

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**

FLORIDA



**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: Florida Department of Education		
Address: 325 W Gaines St, Suite 644 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Felicia A. Williams		
Telephone: (850) 245-0657		
Fax: (850) 245-9551		
e-mail: Felicia.Williams@fldoe.org		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Pam Stewart		
		Monday, May 5, 2014, 11:04:56 AM
_____ Signature		

Verified CSPR Part 2 (5/5/2014)

**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	115,476	S	50.8
4	105,889	S	54.7
5	107,149	S	47.0
6	92,597	S	42.9
7	89,679	S	46.1
8	89,004	S	47.9
High School	79,462	S	50.1
Total	679,256	S	48.6

Comments: In 1213, Florida added the Geometry end-of-course assessment.

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	115,543	S	47.3
4	105,743	S	51.0
5	107,324	S	52.3
6	92,369	S	48.7
7	89,140	S	47.3
8	88,939	S	46.4
High School	95,879	S	40.5
Total	694,937	S	47.8

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	615	S	77
4	636	S	76
5	611	S	70
6	265	S	69
7	280	S	80
8	282	S	79
High School	400	S	74
Total	3,089	S	74.9

Comments: In 1213, Florida added the Geometry end-of-course assessment.

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	616	S	78
4	636	S	76
5	610	S	79
6	266	S	74
7	280	S	76
8	281	S	73
High School	552	S	69
Total	3,241	S	75.4

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>)	178,737
Limited English proficient students	171,597
Students who are homeless	43,479
Migratory students	14,886
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,270
Asian	19,981
Black or African American	399,916
Hispanic or Latino	443,240
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,487
White	362,911
Two or more races	36,816
Total	1,268,621
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	0	0	0	0
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0	0	0	0
K	175	134,747	481	0	135,403
1	215	131,430	610	3	132,258
2	206	125,161	595	1	125,963
3	157	127,610	610	9	128,386
4	116	116,341	612	5	117,074
5	143	117,171	553	14	117,881
6	35	103,770	405	26	104,236
7	28	99,887	329	32	100,276
8	34	99,478	254	79	99,845
9	41	58,775	22	667	59,505
10	18	55,533	27	107	55,685
11	18	49,175	21	20	49,234
12	12	48,356	9	4	48,381
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	1,198	1,267,434	4,528	967	1,274,127

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	346
Reading/language arts	1,057
Science	0
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	186
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	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	0
Other support services	372
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	0	
Paraprofessionals ¹	0	0.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0	
Clerical support staff	0	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0	
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	510.30	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 *	11	63
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	173,828	12,573,863
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	3,655,788	700,871,988
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	4.80	1.80

*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.

Graduation Requirements Distribution of Parent/Family Resource Handbook Title I-English and Spanish (Middle/High School Edition) developed by district Office of Parent Involvement.
 Distribution of A Parent's Quick Guide to Student Success brochure developed by the District Office of Parent Involvement (Parent Focus Share model approaches for family involvement).
 Career Fest, College Nights and Pasos al Futuro - Provide parents with information about post secondary programs and opportunities.
 Individual meetings with parents regarding how to access the parent portal system.
 Technical Assistance Workshops - Provide resources for parents in career awareness for students, how to work with their child at home and parent teacher conferences.
 Addressing summer time and continuing the learning for students and addressing parent concerns.
 Homework Helper Make and Take - Provide materials supplies and strategies to assist parents in help their children with homework to increase student achievement.
 Bullying Prevention and or Cyber Bullying Prevention for Parents Workshop provide parents with information on the prevention their children recognizing and preventing bullying.
 Math Reading Families Building Better Readers Writing and or Science Nights.

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: Florida does not have any concerns.

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)	4,270
K	2,123
1	1,989
2	1,767
3	1,780
4	1,383
5	1,384
6	1,335
7	1,206
8	1,201
9	1,183
10	1,054
11	913
12	803
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	4,329
Total	26,720
Comments:	

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	1,616
Comments:	

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)	672
K	523
1	445
2	412
3	340
4	319
5	324
6	176
7	137
8	126
9	135
10	103
11	105
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	209
Total	4,031
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: One of Florida's main crops, citrus, grows from October to June. In 2012-13, Florida experienced a decline in citrus crop production. For example, a decline of about 10% experienced with all varieties of oranges, 5% drop with grapefruit, and 11% drop with tangerines/tangelos. This situation was partially due to the beginning of drought. Trees struggled to maintain healthy, growing fruit, which sped up the harvesting of the fruit. Due to these changes, more migrant families and their children did not migrate within or to Florida and/or left early. This affected the overall number of families identified, recruited and served in summer months.

Furthermore, there were more summer programs intentionally offered to an elementary school population (grades 1-5), including highly popular science camps for fifth grade. Summer reading program are highly effective. Once a child can read, they are more prepared to be academically successful in all subject areas. S/I MEP programs purposefully designed to build students' early and foundational reading and mathematics skills. Moreover, provision of this type of service addresses the state's MPOs related to reading/language arts and mathematics. This helps explain the decreases in the percent of migrant

children served by the MEP during the S/I in age categories of 3-5 (not kindergarten) and middle school grades as well as the increase in 5th graders served.

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 only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	88
Comments:	

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	No
MIS 2000	No
COEStar	No
MAPS	No
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	Yes
<p>All local student data is transmitted to the state via an automated Management Information System (MIS) - the State of Florida Student Information Database System. The data are collected by the school districts through their local systems, and submitted to the state at pre-set times throughout the year, with a seven month window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. The districts use this same system to transmit the data used to calculate the migrant count. This year's count obtained using the State of Florida Student Information Database using data submitted by districts in August 2013, via Survey 5. Survey 5 differs from all other surveys in that it is a cumulative count of all students served in all programs during the preceding school year (which is the current CSPR/EDEN collection), and therefore captures all migrant students. For 2012-2013 Survey 5, the due date was August 2, 2013 with a state processing window of July 29 - August 30, 2013. State processing is the "clean up" window where districts can upload/delete/edit their data daily. After the end of state processing, the state processes records every weekend. Districts have until February 28, 2014 to change their data; however, we finalize counts much sooner to be able to meet CSPR and EDEN timelines. Last year's child counts were generated using this same system. In 2002, a data element was added to the Florida Student Information Database system called Migrant Status Term, Student Demographic Reporting Format. This data element uses a coding system to indicate whether the migrant child was served in the regular term, summer term, or both. In Migrant Status Term, a separate code (Code X) is used for those identified as migrants, but received no services (neither academic nor support services; in the regular or summer term). In 2006, the coding used to indicate that the migrant child was served in the regular term (3) was revised to reflect that the migrant child was enrolled/served -- with services provided during the regular school day only -- (D) or that the migrant child was enrolled/served -- with some or all services provided during extended day/week -- (E). Extensive technical assistance is provided to school districts to ensure the accuracy of this coding system, including regional workshops and presentations at Florida's annual Information Database Workshop held in June each year and at the technical assistance meeting/workshop usually held in the fall of each year.</p>	

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	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.

