

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**



**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: Tennessee Department of Education	
Address: 9th Floor Andrew Johnson Tower 710 James Robertson Pkwy	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Laquisha Oliver	
Telephone: 615-253-3596	
Fax: 615-532-7510	
e-mail: laquisha.oliver@tn.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Karen Daniels	
_____ Signature	_____ Wednesday, May 7, 2014, 1:35:30 PM

**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	53,547	S	53.2
4	52,471	S	43.0
5	50,578	S	52.0
6	41,199	S	36.7
7	39,274	S	40.0
8	39,507	S	41.8
High School	21,410	S	48.5
Total	297,986	S	45.3
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	53,469	S	42.1
4	52,404	S	41.1
5	50,497	S	48.8
6	41,127	S	48.2
7	39,224	S	37.9
8	38,903	S	38.2
High School	20,592	S	42.4
Total	296,216	S	42.8
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	1,229	S	68
4	1,020	S	55
5	906	S	59
6	647	S	47
7	630	S	52
8	653	S	52
High School			
Total	5,085	S	57.1
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	1,224	S	61
4	1,022	S	54
5	905	S	63
6	647	S	62
7	630	S	57
8	654	S	61
High School			
Total	5,082	S	59.5
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>)	66,952
Limited English proficient students	26,498
Students who are homeless	10,854
Migratory students	711
Comments: The number of Title I students with disabilities is lower this year. A different internal data source was used this year in order to improve data reliability.	

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	985
Asian	6,403
Black or African American	177,696
Hispanic or Latino	49,410
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	426
White	301,297
Two or more races	7,857
Total	544,074
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)	2,953	2,582	21	0	5,556
K	676	59,959	203	2	60,840
1	645	57,773	212	5	58,635
2	631	54,738	198	6	55,573
3	533	53,921	208	14	54,676
4	528	52,762	213	20	53,523
5	484	50,803	172	31	51,490
6	329	41,536	180	46	42,091
7	315	39,799	146	85	40,345
8	356	39,594	114	109	40,173
9	0	24,197	123	165	24,485
10	0	21,150	101	181	21,432
11	0	18,845	91	148	19,084
12	0	18,964	71	75	19,110
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	7,450	536,623	2,053	887	547,013
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	1,139
Reading/language arts	1,597
Science	0
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	0
Comments: The number of students reported in math and RLA is significantly higher this year, due to the lack of data from four TA districts during the 2011-12 school year.	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	0
Other support services	0
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	138	
Paraprofessionals ¹	178	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0	
Clerical support staff	2	
Administrators (non-clerical)	2	
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	7,217.10	95.80
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 *	40	100
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	42,039	4,570,750
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	9,803,255	253,936,347
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.40	1.80

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocation.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2012–2013.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The amount of funding set aside for parental involvement activities for districts who received \$500,000 or less was significantly lower this year. This may be the result of sequestration and limited federal funds. Districts may have used local and state funds to help cover the cost of parental involvement activities.

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)	367
K	167
1	143
2	119
3	109
4	95
5	97
6	88
7	80
8	48
9	73
10	47
11	38
12	16
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	497
Total	1,984

Comments: Update 5/5/14 After revising the coding of our EdFacts report C121 we saw an increase in the total number of eligible migrant children. Despite this increase the count proved still much lower than the count in the 2011-12 C SPR II. As detailed in section 2.3.1.1.1., we have seen a decrease in the number of migrant students coming to our state. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.

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: Update 5/5/14 After revising the coding of our EdFacts report C121 we saw an increase in the total number of eligible migrant children. Despite this increase the count still proved much lower than the count in the 2011-12 C SPR II. We have seen a decrease in the number of migrant students coming to our state. This past year was a very wet growing season. This particularly affected the tomato season and the workers who were working in this. The actual harvest started late and it ended early. This caused less workers to come and then subsequently those that were here left early. This lessened our window to effectively find them and decreased the number of actual workers that are coming to our state for this particular crop. We also continue to see a decrease in our out of school youth population. This has been offset by an increase in more families come but there was still an overall decrease in numbers.

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	126

Comments: Update 5/5/14 After revising the coding of our EdFacts report C121 we saw an increase in the total number of eligible migrant children. The increase from the previous submission to this revision is quite significant, again, it appears in the coding that certain students were excluded who should not have been, particularly in this age band. However, as detailed in

section 2.3.1.1.1., overall we have seen a decrease in the number of migrant students coming to our state from the 2011-12 SY to the 2012-13. This decrease impacted all age groups, including the birth through 2 count.

