

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**

MAINE



**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: Maine		
Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0023		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Rachelle Tome		
Telephone: 207-624-6708		
Fax: 207-624-6706		
e-mail: rachelle.tome@maine.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Rachelle Tome		
		Friday, April 4, 2014, 4:28:23 PM
_____ Signature		

This section of the 2012-13 CSPR was certified by Rachelle Tome rachelle.tome@maine.gov 207-624-6708

**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	2,188	S	54
4	1,871	S	58
5	1,655	S	51
6	1,296	S	62
7	766	S	58
8	824	S	59
High School	373	S	44
Total	8,973	S	56.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,177	S	64
4	1,869	S	64
5	1,651	S	66
6	1,295	S	70
7	764	S	70
8	824	S	78
High School	371	S	44
Total	8,951	S	66.3
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	9,798	S	62.3
4	9,263	S	65.7
5	8,513	S	62.1
6	5,421	S	61.1
7	4,311	S	56.3
8	4,190	S	56.9
High School	836	S	44
Total	42,332	S	61.3
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	9,792	S	68.3
4	9,268	S	68.9
5	8,511	S	71.1
6	5,418	S	68.8
7	4,316	S	68.2
8	4,191	S	76.0
High School	835	S	45
Total	42,331	S	69.3
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I 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>)	5,479
Limited English proficient students	1,803
Students who are homeless	555
Migratory students	5
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	302
Asian	454
Black or African American	1,939
Hispanic or Latino	698
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	39
White	30,607
Two or more races	561
Total	34,600
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)	124	917	0	0	1,041
K	2,134	2,352	14	0	4,500
1	3,043	2,348	51	0	5,442
2	2,769	2,407	35	0	5,211
3	2,206	2,423	30	0	4,659
4	1,904	2,114	29	0	4,047
5	1,580	1,938	21	0	3,539
6	798	1,440	14	0	2,252
7	561	685	6	0	1,252
8	525	788	4	0	1,317
9	85	355	1	0	441
10	60	367	0	0	427
11	16	344	1	0	361
12	0	329	3	0	332
Ungraded	0	0	6	0	6
TOTALS	15,805	18,807	215	0	34,827

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	6,734
Reading/language arts	12,125
Science	20
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	210
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	119
Other support services	32
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	466	
Paraprofessionals ¹	457	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	9	
Clerical support staff	9	
Administrators (non-clerical)	19	
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	394.00	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 *	132	35
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	18,363	378,043
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	18,727,585	30,464,829
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.10	1.20

*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.

Title IA Home School Coordinators performed the following services: home/school visits, parent programs, phone calls/test messages, ongoing parenting support and skill development, collaboration with classroom teachers and other professionals from outside agencies, information to parents about community agencies, web pages, Title I articles in district newsletters, resource lending library for parents, books to students during the holiday season and at the end of the school year.

Home School Coordinator efforts involved coordinating and collaborating with DHHS, Head Start, Carelink, University of Maine cooperative Extension, Youth Alternatives, School staff, Kid's Legal, Community Libraries, Goodall Hospital, Spurwink Family Services and the Adult Learning Centers.

Programs offered in general parent projects are: specific Dad/Mom events, Healthy Eating Programs, Technology Nights, Math & Literacy Nights, Family Fun Nights, Math & Literacy breakfasts as well as community information and resources.

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:

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)	40
K	14
1	24
2	24
3	22
4	17
5	20
6	26
7	18
8	16
9	28
10	27
11	28
12	37
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	52
Total	393

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:

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	25

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)	28
K	7
1	15
2	18
3	14
4	14
5	16
6	17
7	13
8	6
9	21
10	18
11	12
12	17
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	18
Total	234
Comments: NA	

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: The increase in the count of summer served population is a product of an agricultural anomaly that impacted the harvest schedule. A local parasite infestation required growers to hire additional workers for a concentrated harvest of shorter duration. This increase in workers increased the numbers of eligible workers recruited as well as the children served at our summer MEP facilities serving these families and students. Additionally, many of the recruiting staff hired to support the harvest season were seasoned recruiters.

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

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

year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	113
Comments: NA	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

2.3.1.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

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

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data for Category 1 were collected by Identification and Recruitment MEP staff and temporary recruiting staff via tablet technology/electronic COE.