The same system was used to collect, maintain, and generate the state's Category 2 count.

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)?	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.

The database was queried for all children between the ages of 3 and 22 (Date of Birth range of 09/02/90 through 08/31/13 (to include the under 3), inclusive, which captures those who were Under 3, 2 and turned 3 and those who were 21 and turned 22), whose Qualifying Arrival Date is greater than 08/31/09, with a valid Migrant Status Term Code, and any services provided for with Regular or Summer session. This process is applied to all migrant child cases identified in the state student database and then the cases sorted by Category I or II using the Migrant Status Term data element. Edit checks for Category I and Category II are performed on the data file generated by this query to delete children who may be included in error. With regards to verifying that those children whose 3rd birthday occurs during the eligibility period are still residing in the State before including them in the child count, it is a standard procedure that children who will turn 3 during the eligibility period are flagged by the data clerk (whose responsibility it is to input student data into the district database) at the beginning of each school year or at the time or interview or re-interview of a family. Before data submitted for the reporting period (Survey 5), data clerks confer with recruiters to ensure that these children/families are still in the district. The date values indicated throughout this comment guarantee that all children who were eligible and resident for at least one day during the performance period, such as those who reached age 22 or graduated from high school/attained a GED, are included in the Category 1 Count.

The query used finds all migrant children identified within the eligibility reporting period. Since Survey 5 data are cumulative for the entire school year, all those meeting the eligibility requirements are captured, regardless of their length of stay. Recruiters are in constant contact with their families so that when a child turns three during the reporting period, district MEP staff will then identify that child as migrant on the student database. The data element Migrant Status Term identifies which term(s) a migratory child was served and/or identified. Further, migratory children selected for inclusion in the count from the State Student Database had to have a Qualifying Arrival Date greater than 08/31/09. FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "Continuation of Services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations. In addition to the Migrant Status Term data element contained in the Student Demographic Format, data elements in the Federal/State Compensatory Evaluation Format, also transmitted in Survey 5, provide information regarding summer services to migrant students. The Summer school code (Category II) cannot be entered on a student without a link to a code for summer services. Each year, a comprehensive presentation made at the Florida Association of Management Information System (FAMIS) State Database Workshop. This presentation targets migrant staff, data clerks, and MIS staff and covers all reporting requirements for migrant students and migrant program data. When the specific Migrant Status Term data element was created, very explicit definitions were developed and disseminated to MEP/MIS staff. Two of the codes were created to identify students who received services during the summer. The codes are "B" -- students who were served in both the regular 180 day school year AND the summer term and "S" -- students that were served only in the summer term. The definition for summer services states that a student must be served in a Federally Funded (partially or fully) program designed (in whole or part) especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Students enrolled in a conventional summer school must, additionally or concurrently, be provided services that are fully or partially Federally Funded and designed especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Summer programs and services funded partially or fully by migrant program funds are clearly highlighted in district Migrant Education Program Project applications and are corroborated by district logs and reviewed during on-site MEP monitoring visits. Districts provided guidance clarifying those children who receive instructional packets as a one-time act of providing instructional or support services cannot be included in their "summer count".

All students in Florida are assigned a unique, ten-digit Student Number Identifier, Florida (SID) number, consisting of the student's Social Security number followed by an "X". Those without Social Security numbers assigned a SID by the local school district using a state defined methodology, which then becomes the student's State SID. Should a student move, the receiving district is required to search the State's Student Locator system to determine if the student has prior enrollment history in any of Florida's public schools. If so, the SID, which was originally assigned as the student's SID is to be assigned to the student in the receiving district. Please refer to: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_1213/175625.pdf. Because the SID is unique to each student, further matching is not performed at the state level. For this year's count, the following process was used: A master file containing all the students in the state was generated and the students that met the federal criteria were coded as "Migrant". A separate data file containing only migrant students served in Regular and Summer sessions was generated. All records were matched and unduplicated by data element fields: Migrant Status Term, SID, District Number, and School Number. Because of the uniqueness of each student's SID, there is an assurance that data are unique for each student based

upon Migrant Status Term data element and Florida Student Number Identifier. By using the SID and Migrant Status Term and matching for duplicate SID's, this methodology insures the data tables produce an unduplicated count for each session. When students are initially enrolled by district data staff, THEY must ensure that if a pre-existing SID is selected for a student, it must match on all variables, i.e., name, DOB, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, home language, and parent names, at a minimum, before assigning a new SID. An additional measure to ensure that districts do not generate a new SID for a student with an existing SID will be to disseminate extensive guidance to district MEP and district data staff on nuances of Hispanic names and strongly encourage an in-depth probe of the State Student Locator system to identify such students before a new SID is issued.

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?

Florida has, in a State Board of Education rule, the database reporting requirements that requires districts to supply the information necessary to capture migrant students who are enrolled or identified. Data quality assurance is conducted during the survey reporting periods throughout the program year. Data are compared to the prior year and sent to school districts on a weekly basis during the survey windows so that, through early discovery, districts will have numerous opportunities to review and verify accuracy of the counts and the information supported by these data quality reports and ample time for correction of any migrant reporting problems . This process then helps to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served.

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?	No

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.	353
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	100
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	99

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child did not move with the family during the reporting period. Child was removed from database.

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.