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)	113
K	56
1	55
2	41
3	39
4	37
5	41
6	41
7	34
8	19
9	31
10	12
11	16
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	75
Total	613

Comments: Update 4/2/14 After revising the coding of our EdFacts report C122 we saw a significant decrease in the count of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession. This decrease occurred because a large amount of students were unintentionally included in the file who should not have been. However, the count for this 2012-13 SY still remains much lower than the count for the 2011-12 SY. This can be attributed the explanation detailed in section 2.3.1.2.1., where we saw a decrease in students in the areas where we normally have more students coming in during the summer. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.

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: Update 4/2/14 After revising the coding of our EdFacts report C122 we saw a significant decrease in the count of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession. This decrease occurred because a large amount of students were unintentionally included in the file who should not have been. However, the count for this 2012-13 SY still remains much lower than the count for the 2011-12 SY. Indeed, we saw a decrease in students in the areas that we normally have more students coming in during the summer. This was due to a wet growing season. Many that we normally serve throughout the summer and fall left after a few weeks with us. This affected the total number of students we were able to serve through in-home tutoring and through our summer programs.

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

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	42
Comments: Update 4/2/14 The number of students in this category increased significantly from the amount reported on the initial submission of the CSPR II. This is because of some coding in C124 that reported fewer students ages birth through two than there actually are. However, as detailed in section 2.3.1.2.1., we still saw a decrease in students in the areas that we normally have more students coming in during the summer. This decrease impacted all age groups, including the birth through 2 count.	

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.

The following has been copied directly from MIS2000's 12 Month Contact List report:
 This report picks off the most recent enrollment for each county that is then used to help us compile our performance report data.

- School History.QA3Date >= !StartDate (Student's 3 years of eligibility based on their QADate ends after the beginning of the date range) The start date is 9/1/2008. QA3 is QAD X 3.
- ((School History.TERMTYPE <> N) or (School History.TERMTYPE is null)) (Has no TermType or if they do, it's not N) N is non-migrant
- ((School History.TYPE_ <> S) and (School History.TYPE_ <> T) and (School History.TYPE_ <> L) and (((School History.TYPE_ = P) or (School History.TYPE_ = R) or (School History.TYPE_ = G)))) (Enrollment type can not be S, T, or L which are summer/intersession enrollments and must be P, R, or G which are year round/school enrollments/GED Enrollment)
- School History.DOMID = TN (TN created the enrollment)
- (((Facility.MEPFACILITY is not null) and (((School History.ENROLLDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate) or (School History.WITHDRAWDATE is between !StartDate and !EndDate)))) or (((Facility.MEPFACILITY is null) and (((School History.WITHDRAWDATE is null) or (School History.WITHDRAWDATE >= !StartDate))) and (School History.FUNDINGDATE is between !SHStartDate and !SHEndDate)))) (EnrollDate or WithdrawDate during date range if the Facility is an MEP Facility. Otherwise, FundingDate is during the date range and WithdrawDate is after the beginning of the date range or is null) End date is 8/31/12.
- Student.TWENTYSECONDBDAY >= !StartDate (Student turns 22 after the beginning of the date range)
- Student.THIRDBDAY <= !EndDate (Student turns 3 before the end of the date range)
- ((School History.TERMTYPE <> N) or (School History.TERMTYPE is null)) (Has no TermType or if they do, it's not N) The SchoolHistory.TermType <> N indicates that only qualifying migrants are selected. P, G and R are considered regular year enrollment types and S, T and L are summer or intersession enrollments. The above report specifically selects "P, G or R" enrollment types and omits "S, T and L" enrollment types.

For Summer Intersession the report looks only for those students that have an enrollment type of S, T or L.
 In order to ensure unduplicated counts, a Variable is attached to the formatted report that looks for duplicated students (the same StudentSeq) and suppresses their count to one for the final county. The actual report contains two columns, one duplicated and one unduplicated.

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?

The State contracts with a vendor whose sole responsibility is to accurately gather, compile, and submit to the State all data on migrant children. The agency collects data via the MIS2000 system and looks at enrollment data at LEAs throughout the state to verify migrant status, student enrollment and terms of enrollment, etc. This information is provided to the state and analyzed by both the EdFacts data steward as well as the migrant program coordinator to ensure the quality and viability of the data.