Data Elements and Sections Collected as required by the national COE.

Maine's MEP RSY and Summer Counts are of smaller proportions. This allows the State Education Agency to monitor each eligible child while they are present in Maine to ensure data quality and valid reporting. As a predominantly summer receiving state, Maine has developed strategies to ensure measurable impacts during short term projects, especially during the Summer Intercession, when most of Maine's eligible population arrives.

Maine Data Quality/Validation Procedures:

1. In building the EDFacts reports that populate the CSPR, the state's migrant data-base (MIS2000) administrator runs queries based upon the birthdate of the child to ensure an unduplicated inclusion of only those students who were at least 3 years of age and less than 22 years of age, for at least one day, of the reporting period. This algorithm also ensures only those students who have attained the age of 3 years old with a residency date during the reporting period are included in the 3-21 counts.
2. The system also auto-calculates the End Of Eligibility (EOE) and removes any child whose EOE occurs prior to the inception of the reporting period.
3. During the Summer Intercession Project, Maine's SEA Director works closely with the service provider staff to review common data sets to closely monitor the services to the 0-3 age sector of the population. In particular, any two year old turning three during this period is identified to ensure the child's inclusion into more comprehensive/robust services offered at the Blueberry Harvest School upon attaining the age of 3. This close monitoring at the time of the service provision ensures that all children three or turning three during the reporting period are captured in the final 3-21 counts.
4. Upon receipt of information that would terminate the eligibility of a student (Graduation, GED, etc.) a flag is placed on the student record by the state MEP data coordinator. Once this flag is placed in the system, the student would be included in the counts if the terminating event occurred DURING the reporting period, but prevented from inclusion in any future counts.

Category 1 and 2

Personal Data: male and female parent/guardian first and last name; relationship; legal male and female parent last and first name; current address; current phone number (if available); work phone number (if available); permanent address; permanent phone; student name first/middle/last1/last2/suffix grade; birth date; sex; age; place of birth (city/state/country), grade, multibirth flag, race and ethnicity.

Eligibility information:

Origin and destination of qualifying move: 'From' (District, City, State, Country); 'To' (School District, city, State, country); QA Date (QAD); Current Residency Date; whether the child moved with or joined parents or moved on his/her own; name of qualifying worker; relation to child; in order to obtain qualifying work; temporary/seasonal work; agriculture or fishing industry; specific qualifying activity; reason for temporary (if applicable); basis of temporary determination (if applicable); additional comments (if applicable); signature of parent/guardian or eligible student (if qualifying worker); signature of recruiter; eligibility verification date and signature by state MEP Director or approval authority.

Child count data for Category 2 were collected by Identification and Recruitment Maine MEP staff and temporary recruiting staff via tablet technology/electronic COE. In addition, service providers/MEP Projects collected data elements pertinent to Category 2 in Maine's MIS2000 web interface. Data elements were submitted to the SEA via Maine's MIS2000 Web Interface, which is linked to the primary MIS2000 database, electronic file submissions and paper copies (source/raw data).

MEP Project Data:

Current school or project; date of enrollment; attendance (total days present); type of instruction or services; total days enrolled; withdrawal date. LEP or Special Education designation, graduation and drop out data is extracted from the State Information System and then integrated into the MIS2000 system

COLLECTION OF DATA: METHODOLOGY/PROCESS

Category 1

Student demographic and eligibility data elements were collected on electronic COEs by State and temporary recruiters hired and trained by MEP staff and/or ESCORT staff for seasonal recruitment. The data elements were collected by means of personal interviews with parents and/or guardians during the school year and summer in Maine. Recruiters visited worker camps, crop sites, processing plants, homes, and schools to conduct interviews with potentially eligible families and workers. In some cases, preliminary phone interviews were conducted by recruiters to follow-up on school surveys to determine likely eligibility in order to schedule a personal interview to complete the COE.

