

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 2012-13**

ARIZONA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**

**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) 2012-13 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 200~~06~~6, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 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, 2012-13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2012-13		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Arizona Department of Education		
Address: 1535 West Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85007		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Richard Valdivia		
Telephone: (602) 542-3270		
Fax: (602) 542-3050		
e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Richard Valdivia		
		Tuesday, May 6, 2014, 6:11:05 PM
_____ Signature		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2012-13



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 17, 2012
5PM EST**

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	47,428	S	60.1
4	47,200	S	57.0
5	46,541	S	54.7
6	45,417	S	55.1
7	43,363	S	56.5
8	42,775	S	48.9
High School	29,428	S	50.9
Total	302,152	S	55.0

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	47,430	S	67.7
4	47,194	S	69.8
5	46,546	S	71.9
6	45,439	S	73.5
7	43,371	S	79.8
8	42,781	S	64.8
High School	29,781	S	76.8
Total	302,542	S	71.8

Comments:

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	11,471	S	73.6
4	11,108	S	67.9
5	10,931	S	67.2
6	10,256	S	63.0
7	8,134	S	62.9
8	7,818	S	56.4
High School	7,057	S	56.5
Total	66,775	S	64.8
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	11,476	S	80.5
4	11,114	S	80.2
5	10,941	S	82.6
6	10,262	S	80.6
7	8,139	S	84.9
8	7,820	S	71.2
High School	7,098	S	81.4
Total	66,850	S	80.4
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>)	36,562
Limited English proficient students	30,413
Students who are homeless	13,019
Migratory students	793
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	14,544
Asian	4,698
Black or African American	19,104
Hispanic or Latino	176,954
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	837
White	55,408
Two or more races	4,602
Total	276,147
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	0	45	0	0	45
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	0	1,962	0	3	1,965
K	1,306	22,822	125	52	24,305
1	1,826	23,051	132	76	25,085
2	1,771	22,708	121	62	24,662
3	1,793	22,238	140	70	24,241
4	1,505	21,690	134	63	23,392
5	1,482	21,286	125	77	22,970
6	1,827	20,199	98	58	22,182
7	1,995	18,975	83	110	21,163
8	1,990	18,382	56	125	20,553
9	2,028	15,298	14	217	17,557
10	1,748	15,741	24	234	17,747
11	1,524	14,432	32	313	16,301
12	1,502	14,937	24	286	16,749
Ungraded	11	55			66
TOTALS	22,308	253,821	1,108	1,746	278,983

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	15,591
Reading/language arts	19,536
Science	6,019
Social studies	5,825
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	75
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	
Supporting guidance/advocacy	
Other support services	
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	259	
Paraprofessionals ¹	211	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	31	
Clerical support staff	18	
Administrators (non-clerical)	31	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

- a. 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:
 - (a) 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;
 - (b) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (c) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (d) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (e) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (f) Acting as a translator; or
 - (g) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. 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.
- c. 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	852.80	100.00
Comments:		

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2012 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012–2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012–2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs *	382	101
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	327,571	11,529,604
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	42,763,225	267,120,859
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.80	4.30

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2012 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 2012–2013.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs in Arizona used Parental Involvement monies for parent involvement rooms at schools, for parent involvement liaisons, for parent universities, for teaching English to non-English speaking parents, for providing translators at parent involvement meetings for second language speaking parents, and for educating parents on the Arizona college ready and career standards, etc.

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 performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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 performance period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the performance period would only be performance in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2011 v August 31, 2012), youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: There are no concerns on the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only

once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	724
K	469
1	523
2	553
3	584
4	554
5	571
6	544
7	596
8	447
9	594
10	661
11	648
12	985
Ungraded	286
Out-of-school	84
Total	8,823
Comments: N/A	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: N/A

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children from age birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	317
Comments: N/A	

2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs.
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	62
K	84
1	106
2	104
3	122
4	106
5	90
6	92
7	77
8	62
9	43
10	66
11	94
12	87
Ungraded	5
Out-of-school	4
Total	1,204
Comments:	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: LEAs who hold Migrant Education Programs reported more Title I funded summer school projects, which accounts for the decrease in Migrant student participation during Summer/Intersession term.