The sampling was not stratified.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Several issues affected the response rate. First, the response rate among the original sample was low. Second, given the large size of Florida and its variations in climate, students and their families are migrating at different times, which meant that it was likely that students will be, in some instances, absent during the re-interview times. To account for non-response, oversampling was included in the sample design. Since there was uncertainty about what would be an appropriate response rate, the sorted list option was used so that sample size could be increased as needed. As a result two additional randomly selected samples were provided to the re-interviewer. The original sample was 174 and the final sample size was 353. Of these 353 names, 63 were not attempted because the re-interviewer was not able to travel back to this location or the region was unable to provide contacts or contact information within the re-interview time frame. To improve the response rate and ensure more even coverage of Florida's diverse locations, 17 of the re-interviews were completed by phone after the in-person interviewing period was completed. The re-interviewer focused on families which had prior contact attempts and were unavailable because they had not returned to the state or because they had scheduling conflicts. The JBS team lead and statistician determined that supplementing the completed interviews with phone interviews with existing sample

members would provide more representative data by including harder-to-contact families. When this list was exhausted, the re-interviewer was instructed to make initial attempts over the phone in regions where she had not been able to visit a second time.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	
Yes/No	
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) 11/12

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.

To ensure an independent process was used, JBS International was contracted to conduct the re-interview in the state of Florida. The ID&R Office assisted contractor by providing a list of all the students in the state for whom a COE was completed during the period, as well as providing access and contact information to local district coordinators. The re-interviewer provided by the contractor was an independent consultant for JBS with no relation to the FL MEP and no conflict of interest with migrant families in the state.

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.

In addition to the external re-interview by JBS, Florida districts conduct local re-interviews on an annual basis. Re-interview protocol for local re-interviews requires districts to use staff not involved in the initial eligibility determination, to avoid contacting the sample families prior to the re-interviewer's visit, and to conduct face-to-face re-interviews. For the reporting period, a total of 897 COEs were sampled. Of these, an attempt to re-interview was made for 665 COEs, resulting in a total of 479 completed re-interviews. The response rate was 53.4% (479/897). There were 214 non responses, comprised of 69% (137) who had moved away (per neighbors or new tenants) and 31% (67) who were not found after multiple attempts. Of the 479 completed re-interviews, 19, or 4%, were determined ineligible. All the students who were determined ineligible were removed from the district and state database. The FL MEP will continue to provide guidance to LEAs for effective and ongoing re-interview efforts.

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)	89
K	640
1	640
2	504
3	472
4	409
5	391
6	358
7	323
8	332
9	371
10	299
11	293
12	179
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	59
Total	5,359

Comments: Besides having an educational interruption, one of the criteria for determining Priority for Services (PFS) in Florida is the child's performance on the state assessment. If it is not "satisfactory" or "proficient," child identified as PFS. The changes in Florida's state assessment tool (FCAT to FACT 2.0) caused an overall decline in student performance across the board, including migrant students. More migrant students identified as not meeting the "satisfactory" or "proficient" level in reading and mathematics. This explains why there was an over 25% increases in the eligible PFS-PP count of migrant students from grades 5-12.

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)	555
K	1,601
1	1,418
2	1,039
3	915
4	554
5	479
6	322
7	244
8	252
9	254
10	203
11	188
12	135
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	187
Total	8,346
Comments:	

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	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	202
K	180
1	210
2	180
3	267
4	190
5	192
6	195
7	182
8	169
9	148
10	148
11	117
12	104
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	20
Total	2,504

Comments: Florida's IDEA population experienced an increase of over 10,000 student from 2011-12 to 2012-13 partly due to improved assessment. Some of them were migrant students, which explain the increases identified in IDEA migrant student population.

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	1,045
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,685
K	670
1	640
2	468
3	464
4	368
5	330
6	300
7	275
8	261
9	236
10	197
11	167
12	94
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3,175
Total	10,375

Comments: Overall, Florida increased in eligible migrant count for 3rd and 12th grade. Based on their raised awareness of changes with FCAT (3rd grade being the first time it is taken), more parents ensured that their children were present for FCAT 2.0 testing for 3rd graders. More students who traveled returned to high school to finish their 12th grade year.

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	1,569
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,787
K	1,822
1	1,675
2	1,469
3	1,502
4	1,156
5	1,154
6	1,120
7	1,032
8	1,016
9	1,001
10	917
11	803
12	677
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	4,050
Total	24,750
Comments:	

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	557
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,379
K	671
1	609
2	584
3	574
4	425
5	430
6	425
7	380
8	363
9	497
10	363
11	337
12	341
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	573
Total	8,508

Comments: Through the new Service Delivery Plan (SDP), Florida's Migrant Education Program (FMEP) placed emphasis on ensuring migrant pre-kindergarten and kindergarten students receive focused attention during the regular school year particularly by connecting those children to existing services since resources are limited. Strategies in the SDP included building stronger relationship with early education teachers. This explains the over 25% increase in the referred services during RY to migrant students in K. Furthermore, Florida has implemented significant changes associated with the increased level of requirements needed to graduate from high school. In 2012-13, those changes include passing Algebra and Biology End-of-Course Exams (EOC) to earn course credit. Ninth grade is the first time EOC taken and 12th grade is the last. Many migrant students struggle to pass EOC so services provided directly and via referrals to assist them. This explains the over 25% increase in the referred services during RY to migrant students in 9th and 12th grade students Moreover, the Out-of-School Youth (OSY) population overall dropped, which explains the decrease in the number of OSY receiving referred services in RY.

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	17
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	196
K	189
1	155
2	166
3	148
4	108
5	109
6	74
7	51
8	44
9	41
10	28
11	36
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	79
Total	1,445

Comments: The explanation provided for 2.3.1.2 explaining the decreases in the count of migrant children served by the MEP during the S/I in age categories of 3-5 (not kindergarten) and middle school grades directly related to the decreases indicated in referral services in S/I to the same age/grade level of migrant students. Less direct services provided to K students, however MEP ensured they received services via referrals, which explains the over 25% increase. Furthermore, the overall decrease in the OSY population explains the decrease in the referral services in S/I to OSY.

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	6
8	11
9	27
10	33
11	42
12	21
Ungraded	
Total	140
Comments: All data is accurate as reported.	

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	13
Comments: All data is accurate as reported.	