Maine's MEP hired and deployed additional summer ID&R staff. Two 15 week experienced recruiters and an University of Maine intern were hired for the duration of the summer in order to ensure all eligible migratory children and youth were recruited and were provided with the opportunity to access the services they were entitled to receive during Maine's busiest crops, Broccoli and Blueberry Harvest. In addition, during the Blueberry Harvest (first three weeks in August), the SEA hired additional, temporary experienced Summer recruiters and an onsite ID&R coordinator through ESCORT. Summer interviews were conducted by teams of two recruiters using an initial screening tool in paper form (the field script), followed by tablet technology and electronic COEs. The recruiter collected and inputted data directly into MIS2000 tablet system; making the process more efficient and effective for the guardian or worker, the recruiter and the reviewer(s). Once a recruiter determined eligibility and entered the information it would be assigned a pending status; then the Field Leader would review the COE, followed by the ID&R coordinator. Lastly, the Director or Approval Authority reviewed the COE for verification. The data only becomes visible once this approval takes place. Only at that point, the data is populated into the system of record, MIS2000. Any cases with questions, inconsistencies, or missing data would be returned to the previous reviewer for additional clarifications. The system would alert reviewers and the recruiter that the COE was rejected. If the reviewers lack sufficient information to clarify questions or inconsistencies, the COE was returned to the original recruiter, who would have to re-interview the family again. The MIS2000 system also flags any field that would create a potential duplicate within the system based upon input data: first/last name, birthdate, gender, etc. The reviewer ensures the student does not already exist within the system with these checks. Additional quality assurance checks are completed with the MSIX portal for assurances of no duplication of records.

Category 2:

The Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on the review of data elements included in MEP Projects. The COE is the primary source for data-points in both databases. Additional data elements to populate Category 2 counts are collected by MEP projects via MIS2000 web interface as well as their own individual data management systems (source data). MEP Projects or Service Providers collect enrollment data, (attendance) number of days present and type of provided instruction. Based upon this information, students are flagged "Summer Services" (June 16- Aug 15) and/or "Regular School Year" in data base for inclusion in Category 2 counts.

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?

All of our reports are built utilizing our Migrant Student Information System Database - MIS2000. This ensures migrant data accurately accounts for all migrant children in each ED Facts data file; since all the data is contained in our MIS2000 system, and we use this system to produce our EDEN reports. Additional quality checks and assurances are also utilized by checking source level documentation to validate the aggregated totals produced by MIS2000 and, subsequently uploaded to EDEN - to ensure quality and accuracy of our reports.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MSIX data exchange is utilized as an addition validation tool to ensure our Migrant Student Information data system (MIS2000) is producing unduplicated MEP student counts. Any potential duplicate students identified by MSIX are scrutinized to determine if the student is a duplicate or not. If the student is found to be an actual duplicate, the change is made in MIS2000 as well as MSIX to ensure accurate, unduplicated student counts.

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.	65
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	11
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	11

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No children were deemed ineligible during the re-interview process.

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 by group. The Maine MEP used random samples from the statewide migrant population. Using the state's database for Migrant students, MIS2000, the Maine MEP generated a list of all the current eligible migrant students in Maine with a Qualifying Arrival Date between September 1, 2012 and August 31, 2013. The list of current eligible migrant students was exported into Microsoft Excel and a random list was generated. The first 50 samples on the randomly generated list were selected as re-interview samples.

An additional 15 samples that were also randomly generated were included as replacement samples, for a total sample pool of 65.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The list of migrant students was randomly ordered. The replacement samples were chosen from the same list. Numbers 1 through 50 were the original samples and number 51 through 65 were replacement samples.

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	Phone Interview
	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) 08/11

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No formal re-interview process was conducted during this reporting period. A formal re-interview process is scheduled for the 2013-14 reporting period.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable

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

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	1
1	2
2	1
3	3
4	2
5	4
6	1
7	1
8	
9	1
10	
11	3
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	20
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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	2
3	2
4	1
5	
6	1
7	
8	
9	2
10	1
11	1
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	11
Comments:	

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	24
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	26
K	11
1	21
2	20
3	14
4	13
5	16
6	22
7	16
8	12
9	20
10	18
11	19
12	30
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	48
Total	330
Comments:	

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	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9
K	
1	3
2	1
3	3
4	
5	2
6	4
7	3
8	
9	1
10	2
11	2
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	10
Total	48
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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	1
6	
7	
8	1
9	
10	1
11	
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	6
Comments:	

2.3.2.7 Referrals — During the Summer/ Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

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

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	S
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	S
12	0
Ungraded	
Total	3

Comments: While the numbers would indicate that the percentage of MEP students Dropping out has increased substantially from last year, our numbers are very low (1 in 2012 vs 3 in 2013). Additionally, 2 of the 3 students that were listed as Dropouts for 2013 actually were pursuing other educational endeavors thru the High School Equivalency Program (HEP). Maine classifies these students not pursuing a traditional education as dropouts; however, they are still pursuing educational advancements though in non-traditional means.