2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- Children who received locally referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0
Comments: N/A	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following questions request information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	<input type="checkbox"/> No
MIS 2000	<input type="checkbox"/> No
COEStar	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
MAPS	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<input type="checkbox"/> No
N/A	

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

2.3.1.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Data Collection and Management Procedures	(Yes/No)
Does the State collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children are accounted for in the performance period . In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- Children who were age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods
- Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category
- Children two years of age that turned three years old during the performance period.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since COEStar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEStar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source. The calculation of eligibility is relatively simple because the COEStar system contains a copy of the actual COE. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; and the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if the child can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEStar data searches and synchronization effectively eliminate this possibility). By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulation, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted. To maintain an audit track, COEs cannot be physically deleted after they are added to COEStar, but COEs determined to be ineligible may be disqualified. TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, Residency dates, Enrollment dates, Withdrawal dates, Departure dates, LEP, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate the child left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began. Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in category 2. Entry of this data means that the State served the child during the summer/intersession term. Additional services information can be added to indicate the nature of services but the summer/ intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service began. COEStar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state, region, county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level, eligible children are counted only once in each eligible category. Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in School wide and TA programs funded by MEP and in both regular and summer/intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED*Facts* data file?

TROMIK extracts the EDEN data directly from the data source files that contain COE's, child identification, enrollments and services. The data is formatted into XML files for transmission for EDEN. Excel reports summarizing the data for the SEA and LEA levels are also produced and inspected for quality.

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	(Yes/No)
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	Yes

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA and Statewide Services use MSIX to verify data. They receive work list items from MSIX, which include near matches, near match validation, initiate merges to validate split, and potential duplicates. SEA, Statewide Services, and TROMIK also review data completeness and data validity.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	Yes
Do the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	Yes
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	Yes
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	Yes
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	Yes
Does the SEA review student attendance at summer/inter-session projects?	Yes
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	Yes
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	Yes
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	Yes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	113
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	50
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	50

Describe any reasons children were determined ineligible in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All children were determined eligible in the re-interviewing process. The state of Arizona produced a 0% error rate.

Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes
Was the sampling statewide?	Yes

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

It was a statewide sampling.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	Face re-interviews
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	
Was there a standard instrument used?	Yes
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes

Were re-interviewers trained and provided instruments?	Yes
Did the recruitment personnel who made the initial eligibility determinations also conduct the re-interviews with the same families?	No
When were the most recent independent re-interviews completed (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LOA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	(MM/YY) 06/12

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this performance period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No response is needed since we did not conduct an independent interview for this reporting period.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reinterviews produced 0% error rate.

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 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.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	20
1	34
2	46
3	39
4	53
5	45
6	54
7	33
8	30
9	34
10	33
11	36
12	48
Ungraded	23
Out-of-school	1
Total	530

Comments: For 2012-2013 school year, Arizona has identified a reduction in student mobility. Mobility is a consideration for priority for services. Therefore, there has been a decrease in Priority for Services.

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.

2.3.2.2 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) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	151
1	305
2	377
3	308
4	266
5	220
6	174
7	158
8	66
9	71
10	112
11	95
12	80
Ungraded	24
Out-of-school	5
Total	2,413
Comments: N/A	

2.3.2.3 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) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11
K	32
1	22
2	31
3	28
4	30
5	47
6	46
7	40
8	47
9	22
10	10
11	19
12	22
Ungraded	5
Out-of-school	1
Total	413

Comments: A large number of the children identified as Children with Disabilities for the 2012-2013 reporting school year is a result of the increase of eligible Migrant students found eligible for the Migrant Education Program. Another reason for the increase is due in part to the improved assessment and evaluation of IDEA of students at the LEA.

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2013 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	223
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	316
K	216
1	241
2	254
3	239
4	244
5	243
6	237
7	269
8	203
9	321
10	345
11	263
12	366
Ungraded	122
Out-of-school	45
Total	4,147

Comments: The reason for the increase of QAD (12 month period) is because of Arizona's political environment. It has become less hostile to our Migrant families, and therefore, the state has seen an increase of Migrant families within the 2012-2013 reporting year. Arizona is also recruiting through consortia agreements between districts where recruitment did not occur in the past. Additionally, the increase is due to students moving between LEAs from last year's reporting period to this year's reporting period.