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	733
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,678
K	1,623
1	1,497
2	1,348
3	1,336
4	1,062
5	1,053
6	1,020
7	964
8	934
9	1,047
10	939
11	813
12	706
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,630
Total	20,383

Comments: As noted, Florida implemented changes associated with the increased level of requirements needed to graduate from high school. MEP provided supplemental instructional and support services to address this need particularly to ensure

migrant 12th graders graduated. This explains the over 25% increase in services in RY provided to 12th grade migrant students. The OSY population overall dropped, which explains the decrease in the number of OSY served in RY.

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	63
K	451
1	416
2	339
3	309
4	291
5	268
6	241
7	228
8	225
9	310
10	247
11	252
12	143
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	53
Total	3,836
Comments: Overall, the PFS migrant population increased in almost all grades as noted in comment for 2.3.2.1, which explains the over 25% increase in the number of PFS migrant students served in RY. The only exception is the decrease of services to age 3-5 (not kindergarten) migrant students. The decrease explained by the need to shift MEP resources and services to school-age PFS children.	

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)	3
K	2
1	4
2	2
3	1
4	1
5	1
6	4
7	3
8	1
9	2
10	9
11	8
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	48
Comments:	

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	733
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,678
K	1,623
1	1,497
2	1,348
3	1,336
4	1,062
5	1,053
6	1,020
7	964
8	934
9	1,047
10	939
11	813
12	705
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,627
Total	20,379

Comments: The over 25% increase in instructional services to 12th grade migrant student explained above in 2.3.3.1. Essentially more students assisted academically during RY to meet the new challenging Florida high school requirements. The overall decrease in the OSY population explains the decrease in instructional services in RY provided to OSY.

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	53	53	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	232	229	
K	174	129	
1	169	129	
2	175	130	
3	182	146	
4	139	96	
5	136	99	
6	130	116	
7	117	91	
8	98	73	
9	155	90	13
10	96	51	34
11	62	38	37
12	61	45	37
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	127	76	0
Total	2,106	1,591	121

Comments: The under 25% decrease in age birth through 2 receiving reading and mathematics instruction as well as K, 1st, and 2nd grade students receiving reading during RY is the same as that provided in 2.3.3.2. That is, resources shifted to meet the needs of school-age PFS migrant children. In Florida, all children including migrant, in kindergarten through elementary access many more instructional services (reading and mathematics) during RY than children in upper grades. Therefore, the need to supplement is not as great. On the flip side, since there are less instructional and transitional (3rd to 4th; 8th to 9th, etc.) support opportunities available outside of migrant for upper grade students such as 3rd, 6th, 7th, and 9th, the MEP provides supplemental reading and mathematics instruction when needed and where possible during RY. This explains the 25% increase in those grades. English acquisition and literacy is a primary focus for instructional services to OSY because that was the need highlighted by the new FMEP Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and SDP. Less focus placed on mathematics instruction to OSY, which explains the 25% decrease in mathematics instruction to OSY. Lastly, to address the new high school requirements and the MPO associated with graduation in the FMEP SDP, a heightened focus on credit accrual implemented. This explains the over 25% increase in credit accrual during RY.

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	730	729
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,643	2,619
K	1,597	1,560
1	1,477	1,431
2	1,331	1,291
3	1,319	1,283
4	1,048	1,009
5	1,040	1,003
6	1,006	972
7	951	905
8	927	886
9	1,036	982
10	926	856
11	804	743
12	697	655
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	2,621	2,608
Total	20,153	19,532

Comments: As noted, Florida implemented changes associated with the increased level of requirements needed to graduate from high school. MEP provided supplemental instructional and support services such as transportation, needs assessment and health services to address this need particularly to ensure migrant 12th graders graduated. This explains the over 25 percent increase in support services in RY for 12th graders. The overall decrease in the OSY population explains the decrease in support and counseling services in RY provided to OSY.

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~~er~~ 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	88
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	675
K	525
1	449
2	414
3	341
4	320
5	325
6	180
7	140
8	127
9	137
10	112
11	113
12	12
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	209
Total	4,167

Comments: There were more summer programs intentionally offered to an elementary school population (grades ~~5~~), including highly popular science camps for fifth grade. Summer reading program are highly effective. Once a child can read, they are more prepared to be academically successful in all subject areas. S/I MEP programs purposefully designed to build students' early and foundational reading and mathematics skills. Moreover, provision of this type of service addresses the state's MPOs related to reading/language arts and mathematics. This helps explain the decreases in the percent of migrant children served by the MEP during the S/I in age categories of 3-5 (not kindergarten), 7th, 8th, 10th grade as well as the increase in 5th graders served.

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	15
K	116
1	106
2	77
3	74
4	78
5	60
6	34
7	29
8	33
9	38
10	32
11	34
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	730

Comments: There is an over 25% decrease in 1st and 2nd grade PFS students served in S/I; because the most in need students in elementary grades targeted for summer school. Per the explanation provided in 2.3.1.2, one of the primary intents of summer programming is to build students' foundational reading and mathematics skills.

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	88
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	675
K	524
1	449
2	414
3	341
4	320
5	325
6	180
7	140
8	127
9	137
10	112
11	113
12	12
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	208
Total	4,165

Comments: There were more summer programs intentionally offered to an elementary school population (grades -5), including highly popular science camps for fifth grade. Summer reading program are highly effective. Once a child can read, they are more prepared to be academically successful in all subject areas. S/I MEP programs purposefully designed to build students' early and foundational reading and mathematics skills. Moreover, provision of this type of service addresses the state's MPOs related to reading/language arts and mathematics. This helps explain the decrease in the percent of migrant children who received instructional services in S/I in age categories of 3-5 (not kindergarten), 7th, 8th, 10th grade as well as the increase in 5th graders served.

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	69	69	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	355	116	
K	312	207	
1	281	210	
2	249	174	
3	216	146	
4	182	125	
5	177	120	
6	77	65	
7	60	50	
8	53	48	
9	58	46	35
10	30	22	39
11	24	11	44
12	2	2	2
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	113	90	0
Total	2,258	1,501	120

Comments: There is an under 25% decrease in reading and mathematics instruction provided to 6th and 7th grade students and over 25% increase in to 3rd and 5th grade students in S/I because elementary grades targeted for summer school. Per the explanation provided in 2.3.1.2, one of the primary intents of summer programming is to build students' foundational reading and mathematics skills. In addition, science camps (reading instruction incorporated into the lessons) highly popular for 5th graders.