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.

We do searches of MSIX data to check for duplications, we also review QAD dates and residency dates of past moves to check the accuracy of the dates we have from COE data. We also compare student scores and testing data.

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.	120
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	75
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	74

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The youth was found to be a year older than the COE had listed. We were able to determine that the youth was older by reviewing past COE data that we had from previous moves.

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.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We did not have to replace since we had a large pool of reinterviews that we conducted.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	Both
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	
Yes/No	
Was there a standard instrument used?	Yes
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility	

determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers trained and provided instruments?	Yes
Did the recruitment personnel who made the initial eligibility determinations also conduct the re-interviews with the same families?	No
When were the most recent independent re-interviews completed (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LOA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	(MM/YY) 08/12

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

We always review any and all mistakes or errors on COEs and then contact the recruiters regarding the errors. When additional training is needed, we contact them and provide that as soon as possible to ensure that the same mistakes are not made repeatedly. Sometimes errors are not on the part of the recruiter but on the part of the data provided by the families. If we have a data source such as school records that contradicts what the family originally provided to us we, have the recruiter recheck with the family and, if any additional information cannot be provided, we go with the data that can be verified.

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)	367
K	24
1	80
2	65
3	66
4	55
5	56
6	51
7	48
8	34
9	46
10	21
11	27
12	8
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	27
Total	975

Comments: Update 5/5/14 There was an increase in the number of eligible migrant students classified as having priority services from the initial submission of the CSPR II and the current data provided. This was due to a coding error in EdFacts file C121 that accidentally excluded certain students who should have been included. However, there still remains a decrease in the amount of students reported in this category in the 2011-12 SY and the 2012-13 SY. The decrease in count of eligible migrant students classified as having priority for services from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.

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)	7
K	116
1	94
2	72
3	47
4	42
5	41
6	30
7	25
8	10
9	19
10	13
11	11
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	532
Comments: Update 5/5/14 There was a decrease in the number of students reported as LEP from the initial C SPR II submission to this revised submission. This was due to a coding error that included some students that should have been excluded. This corrected count is still slightly below the count reports in the 2011-12 C SPR II. This is attributed to the overall decrease in the number of migrant students in the state. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.	

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	3
1	4
2	6
3	1
4	4
5	2
6	2
7	
8	3
9	3
10	3
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	31

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was an increase in the count of students initially included in the CSPR II to the current count. This was due to a coding error in EdFacts file C121 that has since been fixed. However, there has remained an overall decrease in the count of children with disabilities from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. Some subgroups, such as children with disabilities, saw marked decreases in overall counts as a direct result of this decrease in total migrant students.

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	74
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	91
K	32
1	37
2	26
3	27
4	21
5	17
6	19
7	22
8	13
9	21
10	6
11	9
12	4
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	212
Total	631

Comments: Update 5/5/14 There was an increase in this category of migrant students from the initial submission of the CSPR II to the current data in place. This increase can be directly attributed to an error in the coding of EdFacts file C121 that has since been rectified. However, as a whole there was a decrease overall in the amount of students in this category from the 2011-12 SY to the 2012-13 SY. This is because of the overall decrease in the number of migrant students reported in the state in the 2012-13 SY. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.

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	53
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	263
K	114
1	107
2	86
3	82
4	69
5	67
6	60
7	57
8	33
9	54
10	36
11	25
12	9
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	236
Total	1,351

Comments: Update 5/5/14 There was an overall decrease in the number of students reported in this category in the originally submitted CSPR II and the current data in place. This was the result of a coding error in the C121 file that has now been rectified. There was a notable increase from the 2011-12 SY to the 2012-13 SY. This is likely due to the high transience nature of this population, and such variation is not entirely uncommon from year to year. This is the best data available to us and is accurate to the best of our knowledge. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.

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	12
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	91
K	3
1	2
2	2
3	5
4	4
5	2
6	1
7	2
8	
9	3
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	127

Comments: Update 4/2/14 Some slight changes were made to this category in those ages 3-5, 1st grade, 3rd grade, and 5th grade. These changes had to be made because of a slight coding error in EdFacts file C145. However, the total has remained the same for all students receiving referrals in the RY. The decrease in count of referrals during the regular school year from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1.