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose most recent qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2012-13 regular school year) The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	179
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	444
K	281
1	285
2	319
3	330
4	318
5	319
6	330
7	339
8	247
9	325
10	376
11	355
12	562
Ungraded	180
Out-of-school	44
Total	5,233

Comments: The total that is placed on this reporting period is indicative of 36 months. TROMIK did provide the totals for 12 months. Here are the numbers that reflect 12 months:

Age birth through 2 =119

Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) =247

K =156

1=157

2=181

3=164

4=179

5=168

6=193

7=189

8=130

9=199

10=235

11=168

12=305

Ungraded=88

Out-of-school=24

Total=2902

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a 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 received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	21
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	71
K	50
1	56
2	53
3	80
4	65
5	67
6	54
7	43
8	42
9	25
10	19
11	16
12	20
Ungraded	12
Out-of-school	5
Total	699
Comments: The reduction is due to small rural districts experiencing closures of social services and referral agencies within their vicinity or limitations of available services.	

2.3.2.7 Referrals — During the Summer/ Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** 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 received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: Because of the funding limitation throughout the state, the availability of providers has been reduced.	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	10
8	20
9	22
10	24
11	28
12	81
Ungraded	
Total	185
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the performance 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 2011-12 performance period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 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 GED	#
Obtained a GED in your State During the Performance Period	8
Comments: For SY 201-2013, there was an increase of Out of School Youth. Therefore, LEAs assisted eligible migrant students in obtaining a GED.	

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data Regular School Year

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant children in MEP-funded services during the regular school year.

Participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Eligible migrant children and children who continued to receive MEP-funded 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 Schoolwide Program (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were only served 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.

2.3.3.1 MEP Children 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 the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	219
K	222
1	330
2	373
3	361
4	373
5	377
6	361
7	363
8	279
9	308
10	408
11	426
12	573
Ungraded	31
Out-of-school	15
Total	5,024
Comments: N/A	

2.3.3.2 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 MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5	0
K	18
1	32
2	41
3	36
4	45
5	39
6	49
7	30
8	24
9	21
10	15
11	20
12	24
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	0
Total	395
Comments: For 2012-2013 school year, Arizona has identified a reduction in student mobility. Mobility is a factor to determine priority for services. Therefore, there has been a decrease in Priority for Services.	

2.3.3.3 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 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 During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	1
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	1
10	0
11	1
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	6

Comments: Arizona school districts identified three additional children to which extended services were provided. Historically, Arizona has had a high graduation rate and low drop-out rate for Migrant students. Therefore, there is less need for extended services.

2.3.3.4 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	Instructional Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	66
1	165
2	192
3	171
4	199
5	165
6	156
7	108
8	54
9	51
10	14
11	31
12	98
Ungraded	37
Out-of-school	5
Total	1,512

Comments: : From the prior reporting period (201-2012) to this reporting period (2012-2013), Arizona has experienced instructional services for Migrant students coming from other funding sources, such as Title I. Therefore, this has reduced the instructional services provided by Title I, Part C.

2.3.3.4.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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 During the Regular School Year	Mathematics Instruction During the Regular School Year	High School Credit Accrual During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)			
K	66	42	
1	156	103	
2	181	131	
3	154	99	
4	190	142	
5	154	117	
6	143	109	
7	82	57	
8	38	18	
9	37	19	3
10	1	4	8
11	1	2	25
12	4	10	84
Ungraded			37
Out-of-school	2	3	1
Total	1,209	856	158

Comments: The SEA emphasized the importance of supporting migrant students in reading and math to help students perform better on state assessments in effort to reduce the achievement gaps between Migrant and Non-Migrant students. The increase in high school credit accrual is attributed to the growth in the 11th-12th grade students with credit deficiency. These students participated in credit accrual programs such as Arizona's PASS program.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Regular School Year

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	Support Services During the Regular School Year	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	5	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	219	0
K	214	0
1	297	0
2	326	1
3	321	0
4	310	0
5	335	0
6	320	0
7	329	0
8	260	0
9	294	0
10	408	1
11	426	0
12	570	1
Ungraded	31	1
Out-of-school	13	0
Total	4,678	4
Comments: The reduction in counseling services is due primarily to school districts providing counseling services only to students highest in need. This is the result of funding limitations experienced by the LEAs.		

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.

2.3.4 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.

2.3.4.1 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 the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	62
K	84
1	107
2	104
3	122
4	106
5	91
6	92
7	78
8	62
9	43
10	66
11	94
12	88
Ungraded	5
Out-of-school	4
Total	1,208
Comments: LEAs who hold Migrant Education Programs reported more Title I funded summer school projects, which accounts for the decrease in Migrant student participation during Summer/Intersession term.	

