
				2013-14:			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
<p>Comments: Frequency of collection: Performance Indicators -5 are collected annually and 6-10 are collected biannually. Actual Performance for 6.: Early onset of drug use is reported as three percentages which are defined as the percentage of students who smoked a whole cigarette for the first time before age 13 years, the percentage of students who had their first drink of alcohol other than a few sips before age 13 years, and the percentage of students who tried marijuana for the first time before age 13 years. Targets, Baseline and Year Baseline Established: These have always been omitted, and no information is available.</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	Unlawful purchasing, manufacturing, transporting, selling, using or possessing intoxicating alcoholic beverages.
Illicit drug related	The violation of laws prohibiting the production, distribution, and/or use of certain controlled substances and the equipment or devices utilized in their preparation and/or use. Does not include tobacco.
Violent incident without physical injury	The State has no definition at this time.
Violent incident with physical injury	The State has no definition at this time.
Weapons possession	The violation of laws, ordinances or direct policy prohibiting the manufacture, sales, purchase, transportation, possession, concealment, or use of firearms, cutting instruments, or other deadly weapons.
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The State does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion data at this time.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	13	746
6 through 8	136	725
9 through 12	181	625
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The State does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion data at this time.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<	746
6 through 8	34	725
9 through 12	110	625
Comments:		

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The State does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion data at this time.		

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	36	746
6 through 8	147	725
9 through 12	202	625
Comments:		

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The State does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion data at this time.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<	746
6 through 8	8	725
9 through 12	6	625
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		
6 through 8		
9 through 12		
Comments: The State does not differentiate between suspension and expulsion data at this time.		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<	746
6 through 8	127	725
9 through 12	363	625
Comments:		

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	24
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	60
Parental involvement activities	6
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	3
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	27
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	4
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of Michigan's rural and low-income schools used their resources during the 2011-12 school year to enhance educational technology in the rural schools and to develop the instructional capacity of local teachers. An additional thirty percent (30%) of the activities focused on program and strategies to enhance Title I, Part A, e.g., instructional strategies in core academic areas. The majority of the remaining resources were used for professional development activities.

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
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	370
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds <u>FROM</u> Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds <u>TO</u> Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	370	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	198
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	11
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	////////////////////////////////////	221

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)	15,150,348.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	7,256,860.00
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	165,874.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	////////////////////////////////////	7,727,614.00
Total	15,150,348.00	15,150,348.00
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	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	66
Asian	87
Black or African American	60
Hispanic or Latino	64
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	73
White	82
Two or more races	74
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	63
Economically disadvantaged	64

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:

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).

¹ 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).

² 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.