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	18
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	30
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	49

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a significant decrease in the number of students reported on the originally submitted CSPR II for this portion of the document. This was due to a coding error in the EdFacts file C145. However, there was still a noteworthy increase in the number of students reported in 2011-12 SY and the 2012-13 SY. Last year's referrals during the summer/intersession were uncharacteristically low, much diminished from previous years, so these lowered counts were indeed indicative of what an anomaly last year's numbers were. In light of this, the increase in referrals for this year is not out of the norm when looking at previous years and in fact the count still remains much lower than amounts in 2010-2011 and back. As explicated last year, referred services have gone down because the state has been able to provide actual services to students through the expansion of in-home instruction and summer camps. Staff that may have provided referral services several summers previous might have been occupied providing instructional services.

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	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Total	0
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the performance period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2011-12 performance period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your State.

Obtained GED	#
Obtained a GED in your State During the Performance Period	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	32
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	198
K	97
1	77
2	66
3	61
4	50
5	58
6	50
7	42
8	23
9	31
10	21
11	15
12	6
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	140
Total	967

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a notable increase in the number of students within this category from the time in which the CSPR II was originally submitted to the current data. This is due to a misunderstanding with regard to the different

categories within the EdFacts file C123. The errors were corrected and yielded the above data. There was still a decrease in count of MEP students served during the regular school year from last year to this year which can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.

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	198
K	15
1	39
2	30
3	35
4	25
5	34
6	28
7	24
8	16
9	17
10	4
11	12
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	8
Total	488
Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a vast increase in the number of students within this category from the data initially submitted in the CSPR II to the data currently in place. This was due to a coding error in EdFacts file C145 that excluded all students 3-5. These issues were resolved, however, there was still a decrease in the count of eligible migrant students receiving MEP-funded instruction and classified as having priority for services from last year to this year. This can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. The students aged 3 to 5 saw the most marked decrease in priority for services. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.	

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)	6
K	12
1	9
2	7
3	7
4	6
5	3
6	2
7	4
8	2
9	1
10	2
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	61

Comments: Update 5/5/14 There was only a slight change in the data submitted initially in the CSPR II and the data reported above with regard to the count of students ages 3-5. This was due to a coding issue in the EdFacts file C145. Last year there were no continuation of services for students over the regular school year, thus making the count this year appear high. However, due the transient, variable nature of the population of migrant students, continuation of services has shown some variance over the years, with valid counts of students in the 2010-11 CSPR and back. These students qualifying for continuation of services in the state did so under the provision in Section 1304(3) 2. It is possible that with fewer migrant students entering programs in the state that those remaining students might be more static and thus stayed longer (beyond their year of eligibility) than students/families in previous years, thus necessitating more services.

2.3.3.4 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	84
K	52
1	43
2	33
3	37
4	34
5	34
6	27
7	21
8	14
9	14
10	12
11	5
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	12
Total	427

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a slight decrease in the number of students in this category from the data in the originally submitted CSPR II and the current data. This problem was due to a coding error in the EdFacts file C145 that has since been repaired. Overall, as compared to last year, there was decrease in count of students receiving MEP funded instructional services during the regular school year which can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. No ungraded students received instruction during the regular school year.

2.3.3.4.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

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

Comments: The decrease in count of students receiving MEP funded reading and math instructional services during the regular school year from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. No ungraded students received instruction during the regular school year.

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	24	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	161	87
K	92	53
1	74	44
2	61	34
3	57	37
4	49	34
5	56	34
6	50	28
7	40	21
8	22	14
9	29	14
10	21	12
11	15	5
12	6	3
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	133	38
Total	890	460

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was an overall decrease in both support services and breakout of counseling services in the RY from the data in the originally submitted CSPR II and the current revisions. This decrease was the result of a coding error in the EdFacts file C124 in which students were not appropriately include and excluded in the file. The decrease in count of support services and breakout of counseling services during the regular school year from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. There were no ungraded students receiving support services or counseling services during the regular school year.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.4 MEP Participation ~~Summer/Intersession Term~~

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

2.3.4.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	42
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	128
K	81
1	69
2	59
3	51
4	51
5	48
6	47
7	41
8	23
9	35
10	17
11	18
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	77
Total	790

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a marked increase in the number of students reported in this category from the data in the originally submitted CSPR II and the revised information above. This discrepancy was the direct result of a coding error in file C124 where students were excluded from the file that should have been retained. The decrease in count of MEP students served during the summer/intersession from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1.