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	87	86
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	481	474
K	425	421
1	357	348
2	341	329
3	290	287
4	254	253
5	263	262
6	176	170
7	136	135
8	105	104
9	100	100
10	80	80
11	72	72
12	12	12
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	195	195
Total	3,374	3,328

Comments: As noted, elementary population targeted for summer programming. There were less age 3 through 5 year (not kindergarten) and 8th - 11th grade student participating in summer, which explains the under 25% decrease in counseling, and support services provided to these students. Furthermore, the overall decrease in the OSY population explains the decrease in these services in S/I provided to OSY.

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.

2.3.5 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	777
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,795
K	1,671
1	1,535
2	1,376
3	1,372
4	1,091
5	1,092
6	1,047
7	974
8	944
9	1,066
10	946
11	816
12	706
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,703
Total	20,911

Comments: The eligible 12th grade migrant student count increased significantly. As noted in 2.3.2.4, more 12th grade students returned to finish high school. This explains the over 25% increase in the 12th grade student served during the performance period. The OSY population overall dropped, which explains the decrease in the number of OSY served during the performance period.

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	995
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	22,912
Comments: All data is accurate as reported.	

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: These values are 0. Florida has no schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a school wide program.	

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	46	16,118
Regular school year - school day/extended day	11	1,012
Summer/intersession only	15	647
Year round	29	3,480
Comments:		

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:	

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	88	64	30	29
Counselors	10	9	2	2
All paraprofessionals	82	67	35	32
Recruiters	10	7	0	0
Records transfer staff	0	0	0	0
Administrators	4	3	2	2
Comments:				

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 CSRP 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	71	59.00	34	31.00
Comments:				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of *ESEA*).

2.4 Prevention AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 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	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	1	196
Adult corrections	1	52
Other	0	0
Total	2	
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	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	1
Adult Corrections	1
Other	0
Total	2
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			79	2,808	
Total Long Term Students Served			61	938	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			29	1,630	
LEP Students			2	62	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			0	2	
Asian			0	8	
Black or African American			57	1,806	
Hispanic or Latino			14	313	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			8	679	
Two or more races			0	0	
Total			79	2,808	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			79	2,573	
Female			0	235	
Total			79	2,808	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			0	0	
13			0	0	
14			1	0	
15			9	7	
16			26	54	
17			43	148	
18			0	397	
19			0	645	
20			0	792	
21			0	765	
Total			79	2,808	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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?			YES	YES	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			0	1,115	

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
Enrolled in their local district school					60	19	S	S		
Earned high school course credits					62	S	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					S	S	439	S		
Earned a GED					S	S	389	S		
Obtained high school diploma					S	S	S	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					S	S	8	5		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					S	S	513	S		
Obtained employment					S	S	6	118		

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			58	S	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			S	739	

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			8		
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			6		
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			11		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			15		
Comments: Due to the transition to a new statewide assessment we have been able to get accurate outcome data for students in juvenile corrections facilities. We are working with the vendor to correct this problem for the future.					

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			53	S	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			S	800	

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			8		
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			4		
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			13		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			15		
Comments: Due to the transition to a new statewide assessment we have been able to get accurate performance data for students in juvenile corrections facilities. We are working with the vendor to correct this problem for the future.					

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	172	153
Neglected programs	132	189
Juvenile detention	23	11
Juvenile corrections	94	121
Other	0	0
Total	421	
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	172
Neglected programs	132
Juvenile detention	23
Juvenile corrections	94
Other	0
Total	421
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	8,781	899	8,057	5,937	0
Total Long Term Students Served	5,543	737	81	3,300	0

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	1,912	215	2,356	1,714	0
LEP Students	760	37	151	64	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	41		21	15	0
Asian	46	2	19	12	0
Black or African American	3,828	511	4,148	3,203	0
Hispanic or Latino	1,993	120	965	804	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	6	1	8	6	0
White	2,607	230	2,667	1,783	0
Two or more races	260	35	229	114	0
Total	8,781	899	8,057	5,937	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	5,677	476	6,350	3,959	0
Female	3,104	423	1,707	1,978	0
Total	8,781	899	8,057	5,937	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	7	11			0
6	27	31			0
7	33	40			0
8	93	38			0
9	285	27	3		0
10	237	49	4	2	0
11	240	46	35	5	0
12	490	43	116	62	0
13	1,021	51	376	181	0
14	1,458	67	847	515	0
15	1,534	84	1,602	1,183	0
16	1,596	171	2,328	1,803	0
17	1,760	241	2,746	2,186	0
18					0
19					0
20					0
21					0

Total	8,781	899	8,057	5,937	0
-------	-------	-----	-------	-------	---

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

The blanks represent no data reported for that cell (not missing).

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?					
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	0	0	0	0	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The state has developed and made adjustments to the student information system to collect this data beginning with 2014-15 school year.

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	3,331	2,324	395	281	2,932	1,543	3,012	1,747		
Earned high school course credits	7,781	2,593	706	262	7,117	2,435	5,099	2,325		
Enrolled in a GED program	10	24	S	S	20	46	17	29		
Earned a GED	8	22		4	15	54	104	108		
Obtained high school diploma	21	13	S		7	7	12	8		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	5	8	S		S	10	7	10		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	4			S	4		4		
Obtained employment	230	125	39	12	91	119	103	91		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The blanks represent no data reported for that cell (not missing).