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	0
Comments:	

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	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	5
1	11
2	9
3	5
4	4
5	11
6	9
7	8
8	4
9	16
10	11
11	8
12	6
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	14
Total	140
Comments:	

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

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)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	1
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1
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	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14
K	5
1	11
2	6
3	5
4	4
5	11
6	7
7	7
8	3
9	8
10	7
11	4
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	9
Total	106

Comments: In 201-2012, Maine MEP SEA and Projects formulated innovative action plans based on individualized/customized learning. One of the primary goals was to deliver more meaningful instruction; which resulted in an increase in our overall enrollment counts, especially for Maine's recovery youth and/or those experiencing difficulties in school during the last reporting year. In 2012-2013, these efforts were strengthened, which resulted in a proportionate increase in the total counts.

2.3.3.4.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Regular School Year	Mathematics Instruction During the Regular School Year	High School Credit Accrual During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4	1	
K	3	3	
1	6	5	
2	4	4	
3	4	2	
4	3	2	
5	7	7	
6	2	2	
7	2		
8			
9	3	2	
10	5	3	
11	1		
12		1	
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	1	1	
Total	45	33	
Comments:			

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.3.4.2 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		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14	
K	5	
1	9	
2	8	
3	5	2
4	4	
5	11	1
6	8	
7	7	
8	3	
9	15	1
10	9	2
11	6	3
12	6	2
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	6	1
Total	116	12
Comments:		

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	13
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	28
K	7
1	15
2	18
3	14
4	14
5	16
6	17
7	13
8	6
9	21
10	18
11	12
12	17
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	18
Total	247

Comments: The increase in the count of the summer served population is a product of an agricultural anomaly that impacted the harvest schedule. A local parasite infestation required growers to hire additional workers for a concentrated harvest of shorter duration. This increase in workers increased the numbers of eligible workers recruited as well as the children served at our summer MEP facilities serving these families and students. In addition, during the 2012-2013 reporting year, ME MEP SEA established new benchmarks in preparation for its summer programming. The intent was to ensure the accomplishment of the ME MEP summer goal (a minimum of 70% participation in Summer Services per our SDP Goal) through the provision of meaningful and intentionally dynamic/hands on, academically driven Programs/Projects both for OSY, ISY (In School Youth) and school age children. We moved from a service provision model to one that focused on service participation. This vision and its correspondent strategies/approaches resulted in highly customized, student centered and hands-on projects; which in turn, resulted in higher participation across all MEP Projects and higher than expected results.

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

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	13
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	21
K	7
1	15
2	16
3	13
4	13
5	16
6	16
7	10
8	3
9	7
10	5
11	3
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	8
Total	167
Comments:	

2.3.4.4.1 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term	Mathematics Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term	High School Credit Accrual During the Summer/ Intersession Term
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5	5	
K	6	6	
1	14	14	
2	16	16	
3	12	13	
4	12	12	
5	14	14	
6	3	2	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	82	82	
Comments:			

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.4.4.2 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	11	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23	1
K	7	
1	13	
2	17	
3	13	1
4	14	3
5	15	1
6	15	3
7	12	1
8	5	
9	18	
10	16	
11	12	1
12	16	
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	13	
Total	220	11