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	128
K	13
1	40
2	30
3	32
4	27
5	29
6	27
7	26
8	16
9	24
10	2
11	15
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	7
Total	419

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a marked increase in the number of students reported in this category from the data in the originally submitted CSPR II and the revised information above. This discrepancy was the direct result of a coding error in file C124 where students were excluded from the file that should have been retained in the 3-5 age band. The decrease in count of eligible migrant students classified as having priority for services during the summer/intersession from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. The students aged 3 to 5 excluding Kindergarteners saw the most marked decrease in priority for services. There were no ungraded students to report in this category.

2.3.4.4 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	54
K	57
1	49
2	40
3	36
4	35
5	27
6	30
7	29
8	14
9	14
10	10
11	4
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	10
Total	410

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a slight decrease in the count of students in this category from the data in the originally submitted CSPR II to the revisions provided above. This change was the result of a corrected error in the EdFacts report C145 in which students were not initially excluded who should have been. The decrease in count of students receiving instructional services during the summer/intersession from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. No ungraded students received instructional service during summer/intersession.

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)	6	6	
K	8	7	
1	13	13	
2	3	3	
3	6	6	
4	7	7	
5	5	5	
6	8	8	
7	1	1	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	57	56	

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a slight decrease in the count of students in this category from the data in the originally submitted CSPR II to the revisions provided above. This change was the result of a corrected error in the EdFacts report C145 in which students were not initially excluded who should have been. The decrease in count of students receiving MEP funded reading and math instructional services during the summer/intersession from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. No ungraded students received instruction during the regular school year.

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	42	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	110	54
K	70	58
1	60	51
2	48	41
3	45	36
4	47	35
5	40	28
6	44	30
7	39	29
8	22	17
9	33	18
10	17	13
11	16	5
12	3	1
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	73	10
Total	709	426

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was an increase in the support services and decrease in the breakout of counseling services from the originally submitted CSPR II to the revisions listed above. These changes were caused by coding errors in the EdFacts file C145 that have since been rectified. The decrease in count of support services and breakout of counseling services during the summer/intersession from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1. No ungraded students received counseling or support services during summer/intersession.

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	73
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	259
K	124
1	99
2	83
3	74
4	73
5	69
6	66
7	55
8	31
9	49
10	25
11	26
12	9
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	198
Total	1,313

Comments: Update 4/2/14 There was a significant increase in the number of students included in this category from the data in the originally submitted CSPR II to the revisions detailed above. This increase was the result of incorrect coding of information for EdFacts file C054. In this file not all the necessary students were previously included but this problem has now been rectified. The decrease in count of participating migrant students receiving MEP-funded instructional or support services during summer/intersession performance period from last year to this year can be attributed to the overall drop in the count of migrant students within the state, as detailed in sections 2.3.1.1.1 and 2.3.1.2.1.

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	179
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	537
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:	

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		
Regular school year - school day/extended day		
Summer/intersession only		
Year round	1	1,984
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	0.40
Comments: State Director also functions as the director of homeless education and private school participation in all federal programs.	

FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the 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	4	1	11	2
Counselors	0	0	0	0
All paraprofessionals	20	7	17	7
Recruiters	7	4	3	3
Records transfer staff	1	1	1	1
Administrators	1	1	1	1
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	10	5.00	10	8.00
Comments:				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	3	149
Adult corrections	2	236
Other	0	0
Total	5	
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	3
Adult Corrections	2
Other	0
Total	5
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			392	75	
Total Long Term Students Served			242	74	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			190	23	
LEP Students			6	36	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native					
Asian			3		
Black or African American			252	63	
Hispanic or Latino			26	2	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White			111	10	
Two or more races					
Total			392	75	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			392	72	
Female				3	
Total			392	75	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11			1		
12			2		
13			2		
14			21		
15			60		
16			94	1	
17			145	19	
18			65	13	
19			2	16	
20				24	
21				2	
Total			392	75	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

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

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			144	24	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

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

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

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school					S	S	S	0		
Earned high school course credits					202	S	S	0		
Enrolled in a GED program					20	S	75	0		
Earned a GED					S	27	S	0		
Obtained high school diploma					S	16	S	0		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					S	S	S	0		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					277	S	S	0		
Obtained employment					S	S	S	0		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			209	53	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			156	74	

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			50	31	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			59	7	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			14	13	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			33	23	
Comments: Due the transient and high turnover population of Neglected and Delinquent students sometimes students will take a pre-test but not post-test because they've left the agency/program quickly and perhaps unexpectedly or because the agency/program did not administer a post-test for whatever reason. Thus, only a score for pre-tests might be listed for some students.					