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	89	37	S	378	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	103	54	S	301	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)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	5	5	S	60	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	64	26	S	160	0
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	22	5	S	63	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	12	18	S	58	0
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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	99	36	S	342	0
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	108	54	S	297	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)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	4	5	S	47	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	78	28	S	164	0
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	20	4	S	62	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	6	17	S	64	0
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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
Alcohol, past 30 day use - % of students	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grades 6 - 12	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 25.3	34.3	1999-2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 24.6		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 22.7		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Binge drinking of alcohol - % of students	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grades 6 - 12	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 11.9	18.8	1999-2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 11.3		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 9.5		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: FYSAS did not collect this data for 2010-11		

Cigarettes, mean age of first use	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS), Grade 12 only	Annually	2005-2006	2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: FYSAS did not collect this data for 2011-12	12.0	1999-2000	
				2012-13: Not Available				2012-13: FYSAS did not collect this data for 2012-13
				2013-14: Not Available				
				2014-15: Not Available				

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Cigarettes - % of 12th graders who used cigarettes in their lifetime	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS), Grade 12 only	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 35.4	56.2	2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 36.5		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 32.1		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Cigarettes - % of 12th graders who used cigarettes in the past 30 days	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grade 12 only	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 13.4	25.4	2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 13.9		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 11.1		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

			Year of				
--	--	--	----------------	--	--	--	--

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Smokeless tobacco - past 30 day use - % of students	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grades 6 - 12	Annually	2008-2009	2010- 11: Not Available	2010-11: FYSAS did not collect this data for 2010-11	6.2	1999-2000
				2011- 12: Not Available	2011-12: FYSAS did not collect this data for 2011-12		
				2012- 13: Not Available	2012-13: FYSAS did not collect this data for 2012-13		
				2013- 14: Not Available			
				2014- 15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise. For the Performance Indicator "Smokeless tobacco - past 30 day use - % of students", the data collected in both 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 has been identified as being "invalid". The data source "Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey" has dropped this question from its survey for middle school, thereby causing the overall data to be invalid. For this reason, the data source should be changed to another survey, "Florida Youth Tobacco Survey" which asks this of students in grades 6-12, and for which the following data should be updated as accurate (however, due to differing data sources, the data appears to have spiked in this area): 2007-2008: 9.0%; 2008-2009: 8.9%.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Any illicit drug other than marijuana, past 30 days - % of students	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grades 6 - 12	Annually	2012-2013	2010- 11: Not Available	2010-11: 9.5	9.3	1999-2000
				2011- 12: Not Available	2011-12: 8.2		
				2012- 13: Not Available	2012-13: 8.1		
				2013- 14: Not Available			
				2014- 15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010- 11: Not Available	2010-11: 8.7		
				2011- 12: Not Available	2011-12: 7.9		
				2012- 13: Not	2012-13: 7.1		

Attacking someone with intent of hurting them (past 12 months - % of students)	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grades 6 - 12	Annually	2012-2013	Available	18.1	1999-2000
				2013-14: Not Available		
				2014-15: Not Available		

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006-2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Alcohol, mean age of first use - more than a sip	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grades 6 -12	Annually	2005-2006	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: This indicator has not been collected in FYSAS since 2006.	12.3	1999-2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: This indicator has not been collected in FYSAS since 2006.		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: This indicator has not been collected in FYSAS since 2006.		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006-2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Alcohol - % of 12th graders who started using alcohol at age 13 or younger - more than a sip	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS) Grade 12 Only	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 20.1	31.8	2001
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 19.5		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 18.5		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006-2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

		Frequency	Year of most				Year
--	--	------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	-------------

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	of Collection	recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Baseline Established
Percentage of students who perceive GREAT RISK of HARM in smoking marijuana regularly	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS)	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 54.1	59.5	1999-2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 50.9		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 40.8		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: *In 2013, the description of marijuana use was changed from "regularly" to "once or twice a week." As a result, care should be exercised when comparing 2013 data to previous years. The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006-2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students who think it would be WRONG for someone their age to smoke marijuana regularly	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS)	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 77.4	78.9	1999-2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 76.6		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 75.6		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006-2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students who perceive GREAT RISK of HARM if they	Florida Youth			2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 43.9		
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 41.6		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 43.0		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-			

drink 1 or more alcoholic drinks nearly everyday	Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS)	Annually	2012-2013	15: Not Available		40.5	1999-2000
--	--------------------------------	----------	-----------	-------------------	--	------	-----------

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students who think it would be WRONG for someone their age to drink alcohol regularly	Florida Youth Substance Abuse Survey (FYSAS)	Annually	2012-2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 70.2	66.0	1999-2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: 70.4		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 72.3		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students who had been threatened or injured with a weapon one or more times in the past 12 months on school property	Florida Youth Risk Behavior Survey (FYRBS) Grades 9 - 12	Biannually-odd	2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 7.2	10.9	2001
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: Not Available		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 7.1		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise. Four Actual Performance data elements are not collected as these were previously collected through the data source indicated; however, changes were made within recent years and as stated, this data is no longer collected in this format. For the purposes of responding to this report, there is no other data source from which this data can be collected. Actual Performance data, collected via the Youth Risk Behavior Survey is only collected every other year.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: Not Available		

Percentage of students carrying a weapon on school property in the 30 days prior to the survey	Florida Youth Risk Behavior Survey (FYRBS) Grades 9 - 12	Biannually-odd	2009	2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: Not Available	5.4	2001
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: Not Available		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise. Four Actual Performance data elements are not collected as these were previously collected through the data source indicated; however, changes were made within recent years and as stated, this data is no longer collected in this format. For the purposes of responding to this report, there is no other data source from which this data can be collected. Actual Performance data, collected via the Youth Risk Behavior Survey is only collected every other year.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Percentage of students involved in a physical fight on school property one or more times in the past 12 months	Florida Youth Risk Behavior Survey (FYRBS) Grades 9 - 12	Biannually-odd	2013	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: 10.2	12.7	2001
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: Not Available		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: 8.1		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2006/2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise. Four Actual Performance data elements are not collected as these were previously collected through the data source indicated; however, changes were made within recent years and as stated, this data is no longer collected in this format. For the purposes of responding to this report, there is no other data source from which this data can be collected. Actual Performance data, collected via the Youth Risk Behavior Survey is only collected every other year.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
	School			2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: Not Available		
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: Not Available		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: Not Available		
				2013-14: Not Available			

Fighting incidents per 1,000 students, Grades K - 12	Environmental Safety Incident Report (SESIR)	Annually	2008-2009	2014-15: Not Available		26.4	1999-2000
--	--	----------	-----------	------------------------	--	------	-----------