Comments: The increase in the count of the summer served population is a product of an agricultural anomaly that impacted the harvest schedule. A local parasite infestation required growers to hire additional workers for a concentrated harvest of shorter duration. This increase in workers increased the numbers of eligible workers recruited as well as the children served at our summer MEP facilities serving these families and students. In addition, during the 2012-2013 reporting year, ME MEP SEA established new benchmarks in preparation for its summer programming. The intent was to ensure the accomplishment of the ME MEP summer goal (a minimum of 70% participation in Summer Services per our SDP Goal) through the provision of meaningful and intentionally dynamic/hands on, academically driven Programs/Projects both for OSY, ISY (In School Youth) and school age children. We moved from a service provision model to one that focused on service participation. This vision and its correspondent strategies/approaches resulted in highly customized, student centered and hands-on projects; which in turn, resulted in higher participation across all MEP Projects and higher than expected results. In 2011-12 the Maine MEP Summer Harvest School hired a full time guidance counselor. During the 2011-2012 summer Blueberry Harvest School (one of ME MEP Summer Projects) a full time guidance counselor was hired to assess and address the children's counseling needs. In 2012-2013, the needs were addressed instead by two cultural liaisons. Each cultural liaison was to address the needs of the two most prominent cultures represented at the school - Hispanic/Latino and Mic Mac (Native American). The ongoing services provided by these two new roles, such as conduits of ongoing face-to-face, written and verbal communication, resulted in a decrease of the counseling counts by student, however, exhibited a much more effective and meaningful service provision model.

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	15
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	30
K	7
1	17
2	20
3	14
4	14
5	17
6	18
7	13
8	7
9	26
10	22
11	16
12	21
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	26
Total	283
Comments:	

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	27
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	63
Comments:	

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: During the reporting period, the Maine Migrant Education Program was administered and managed solely at the SEA level; there were no sub-grantees during the reporting period. All services were coordinated and rendered by contractor(s).	

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	0	0
Regular school year - school day/extended day	2	140
Summer/intersession only	3	247
Year round	2	283
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: During the 2012-2013 reporting period, the Maine Department of Education assigned and funded a full time director solely dedicated to Migrant Education, Title I, Part C.	

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	0	0	0	0
Counselors	0	0	0	0
All paraprofessionals	0	0	0	0
Recruiters	2	0	2	2
Records transfer staff	0	0	0	0
Administrators	0	0	0	0
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	0	0.00	0	0.00
Comments: During the reporting period the Maine Migrant Education Program was administered solely by the SEA. Service provision for eligible migrants was contracted through ESCORT/SUNY. Therefore, service provision was not provided by directly funded MEP staff. Our initial data was based on a definition of MEP funded -staff as those paid directly by MEP, and not indirectly through contracts. ALL Maine MEP staff who provided services to Maine's eligible population, including teachers and para professionals, were contracted staff.				

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	1	20
Juvenile corrections	1	207
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	2	
Comments: N/C		

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	1
Juvenile Corrections	1
Adult Corrections	0
Other	0
Total	2
Comments: N/C	

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		170	78		
Total Long Term Students Served		9	61		

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)		60	38		
LEP Students		0	38		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native		11	6		
Asian					
Black or African American		3	5		
Hispanic or Latino			1		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White		149	66		
Two or more races		7			
Total		170	78		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		143	78		
Female		27	0		
Total		170	78		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14		10	5		
15		26	11		
16		40	13		
17		46	23		
18		42	21		
19		6	3		
20			2		
21					
Total		170	78		

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: N/C

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

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

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?		NO	YES		
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.		26	78		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: THE BLANK CELLS INDICATE NO SUCH PROGRAM EXISTS. ONCE A YOUTH IS RELEASED FROM DETENTION, NO FORMAL CHARGES WERE MADE AGAINST THEM THEREFORE THERE IS NO FOLLOWUP DONE.

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

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

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who										
Enrolled in their local district school			26	0	78	10				
Earned high school course credits			S	0	71	10				
Enrolled in a GED program			S	0	18	S				
Earned a GED			S	0	S	S				
Obtained high school diploma			S	0	S	S				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			S	0	S	S				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			S	0	40	S				
Obtained employment			S	0	5	S				

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: N/C

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		0	5		
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		0	40		

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	5	0	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	5	0	0
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	4	0	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	29	0	0
Comments: The blanks indicate that we do not have that program in place.					

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		0	34		
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)		0	44		

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	10	0	0
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	4	0	0
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	4	0	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	26	0	0
Comments: We do not have programs for the areas highlighted.					

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	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	3	223
Other	0	0
Total	3	
Comments:		

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	3
Other	0
Total	3
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				20	
Total Long Term Students Served				32	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)				11	
LEP Students					

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American				1	
Hispanic or Latino					
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White				19	
Two or more races					
Total				20	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				6	
Female				14	
Total				20	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12				1	
13				2	
14				3	
15				5	
16				5	
17				1	
18				2	
19					
20				1	
21					

Total			20	
-------	--	--	----	--

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

N/C

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

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

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?				YES	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.				32	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: THE BLANK FIELDS INDICATE NO SUCH PROGRAM EXISTS.