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			188	58	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			152	74	

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			45	30	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			12	7	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			13	11	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			82	26	
Comments:					

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	11	89
Juvenile corrections	4	104
Other	0	0
Total	15	
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	11
Juvenile corrections	4
Other	0
Total	15
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			2,961	402	
Total Long Term Students Served			549	184	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			616	140	
LEP Students			35	0	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			12	0	
Asian			48	0	
Black or African American			1,377	221	
Hispanic or Latino			187	6	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			1,276	166	
Two or more races			61	9	
Total			2,961	402	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male			2,273	359	
Female			688	43	
Total			2,961	402	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5			0	0	
6			0	1	
7			0	0	
8			1	2	
9			8	1	
10			14	2	
11			25	6	
12			94	16	
13			207	29	
14			378	52	
15			551	66	
16			681	88	
17			833	112	
18			146	23	
19			23	4	
20			0	0	
21			0	0	

Total		2,961	402	
-------	--	-------	-----	--

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

The shift in counts of students enrolled in Juvenile Detention facilities and Juvenile Corrections facilities from last year to this year is directly attributed to a reclassification within of many of the facilities/programs under Subpart 2 from Juvenile Corrections facilities to Juvenile Detention facilities. Thus, this led to a spike in the amount of students enrolled in Juvenile Detention facilities and a decrease in the amount of students enrolled in Juvenile Correction facilities. The overall increase in the number of students served is attributed to the inclusion of additional facilities/programs this year that were not in counts from previous years.

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?	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			574	53	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

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

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

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school					1,524	426	140	166		
Earned high school course credits					566	209	47	38		
Enrolled in a GED program					49	15	11	8		
Earned a GED					17	8	S	S		
Obtained high school diploma					19	7	S	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					6	7	S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					S	20	S	S		
Obtained employment					S	40	S	S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			249	151	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			319	128	

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			64	43	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			62	9	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			83	35	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			110	41	

Comments: Due the transient and high turnover population of Neglected and Delinquent students sometimes students will take a pre-test but not post-test because they've left the agency/program quickly and perhaps unexpectedly or because the agency/program did not administer a post-test for whatever reason. Thus, only a score for pre-tests might be listed for some students. The shifts in counts of students in Juvenile Detention facilities and Juvenile Correction facilities are directly correlated to the reclassification of several facilities in the State as expanded on in section 2.4.2.2. As well, there was an overall decrease in the total counts of students reported in this section as compared to last year. The decrease can be attributed to several factors, among them the high-turnover and transient nature of this population of students which may result in greater variation of counts from year to year, and as well the employment of a robust data evaluation method at the State level to ensure accuracy of facility/program reports and mitigate incorrect reporting of data.

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			357	166	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			327	132	

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			73	41	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			60	4	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			88	47	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			106	40	

Comments: Due the transient and high turnover population of Neglected and Delinquent students sometimes students will take a pre-test but not post-test because they've left the agency/program quickly and perhaps unexpectedly or because the agency/program did not administer a post-test for whatever reason. Thus, only a score for pre-tests might be listed for some students. The shifts in counts of students in Juvenile Detention facilities and Juvenile Correction facilities are directly correlated to the reclassification of several facilities in the State as expanded on in section 2.4.2.2. As well, there was an overall decrease in the total counts of students reported in this section as compared to last year. The decrease can be attributed to several factors, among them the high-turnover and transient nature of this population of students which may result in greater variation of counts from year to year, and as well the employment of a robust data evaluation method at the State level to ensure accuracy of facility/program reports and mitigate incorrect reporting of data.