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise. Four Actual Performance data elements are not collected as these were previously collected through the data source indicated; however, changes were made within recent years and as stated, this data is no longer collected in this format. For the purposes of responding to this report, there is no other data source from which this data can be collected. Actual Performance data collected via the School Environmental Safety Incident Report is collected annually but takes approximately one year to process.
Source - Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Battery incidents per 1,000 students, Grades K-12	School Environmental Safety Incident Report (SESIR)	Annually	2008-2009	2010-11: Not Available	2010-11: Not Available	5.3	1999-2000
				2011-12: Not Available	2011-12: Not Available		
				2012-13: Not Available	2012-13: Not Available		
				2013-14: Not Available			
				2014-15: Not Available			

Comments: The targets have been identified as "Not Available" since 2007. Prior to and leading up to 2005, the targets were developed and specified through a collaboration of multiple prevention based agencies and organizations, under the direction of the Governor's Office of Drug Control. Upon the expiration of the target data, no new targets have been established. No request has been made for the SEA or program office to identify or set specific targets for this report or otherwise. Four Actual Performance data elements are not collected as these were previously collected through the data source indicated; however, changes were made within recent years and as stated, this data is no longer collected in this format. For the purposes of responding to this report, there is no other data source from which this data can be collected. Actual Performance data collected via the School Environmental Safety Incident Report is collected annually but takes approximately one year to process.

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 possession, sale, purchase, or use* of alcoholic beverages. (*includes admission of use)
Illicit drug related	The use*, or possession, of any drug, narcotic, controlled substance, or any substance when used for hallucinogenic purposes. (*includes admission of use)
Violent incident without physical injury	"Violent Incidents" are Homicide, Sexual Battery, Battery, and Kidnapping. When reporting any of these SESIR incidents, LEAs must also report the "Injury-Related" element. The "Injury-Related" element is broken down into three separate codes: (A) More Serious Bodily Injury, (B) Less Serious Bodily Injury, or (C) No Serious Bodily Injury.
Violent incident with physical injury	"Violent Incidents if they Result in Bodily Injury" are Arson, Breaking and Entering/Burglary, Disruption on Campus-Major, Robbery, Other Major, Bullying/Harassment, Fighting, and Sexual Harassment. When reporting any of these SESIR incidents, districts must also report the "Injury-Related" element. The "Injury-Related" element is broken down into three separate codes: (A) More Serious Bodily Injury, (B) Less Serious Bodily Injury, or (C) No Serious Bodily Injury.
Weapons possession	Possession of firearms and any other instrument or object (as defined by Section 790.001(13), Florida Statutes, or district code of conduct) that can inflict serious harm on another person or that can place a person in reasonable fear of serious harm. Every incident of weapon possession must be coded as Weapon-Related and Weapon Description used/possessed.
Comments: None	

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	48	72
6 through 8	112	72
9 through 12	73	72
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	0	72
6 through 8	0	72
9 through 12	0	72
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	759	72
6 through 8	2,213	72
9 through 12	1,912	72
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	S	72
6 through 8	18	72
9 through 12	28	72
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	261	72
6 through 8	447	72
9 through 12	391	72
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	4	72
6 through 8	20	72
9 through 12	27	72
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	13	72
6 through 8	303	72
9 through 12	718	72
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	72
6 through 8	S	72
9 through 12	7	72
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	136	72
6 through 8	2,247	72
9 through 12	5,691	72
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	72
6 through 8	29	72
9 through 12	71	72
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
Yes	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
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No	Other Specify 1
No	Other Specify 2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No response.

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	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	0
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	0
Parental involvement activities	0
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	28
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments:	

19Franklin08-20-78NNY
19Franklin09Na0NaNaNNa
19Franklin10-12-911NNY
21Gilchrist03-2-2NaNNNa
21Gilchrist044424YYY
21Gilchrist05-76NaYNa
21Gilchrist06-23-12NaNNNa
21Gilchrist0781NaYNNa
21Gilchrist08-1315NNY
21Gilchrist09Na0NaNaNNa
21Gilchrist10122NNY
22Glades0345NaYNa
22Glades049423YYY
22Glades058-1NaYNNa
22Glades061-1NaNNNa
22Glades074-10NaYNNa
22Glades089223YNY
22Glades09Na6NaNaNNa
22Glades102-2-3NNN
23Gulf035-6NaYNNa
23Gulf045-511YNY
23Gulf05-5-2NaNNNa
23Gulf06-4-4NaNNNa
23Gulf07-110NaNNNa
23Gulf0814109YYY
23Gulf09Na5NaNaNNa
23Gulf10-7-15NNY
24Hamilton03146NaYNa
24Hamilton04141328YYY
24Hamilton054-7NaNNNa
24Hamilton06184NaYNNa
24Hamilton07-13-3NaNNNa
24Hamilton088135YNY
24Hamilton09Na-8NaNaNNa
24Hamilton10-4-17NNY
25Hardee03-6-9NaNNNa
25Hardee042-933NNY
25Hardee0539NaYNa
25Hardee061-5NaNNNa
25Hardee07-5-5NaNNNa
25Hardee081316NNY
25Hardee09Na12NaNaYNa
25Hardee10-13-2-2NNN
26Hendry03-9-2NaNNNa
26Hendry042-619NNY
26Hendry0534NaYNa
26Hendry06-4-7NaNNNa
26Hendry07-1-2NaNNNa
26Hendry08339NNY
26Hendry09Na-8NaNaNNa
26Hendry10-1-3-2NNN
28Highl&S03-1-1NaNNNa
28Highl&S041218NNY
28Highl&S05-2-2NaNNNa
28Highl&S062-1NaNNNa
28Highl&S07-20NaNNNa
28Highl&S084310YNY
28Highl&S09Na-2NaNaNNa
28Highl&S10002NNN
30Holmes03-4-3NaNNNa
30Holmes043-129YNY
30Holmes0534NaYNa
30Holmes066-7NaYNNa
30Holmes07-30NaNNNa
30Holmes083126NYY
30Holmes09Na-2NaNaNNa
30Holmes10-305NNN