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							S	6		
Earned high school course credits							12	12		
Enrolled in a GED program								S		
Earned a GED								S		
Obtained high school diploma							S	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education								S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs								S		
Obtained employment								S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: N/C

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				14	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)				25	

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	
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				14	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				4	
Comments: N/C					

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				17	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)				25	

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				S	
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				17	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				S	
Comments: N/C					

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
Data will be provided when the system reopens in March	Data will be provided when the system reopens in March		Data will be provided when the system reopens in March	2010-11: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March	2010-11: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March	Data will be provided when the system reopens in March	
				2011-12: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March	2011-12: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March		
				2012-13: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March	2012-13: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March		
				2013-14: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March			
				2014-15: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March			
Comments: Data will be provided when the system reopens in March							

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	Possession, sale, manufacture, distribution, use, or showing evidence of use of any alcoholic substances.
Illicit drug related	<p>Maine has two incident types</p> <p>Marijuana-Related: Possession, sale, manufacture, distribution, use, or showing evidence of use of marijuana substances.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Other Drug-Related: Illegal drug possession, sale, manufacture, distribution, use, being under the influence of drugs other than tobacco, alcohol or marijuana. (Includes "huffing" or inhaling mind-altering substances. Includes substances represented as drugs. Includes drug paraphernalia possession or use of drugs such as steroids, speed, cocaine, heroin, etc. Includes taking or selling prescription drugs not intended for the individual involved, such as Ritalin or painkillers. Includes over the counter drugs or legal substances if abused by the student, including glue, substances in aerosol cans, paint thinner, etc. EXCLUDES TOBACCO, ALCOHOL, AND MARIJUANA.</p>
Violent incident without physical injury	<p>Maine has 21 incident types that equate to violent</p> <p>Aggravated Assault</p> <p>Arson</p> <p>Battery</p> <p>Bomb Threat Bomb-Related</p> <p>Bullying/Injurious Hazing</p> <p>Extortion</p> <p>Fighting</p> <p>Fireworks</p> <p>Gang Fight</p> <p>Harassment - Sexual</p> <p>Harassment - Other</p> <p>Hate Crime/Bias</p> <p>Homicide</p> <p>Kidnapping</p> <p>Physical Attack</p> <p>Robbery</p> <p>Sexual Battery</p> <p>Simple Assault</p> <p>Threat / Intimidation</p> <p>Vandalism (criminal mischief)</p>
Violent incident with physical injury	<p>Injury is reported along with any of the following 21 incidents that Maine equates to violent</p> <p>Aggravated Assault</p> <p>Arson</p> <p>Battery</p> <p>Bomb Threat Bomb-Related</p> <p>Bullying/Injurious Hazing</p> <p>Extortion</p> <p>Fighting</p> <p>Fireworks</p> <p>Gang Fight</p> <p>Harassment - Sexual</p> <p>Harassment - Other</p> <p>Hate Crime/Bias</p> <p>Homicide</p> <p>Kidnapping</p> <p>Physical Attack</p> <p>Robbery</p>