2.3.4.2 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 MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: N/A	

2.3.4.4 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	Instructional Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58
K	75
1	89
2	88
3	95
4	92
5	69
6	75
7	72
8	47
9	31
10	23
11	17
12	13
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	844
Comments: LEAs who hold Migrant Education Programs reported more Title I funded summer school projects, which accounts for the decrease in Migrant student participation during Summer/Intersession term.	

2.3.4.4.1 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 During the Summer/ Intersession Term	Mathematics Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term	High School Credit Accrual During the Summer/ Intersession Term
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58	53	
K	75	55	
1	89	50	
2	88	62	
3	95	58	
4	92	54	
5	69	41	
6	74	62	
7	71	56	
8	46	33	
9	11	10	24
10	4	4	18
11	1	1	16
12	1	1	12
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	774	540	70

Comments: LEAs who hold Migrant Education Programs reported more Title I funded summer school projects, which accounts for the decrease in Migrant student participation during Summer/Intersession term. This also accounts for the decline of students participating in mathematics instruction during the summer/intersession term.

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.

2.3.4.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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	Support Services During the Summer/Intersession Term	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2		0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	45	0
K	63	0
1	66	0
2	53	0
3	59	0
4	58	0
5	47	0
6	46	0
7	40	0
8	40	0
9	26	0
10	17	0
11	12	0
12	3	0
Ungraded		0
Out-of-school		0
Total	575	0
Comments: Age birth through 2, Ungraded, and Out-of-School are all zero. Because of the reduction of MEP funded summer services, there is a corresponding reduction in the need for support services.		

FAQs on Support Services:

- 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.
- 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.

2.3.5 MEP Participation – Performance Period

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 performance period. 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 Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	259
K	259
1	351
2	391
3	383
4	383
5	391
6	377
7	378
8	289
9	318
10	425
11	448
12	587
Ungraded	31
Out-of-school	15
Total	5,290
Comments: N/A	

2.3.6 School Data During the Regular School Year

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

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

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 regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	214
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	6,898
Comments: There has been an increase of migrant students eligible for the Migrant Education Program from the 201-2012 reporting period to the 2012-2013 reporting period.	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in School Wide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

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 regular school 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:	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 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 from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State 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.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	6	152
Regular school year - school day/extended day	3	81
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	23	7,018
Comments: For SY 2012-2013, there was a decline of LEAs who provided a MEP Project. Four small LEAs declined funding to implement a Migrant Education Program. However, Arizona's total migrant student count rose. For the most part, LEAs held a year round project, but it was with a smaller amount of migrant student participation during the summer/intersession term.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- 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.

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 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 performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments: The complexity of the Migrant Education Program has changed, which requires a full time MEP State Director.	

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 performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the performance period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a Statewide basis.

2.3.8.2 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.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	27	20	108	78
Counselors	1	1	0	0
All paraprofessionals	32	16	46	31
Recruiters	44	31	16	12
Records transfer staff	27	13	11	8
Administrators	14	8	8	4

Comments: For this reporting period, the decrease in recruiters accounts for the decrease of MEP programs for the 2012-2013 school year. The increase in FTEs summer school teachers is due to do teachers working with a smaller class size to provide more instructional and one to one attention.

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.

2.3.8.3 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.

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	30	13.80	45	32.30
Comments: N/A				

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students.

Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention	14	15
Juvenile corrections	1	180
Adult corrections	10	364
Other		
Total	25	
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 Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	
Juvenile Detention	14
Juvenile Corrections	1
Adult Corrections	10
Other	
Total	25
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 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA) and limited English proficiency (LEP), 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		3,798	340	565	
Total Long Term Students Served	0	3,798	340	565	0

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)		1,962	98	174	
LEP Students		0	0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native		285	20	18	
Asian		13	2	6	
Black or African American		424	50	95	
Hispanic or Latino		1,711	164	316	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		0	0	1	
White		1,362	90	129	
Two or more races		3	14	0	
Total		3,798	340	565	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		3,059	305	538	
Female		739	35	27	
Total		3,798	340	565	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		0		0	
6		0		0	
7		0		0	
8		1		0	
9		0		0	
10		6		0	
11		22		0	
12		85		0	
13		229	2	0	
14		545	15	0	
15		805	51	14	
16		1,128	86	18	
17		977	186	22	
18		0		70	
19		0		54	
20		0		202	
21		0		185	
Total		3,798	340	565	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Data are correct as reported.