32Jackson0335NaYYNa
32Jackson042-117YNY
32Jackson05-23NaNNNa
32Jackson0663NaYNNa
32Jackson07103NaYNNa
32Jackson08-2-515NNY
32Jackson09Na0NaNaNNa
32Jackson10-447NNY
33Jefferson03174NaYNNa
33Jefferson0452827NYY
33Jefferson052014NaYYNa
33Jefferson06-21NaNNNa
33Jefferson07-3-8NaNNNa
33Jefferson080130NNY
33Jefferson09Na-8NaNaNNa
33Jefferson10-3-62NNN
34Lafayette033-11NaYNNa
34Lafayette04679YYY
34Lafayette05-43NaNNNa
34Lafayette062-6NaNNNa
34Lafayette071417NaYYNa
34Lafayette08-1216NNY
34Lafayette09Na-11NaNaNNa
34Lafayette10141214YYY
38Levy032-1NaNNNa
38Levy04-4-333NNY
38Levy05-7-8NaNNNa
38Levy0604NaNYNa
38Levy07-5-2NaNNNa
38Levy086417YNY
38Levy09Na2NaNaNNa
38Levy10324NNY
40Madison03-14NNaNNNa
40Madison04-11N28NYY
40Madison056YNaNYNa
40Madison06-10NNaNNNa
40Madison075NNaNNNa
40Madison08-4N-11NNN
40Madison09NaNNaNaYNa
40Madison10-14N5NNY
47Okeechobee03-4-1NaNNNa
47Okeechobee042-229NNY
47Okeechobee050-1NaNNNa
47Okeechobee06-4-5NaNNNa
47Okeechobee07-3-1NaNNNa
47Okeechobee08-7118NNY
47Okeechobee09Na-6NaNaNNa
47Okeechobee10265NNY
54Putnam031-4NaNNNa
54Putnam040-118NNY
54Putnam05135NaYYNa
54Putnam064-2NaNNNa
54Putnam07-10NaNNNa
54Putnam08-347NNY
54Putnam09Na2NaNaNNa
54Putnam10-9-10NNN
60Sumter0313NaNYNa
60Sumter041118NNY
60Sumter0525NaNYNa
60Sumter060-1NaNNNa
60Sumter0721NaNNNa
60Sumter088216YNY
60Sumter09Na2NaNaNNa
60Sumter10-66-1NYN
61Suwannee031-1NaNNNa
61Suwannee043733NYY
61Suwannee0514NaNYNa

61Suwannee06-3-4NaNNNa
61Suwannee076-2NaYNNa
61Suwannee08-8-113NNY
61Suwannee09Na-3NaNaNNa
61Suwannee10177NNY
62Taylor03-10-7NaNNNa
62Taylor04-6417NYY
62Taylor0540NaNNNa
62Taylor0620NaNNNa
62Taylor0742NaYNNa
62Taylor080-222NNY
62Taylor09Na-2NaNaNNa
62Taylor10-739NNY
66Walton03-1-2NaNNNa
66Walton045425YYY
66Walton0552NaYNNa
66Walton065-3NaYNNa
66Walton0710NaNNNa
66Walton086913YYY
66Walton09Na-4NaNaNNa
66Walton10-7-2-2NNN
67Washington03-6-3NaNNNa
67Washington04-4015NNY
67Washington05-127NaYNa
67Washington06-2-5NaNNNa
67Washington0733NaNNNa
67Washington081-311NNY
67Washington09Na-5NaNaNNa
67Washington105-47YNY
goal 2each Participating Lea Will < The Proportion Of All Students Scoring Non-Proficient OnFcat Reading Mathematics&
Writing By 10 % Each School Year Through 2013-2014districtDistrict NameWrit ChangeRead ChangeMath ChangeGoal Met
WritGoal Met ReadGoal Met Math
00StateNa00NaNN
04Bradford-6-20NNN
07Calhoun-20-1NNN
09Citrus-111NNN
12Columbia-1-11NNN
14Desoto0-5-2NNN
15Dixie434YNY
19Franklin-5-2-4NNN2111-2NNN
22Glades127NNY
23Gulf11-1NNN
24Hamilton-617NNY
25Hardee7-2-1YNN
26Hendry0-30NNN
28Highl&S-8-10NNN
30Holmes-311NNN
32Jackson-322NNN
33Jefferson024NNN
34Lafayette204NNY
38Levy51-2YNN
40Madison-100-6NNN
47Okeechobee10-2NNN
54Putnam-502NNN
60Sumter230YYN
61Suwannee221NNN
goal 3-Cut The Average Gap Between Minority & Non-Minority20 % Each School Year Through 2013-2014distDist NameGap
Writ Goal MetGap Read Goal MetGap Math Goal Met
04BradfordNNN
07CalhounNNN
09CitrusNNN
12ColumbiaNNN
14DesotoNNN
15DixieNYN
19FranklinNNN
21GilchristNNN
22GladesNNN

23GulfNNN
24HamiltonNNN
25HardeeNNN
26HendryNNN
28Highl&SNNN
30HolmesNNN
32JacksonNNN
33JeffersonNNN
34LafayetteNNN
38LevyNNN
40MadisonNNN
47OkeechobeeNNN
54PutnamNNN
goal 4-Each Participating Lea Will < The Proportion Of Hs StudentdistrictDistrict NameReduce By 10%Goal Met
04Bradford-5.01N
07Calhoun-0.53N
09Citrus0.43N
12Columbia1.15N
14Desoto2.45N
15Dixie6.56N
19Franklin-3.51N
21gilcHRIST0.74N
22GLADES8.23N
23GULF-0.63N
24HAMILTON-4.21N
25HARDEE0.20N
26HENDRY5.60N
28HIGHLANDS1.43N
30HOLMES-0.42N
32JACKSON3.51N
33JEFFERSON-9.98N
34LAFAYETTE14.52N
38LEVY5.05N
40MADISON2.06N
47OKEECHOBEE6.26N
54PUTNAM2.18N
60SUMTER2.79N
61SUWANNEE2.35N
62TAYLOR1.08N
66WALTON1.26N
67WASHINGTON1.92N

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

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)	0.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		0.00
Total	0.00	0.00

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

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	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	77
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.4
<i>Asian</i>	88.4
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	
Black or African American	64.6
Hispanic or Latino	74.9
White	80.5
Two or more races	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	67.0

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Florida's State Accountability Plan does not include 'Two or more races' or 'Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander'.
--

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 ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN032 "List of Other Identified 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 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>.