	Sexual Battery Simple Assault Threat / Intimidation Vandalism (criminal mischief)
Weapons possession	Maine has 5 incident types that equate to Weapons Assault With Firearm: An attempt to cause or purposely cause serious bodily injury to another by use of a firearm. (See also: "Possession of Firearm" definition.) Assault With Other Weapon: An attempt to cause or purposely cause serious bodily injury to another by use of a weapon other than a firearm. (See also: "Possession of Other Weapon" definition.) Possession of Firearm: Possession of a handgun, rifle, or shotgun. (Do not include BB guns and other air-powered rifles; they should be considered "other weapons.") According to the Gun-Free Schools Act and the United States Code (18 USC 921), firearms include: Any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of any explosive; The frame or receiver of any weapon described above; Any destructive device, which includes: (A) any explosive, incendiary, or poison gas (1) bomb; (2) grenade; (3) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces; (4) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than one-quarter ounce; (5) mine; or (6) similar device (B) any weapon which will, or which may readily be converted to, expel a projectile by the action of an explosive or other propellant, and which has any barrel with a bore of more than one-half inch in diameter. (C) any combination of parts either designed or intended for use in converting any device into any destructive device described in the two immediately preceding examples, and from which a destructive device may be readily assembled. Possession of Other Weapon: Any instrument or object, OTHER THAN A FIREARM, possessed or used to inflict harm on another person, or to intimidate any person. Examples include all types of knives, chains, pipes, razor blades or similar instruments with sharp cutting edges; ice picks, dirks, other pointed instruments (including pens and pencils); numchucks; brass knuckles; Chinese stars; billy clubs; tear gas guns; electrical weapons or devices (stun guns); BB or pellet guns; explosives or propellant type weapons not listed in the "Possession of a Firearm" definition. Sale or Transfer of a Weapon: Selling or transferring a firearm or other weapon.
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	211	173
6 through 8	818	169
9 through 12	1,005	111
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	173
6 through 8	0	169
9 through 12	0	111
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	0	173
6 through 8	0	169
9 through 12	0	111
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	173
6 through 8	0	169
9 through 12	0	111
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	28	173
6 through 8	69	169
9 through 12	72	111
Comments:		

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	173
6 through 8	0	169
9 through 12	0	111
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	0	173
6 through 8	17	169
9 through 12	97	111
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	173
6 through 8	0	169
9 through 12	0	111
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	0	173
6 through 8	80	169
9 through 12	482	111
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	173
6 through 8	S	169
9 through 12	5	111
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
No Responses	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
No Responses	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
No Responses	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
No Responses	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
No Responses	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
No Responses	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
No Responses	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
No Responses	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No Responses	Other Specify 1
No Responses	Other Specify 2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data will be provided when the system reopens in March

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	22
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	27
Parental involvement activities	5
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	13
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	12
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title VI Rural Low-Income 12-13 Data - Maine

In Maine all our Title VI NCLB Rural Low-Income (RLI) goals are related either directly or indirectly to improving the achievement levels of at risk students. In the application process, Title VI eligible district choose the area or areas of concentration that will allow them to meet their targets related to the national goals. The Department was approved for an ESEA Accountability waiver in August 2013 and all have used the RLI program to supplement programs to improve the achievement of students either directly or through the professional development of teachers. Listed below are examples of some of the projects that Maine RLI districts implemented to meet national and local goals of improving student's achievement.

Goal: Improve student achievement:

SAD 49 Used funds to support a part time Assistant Principal whose responsibilities include overseeing academic interventions for grades 7-8 students who are not meeting grade level expectations. He works with a team that includes the Principal, math coach/teacher, literacy teacher, and a math teacher. Together, they analyzed available achievement data to determine Title IA identified students and the most effective approach on the delivery of services. Data being analyzed came from multiple sources, including NECAP, NWEA, CTB, and local assessments. Services included one-to-one and small group instruction during the school's START time each morning and assigning identified students to a math and or literacy intervention class.

SAD 59 provided additional support for the Title IA Program at Manson Park School with a focus on the improvement of reading and writing skills/strategies for identified Title I Kindergarten students. This will help them make improvements to meet local standards. Funds were used to employ 4 educational technicians who worked with students both in and out of the classroom under the supervision of the literacy specialist. The literacy specialist also worked directly with children to provide interventions, and will support classroom teachers by modeling effective literacy practices. The literacy specialist communicated with parents of Title I students about the program and their children's progress. The literacy specialist also assisted the principal and curriculum specialist with the collection of local assessment data, which was reviewed with teachers and administrators to make any necessary educational changes in classrooms and/or the program.

SAD 29 Houlton, developed an after school program for Title IA eligible 7th and 8 grade students. Students who were failing two or more courses were the target population. Attendance was one of the limiting factors of success. About 55% of the students exited the program successfully completing the work requirements. That percentage was about the same as the number of students who attended regularly. With such a high correlation between success and attendance, efforts will be increase to improve student attendance in this volunteer program in the future

SAD 37 Harrington developed a credit recovery program for eligible Title IA high school students. This program was an intense 3 week program that was set up as a partnership with EdGE, an afterschool credit recovery program. Title IA at risk students attended completing hands-on activities in language arts, mathematics and science. Attending students were given a fresh start and new confidence which is expected to carryover as they take courses this fall semester. The program was evaluated as successful by staff, student and affected parents.