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?		No	Yes	Yes	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.		0	340	565	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school			68				S	S		
Earned high school course credits			1,227		335		S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program			233		S		458	S		
Earned a GED			233		94		107	S		
Obtained high school diploma			S		16		S	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education							S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					126		S	S		
Obtained employment			4				S	S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 four 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, 2012, 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	64	255	342	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	47	306	565	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		14	38	227	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		8	38	206	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		20	76	40	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		5	154	92	
Comments: Data are correct as 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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

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	65	255	378	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	0	47	306	565	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		11	114	172	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		12	S	86	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		22	114	194	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		S	78	113	
Comments: Data are correct as reported.					

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	35	94
Neglected programs	2	90
Juvenile detention	1	14
Juvenile corrections	1	145
Other	1	231
Total	40	
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	35
Neglected programs	2
Juvenile detention	1
Juvenile corrections	1
Other	1
Total	40
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 disability (IDEA), and limited English proficiency (LEP), 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	1,411	469	63	359	294
Total Long Term Students Served	531	381	0	359	294

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	341	39	30	0	72
LEP Students	123	33	0	0	5

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	99	27	191	84
Asian	5	17	0	2	2
Black or African American	113	36	2	90	28
Hispanic or Latino	799	251	15	8	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2	0	0	0	1
White	286	62	17	65	107
Two or more races	40	4	2	3	19
Total	1,411	469	63	359	294

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	880	254	52	19	
Female	531	215	11	340	294
Total	1,411	469	63	359	294

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	7	2	0		0
6	18	7	0		0
7	20	7	0		0
8	27	8	0		0
9	27	9	0		0
10	26	10	1		0
11	54	16	1		0
12	68	14	1		2
13	105	17	1	0	15
14	70	37	8	0	21
15	81	140	18	6	61
16	162	82	20	102	81
17	207	74	8	196	84
18	219	35	5	13	30
19	179	8	0	18	0
20	111	2	0	16	0
21	30	1	0	8	0

Total	1,411	469	63	359	294
-------	-------	-----	----	-----	-----

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

Data are correct as reported.

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	155	88	47	359	290

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school	534	151	361		S	61	179	S		147
Earned high school course credits	812	33	333		35	42	S	S	256	
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S	S		S	S	177	S	12	
Earned a GED	4	S	S		S	S	40	S	8	S
Obtained high school diploma	19	S	12		S	S	S	S	7	
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	14	S	S		S	S	S	S		4
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	32	S	242		S	14	S	S	52	
Obtained employment	19	S	S		S	7	S	S	5	30

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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 four change categories in the second table below. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the tables below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, 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	116	73	S	161	35
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	262	19	S	104	53

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	37	S	S	26	S
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	125	10	S	4	S
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	91	7	S	21	28
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	9	S	S	53	20
Comments: Data are correct as reported.					

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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

Is reporting pre-posttest data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre-posttest data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

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	176	144	S	173	47
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	265	51	S	100	53

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	54	4	S	29	S
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	114	32	S	S	5
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	85	10	S	13	5
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	12	5	S	55	41
Comments: Data are correct as reported.					

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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	2013 Arizona YRBS	Every two years	2012-13	2010-11: 27%	2010-11: 34.6%	28.6%	2002/2003
				2011-12: 27%	2011-12:		
				2012-13: 27%	2012-13: 31.3%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students that carried a weapon on school property on one or more of the past 30 days	2013 Arizona YRBS	Every two years	2012/13	2010-11: 5%	2010-11: 5.7 %	5.8%	2002/2003
				2011-12:	2011-12:		
				2012-13: 5%	2012-13: 4.8 %		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students that engaged in fights on school property during the past 12 months	2013 Arizona YRBS	Every two years	2012/13	2010-11: 11%	2010-11: 10.7%	11.7%	2002/2003
				2011-12:	2011-12:		
				2012-13: 5%	2012-13: 8.8 %		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: 0%	2010-11: 0%		

Number of persistently dangerous schools	Annually	2012/13	2011-12:0%	2011-12:0%	0%	2002/2003
			2012-13:0%	2012-13: 0%		
			2013-14:			
			2014-15:			

Comments:

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	The violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or use of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol. This includes being intoxicated at school, school-sponsored events, and school-sponsored transportation.
Illicit drug related	The unlawful use, cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, purchase, possession, transportation, or importation of any controlled drug or narcotic substance, or equipment and devices used for preparing or taking drugs or narcotics. This includes being under the influence of drugs at school, school-sponsored events, and on school-sponsored transportation. Category includes over-the-counter medications if abused by the student. This category does not include tobacco or alcohol.
Violent incident without physical injury	* See below
Violent incident with physical injury	** See below
Weapons possession	The possession of any instrument or object possessed or used which is designed for lethal use (includes three dangerous items, namely: knife with a blade of <2.5 inches, razor blade/box cutter and mace/pepper spray).
<p>Comments: * The following are considered by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) as violent: Arson of structure or property, Arson of an occupied structure, Burglary or Breaking and Entering (First, Second or Third Degree), Extortion, Robbery, Armed robbery, Bullying, Threat or Intimidation, Hazing, Fighting, Assault, Aggravated assault, Fire alarm misuse, Bomb threat, Chemical or biological threat, Other school threat, Harassment(Sexual and Non-Sexual, with and without contact), Sexual Abuse or Sexual Conduct with a Minor or Child Molestation, Sexual Assault or Rape, Vandalism of school property, Vandalism of personal property, and Kidnapping, Homicide, Endangerment, and Harassment.</p> <p>**Physical injury is defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Incidents with injury include those in which one or more students, school personnel, or other persons on school grounds require professional medical attention. Examples include stab or bullet wounds, concussions, fractured or broken bones, or cuts requiring stitches. USED Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) •Serious Bodily (physical) Injury: A bodily (physical) injury that involves a substantial risk of death; extreme physical pain; protracted and obvious disfigurement; or protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ or faculty (18 U.S.C. Section 1365(3)(h)). <p>Additional notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Counts that follow represent the number of students suspended or expelled in an incident pertaining to the specific violation. •The count of LEA's is not consistent across the questions. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The data for CSPR reporting comes from Arizona's student level database AzSAFE. When an incident occurs, schools enter the data into an incident management system and indicate the students involved, the type of violation that occurred (violent physical injury, alcohol use, drug use, possession of weapons etc.) and the actions taken (suspension, expulsion etc.). If an incident occurs and does not involve a particular violation, schools will not report that data and therefore there will be no records in AzSAFE for that school (i.e. the default is not "0"). This is unlike a year end paper report, where if a particular violation does not occur schools would record it as "0". As such, the number of schools reporting per year for a particular violation will be different. 	

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	6,892	117
6 through 8	12,267	199
9 through 12	6,885	152
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	7	2
6 through 8	23	11
9 through 12	23	11
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	46	18
6 through 8	100	25
9 through 12	50	21
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	S	1
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	525	99
6 through 8	631	99
9 through 12	404	74
Comments:		

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	6	3
9 through 12	9	7
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	21	12
6 through 8	304	62
9 through 12	803	84
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	S	1
9 through 12	4	3
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	88	29
6 through 8	1,761	101
9 through 12	3,495	110
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	20	7
9 through 12	32	14
Comments:		

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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	7
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	7
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	10
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	6
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	17
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
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.

CSPR RLIS FY 13

Project detail report

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Results provided are based on the grades in the school. Results for populations with fewer than 11 students or where all students score at the same performance level are masked to protect student identification, as required under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). AZ Dash % reflects AIMS percent of students passing.

Fiscal years listed below are Arizona's fiscal year 2012-2013. The following list includes the name of the LEA, use of funds and the results.