Goal: Using technology to support improved student achievement:
Augusta

SAD 54 expanded academic programs with a high school's Electronic Design & Graphic Arts class which publishes the district's newsletter. The production of the newsletter allowed the students to use a wide range of sophisticated technology and experience real-life publishing with deadlines, etc. The newsletter is mailed to every household in RSU 54/MSAD 54 three times per school year to promote parental and community involvement These students in Electronic Design & Graphic Arts class earned an A grade for publishing a professional newsletter. Over 8,000 residences in RSU54/MSAD54 received the district newsletter 3 times during the past year increasing parent and community awareness and involvement in our students' education.

Madawaska K-12 teachers used the Rubicon Atlas Mapping System to continue to create a cohesive curriculum aligned to the Common Core standards. Teachers and educational technicians utilized the maps for informing students of daily/weekly goals. The IWalkthrough computer base program was purchased for every building for administrators to gather information on

teaching/instruction and student engagement within the specific buildings. The cumulative data was shared with the teaching staff during professional development to inform effective instruction.

Waterville teachers in all content areas grades 3-12 utilized online curriculum mapping software to revise and align curriculum. Math curriculum is substantially complete, with K-5 curriculum adopted by the school board and grades 6-12 scheduled for board review this fall. K-5 ELA aligned to the Common Core has been written and approved by the school board, with grades 6-12 also scheduled for board review this fall.

Winthrop Computer programs are an effective and efficient means to collect, utilize and manage educational information. The district utilized the DRA2 Online Management System. The DRA2 is the primary assessment and is used for formative assessment, summative assessment and progress monitoring for all students in grades K-5. It is also utilized as part of the Universal Screening process for RTI. AIMSweb is also included for use as a Progress Monitoring Tool in the district's Tier II RTI system for grades K-8

In SAD 4, the DRA2 Online Management System was utilized by 100% of the Classroom Teachers in Grades K-5 and the Learning Lab staff. The data is used as a portion of the district's Universal Screening Process under RTI and as an effective and efficient means of organizing and storing student assessment data for use by teachers and interventionists. A license for AIMSweb was purchased this year and used as a Progress Monitoring Tools for Tier II under RTI

SAD 15 used a combination of funds including local and Title VI, MSAD 15 to provide a technology integrator in classrooms to help teachers integrate technology into instruction. Additionally, technological tools for staff and students to use were purchased. 97.6% of staff responded 'agree' and 'strongly agree' regarding the use of technology in their classrooms as an instructional tool.

SAD 27: All Valley River Middle School teachers have received teacher iPads and have received basic instruction in using the iPads and ways to integrate their use into the classrooms. Teachers have access to Apple tv's and a few have installed the air server app to replace the apple tv for mirroring in the classroom. Teachers have received instruction during district workshops on various tools that can be used to "flip" the classroom such as: VoiceThread, Educreation, ShowMe and 1 teacher has put together an iBook for his curriculum and 4 other teachers out of 10 have participated in training for iTunes U course manager and are interested in putting their curriculum into an iBook format. Over 60% of middle school teachers attended a 1 1/2 workshop on integrating and using the iPad as an instructional tool. The 7 and 8th grade teachers have a comprehensive grade level website that is created; however, some teachers continue to prefer to use their own personal portals/websites.

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?	No
Comments: Only local districts used this authority.	

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).	21
Comments: N/C	

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)	21	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		21

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)	469,642.00	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		469,642.00
Total	469,642.00	469,642.00
Comments: N/C		

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	86.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	72
Asian or Pacific Islander	≥95%
<i>Asian</i>	≥95%
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	≥50%
Black or African American	75
Hispanic or Latino	81
White	86.9
Two or more races	77
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	73
Economically disadvantaged students	76.9

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

n/c

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

2.12 LIST OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved ESEA Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to ED*Facts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools⁶ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

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

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁸ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Status for SY 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

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

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools⁹ with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

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

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Status for SY 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹⁰
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

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

2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA Flexibility for SY 2013-14: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA Flexibility request
- State-specific status for SY 2013-14 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

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

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action¹¹ under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2013-14 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

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

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