1. Altar Valley Elementary District-Received funds for 2013 for teacher recruitment. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 56% to 57%. Reading increased from 69% to 70%.
2. Baboquivari Unified School District -Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Retention & Recruitment. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 20% to 23%. Reading increased from 41% to 44%.
3. Bisbee Unified School District-Received funds for 2013 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 45% to 44%. Reading decreased from 76% to 75%.
4. Blue Ridge Unified District- Received funds for 2013 for Title I A activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 65% to 68%. Reading increased from 77% to 81%.
5. Camp Verde Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Professional Development, Educational Technology, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math remained at 56% . Reading increased from 73% to 76%.
6. Career Development, Inc.-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Professional Development, Educational Technology, Safe and Drug Free Schools and Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results are as follows: Math increased from 18% to 28%. Reading increased from 54% to 63%.
7. Destiny School, Inc. - Received funds for 2013 for Title IA activities. The AIMS results are as follows: Math decreased from 71% to 67%. Reading remained at 79%.
8. Douglas Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Retention & Recruitment, Teacher Professional Development and Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math remained at 44%. Reading increased from 64% to 66%.
9. Founding Fathers Academies, Inc. - Received funds for 2013 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 22% to 18%. Reading decreased from 49% to 44%.
10. Gila County Regional-Received funds for 2013 for Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 18% to 16%. Reading decreased from 46% to 43%.
11. Holbrook Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Title I A Activities, Teacher Professional Development, and Parent involvement activities. . The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 51% to 56%. Reading increased from 70% to 73%.
12. Kayenta Unified District- Received funds for 2013 for Title I A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 36% to 38%. Reading increased from 56% to 60%.
13. Mexicayolt Academy-Received funds for 2013 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 60% to 83%. Reading increased from 52% to 71%.
14. Miami Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 50% to 48%. Reading decreased from 68% to 67%.
15. Nadaburg Unified School District-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher professional development, Parental involvement activities, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools program activities. . The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 56% to 55%. Reading increased from 77% to 78%.
16. Nogales Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Safe and Drug Free Schools and Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 67% to 63%. Reading decreased from 81% to 78%.
17. Omega Alpha Academy-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Retention & Recruitment. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 39% to 41%. Reading decreased from 51% to 47%.
18. Payson Unified District- Received funds for 2013 for Title I A activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 48% to 44%. Reading increased from 44% to 55%.
19. Pinon Unified District- Received funds for 2013 for Title I A activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 30% to 33%. Reading increased from 53% to 54%.
20. Quartzsite Elementary District- Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Retention and Recruitment activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 53% to 46%. Reading decreased from 67% to 64%.
21. Queen Creek Unified District- Received funds for 2013 for Educational Technology and Teacher professional development. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 75% to 79%. Reading increased from 88% to 89%.
22. San Carlos Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Parental involvement activities. The AIMS results are as follows: Math increased from 12% to 14%. Reading remained at 28%.

23. Santa Cruz Valley Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Retention & Recruitment, Teacher Professional Development, Educational technology, Parental involvement activities, and Title I-A activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 60% to 61%. Reading increased from 76% to 78%.
 24. Show Low Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher professional development. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 61% to 60%. Reading increased from 80% to 84%.
 25. Snowflake Unified- Received funds for 2013 for Safe and Drug-Free Schools program activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math remained at 71%. Reading remained at 83%.
 26. Toltec Elementary District -Received funds for 2013 for Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math decreased from 49% to 48%. Reading decreased from 66% to 64%.
 27. Tombstone Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 55% to 60%. Reading increased from 80% to 83%.
 28. Topock Elementary District-District-Received funds for 2013 for Safe and Drug-Free Schools program activities, Title I-A activities, and Educational Technology. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 67% to 76%. Reading increased from 85% to 90%.
 29. Willcox Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Teacher Retention & Recruitment and Title I-A activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math increased from 42% to 50%. Reading increased from 62% to 66%.
 30. Window Rock Unified District-Received funds for 2013 for Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math remained at 32%. Reading increased from 54% to 56%.
 31. Winslow Unified District -Received funds for 2013 for Title I-A Activities. The AIMS results were as follows: Math remained at 53%. Reading 72% to 73%.
-

2.10 Funding TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2012-13?	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified that state that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	3
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

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 FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	37,206.00	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		4,880.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		32,326.00
Total	37,206.00	37,206.00
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 ⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort 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 2012-13). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	84
<i>Asian</i>	
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	
Black or African American	69.5
Hispanic or Latino	68.8
White	82.3
Two or more races	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	62.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20
Economically disadvantaged students	69.3

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/hsgguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

⁴ The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

2.12 LIST OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved ESEA Flexibility requests 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* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools⁶ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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).

The data for this question are reported through ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward Schools" report in the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS). The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN030 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

⁶ The definition of reward schools is provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁸ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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 2013-14 (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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

⁸ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools⁹ with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN032 "List of Other Identified Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN032 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

⁹ The definitions of reward, priority, and focus schools are provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>.

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹⁰
- 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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

¹⁰ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN034 "List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuse's report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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 action¹¹ under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

¹¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.