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
The number of persistently dangerous schools as defined by the State	Annual Report of Zero Tolerance Offenses/Unsafe School Choice Policy	Annual	2012-13	2010-11: 0	2010-11: 0	0	2003
				2011-12: 0	2011-12: 0		
				2012-13: 0	2012-13: 0		
				2013-14: 0			
				2014-15: 0			
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The number of incidents involving the possession or use of illegal drugs on a school campus or at a school sponsored event	Annual Report of Zero Tolerance Offenses	Annual	2012-13	2010-11: 2915	2010-11: 209	N/A	N/A
				2011-12: 2915	2011-12: 341		
				2012-13: 2915	2012-13: 338		
				2013-14: 2915			
				2014-15: 2915			
Comments:							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The number of incidents involving the possession of a firearm on a school campus or at a school sponsored event	Annual Report of Zero Tolerance Offenses	Annual	2012-13	2010-11: 180	2010-11: 39	N/A	N/A
				2011-12: 180	2011-12: 180		
				2012-13: 180	2012-13: 80		
				2013-14: 180			
				2014-15: 180			
Comments:							

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	State Code 23-Alcohol
Illicit drug related	State Code 17-Drug
Violent incident without physical injury	State Codes: 27-bomb threat 28-other threat 29-bullying 30-fighting 31-sexual harassment 32-assault of staff 33-assault of student 37-attempted homicide
Violent incident with physical injury	State Codes: 34-sexual assault 35-aggravated assault of staff 36-aggravated assault of student 38-homicide
Weapons possession	State Codes: 18-possession of a handgun 19-possession of a rifle 20-possession of explosives
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	8,920	138
6 through 8	13,397	138
9 through 12	8,894	138
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	223	138
6 through 8	552	138
9 through 12	1,007	138
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	69	138
6 through 8	59	138
9 through 12	65	138
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	36	138
6 through 8	72	138
9 through 12	106	138
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	19	138
6 through 8	21	138
9 through 12	10	138
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	5	138
6 through 8	9	138
9 through 12	35	138
Comments:		

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	6	138
6 through 8	110	138
9 through 12	277	138
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	138
6 through 8	6	138
9 through 12	13	138
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	22	138
6 through 8	348	138
9 through 12	888	138
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	17	138
6 through 8	142	138
9 through 12	728	138
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	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
___ No	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
___ No	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
___ No	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
___ No	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
___ No	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
___ No	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
___ No	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
___ No	Other Specify 1
___ No	Other Specify 2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	6
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	43
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	46
Parental involvement activities	21
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	12
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	60
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	8
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.

Tennessee Consolidated State application, June 2002: Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2: The State identifies specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student academic achievement as measured by the percentage of students proficient or above on state assessments as well as a decrease in the student dropout rate as factors it will measure. The Rural and Low-Income School program will provide funds to approximately 40% of the state's districts. It will be a section in the required local consolidated application, and applicants will address how the use of funds will assist them in meeting the State's goals. The State will approve only those applications which show that the use of Title VI funds help to increase student performance or reduce the dropout rate.

Districts improved student performance with the use of Title VI funds in the following manners:

- Providing additional Title I, Part A support and resources to students such as, portion of salaries and benefits for instructional staff; intervention specialists; math and reading coaches; graduation coaches for students at-risk of not graduating
- before and after school tutoring programs
- parent involvement activities; family support managers
- ELL summer school for students performing below proficiency
- professional development around differentiated instruction strategies, core instruction, credit recovery and remediation programs, instructional technology integration to aid teachers and students in their goal to reach TCAP/EOC proficiency rates
- programs to address bullying and a school climate conducive to increased student achievement
- providing student technologies such as iPads, notebooks, etc. to enhance learning activities related to common core standards
- technology to support distance learning activities and eInstructional tools to increase student engagement
- additional and/or upgraded classroom software/hardware to enhance instruction and learning

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

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

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	4
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	4	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		4

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)	136,827.00	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		136,827.00
Total	136,827.00	136,827.00

Comments: The amount of funding transferred from "Improving Teacher Quality State Grants" into Title I Part A in 2011-12 was \$149,050. The amount transferred in 2012-13 was \$136,827. This is within a 10% margin. The reason for the difference in total transferability between years (\$271,283 in 2011-12 and \$136,826 in 12-13) is that in 2011-12, \$122,773 in funds were transferred into the Education Technology grant. This grant is no longer active and therefore is not an option for LEAs to transfer funds into.

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	86.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	84
Asian or Pacific Islander	90
<i>Asian</i>	90
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	88
Black or African American	77.8
Hispanic or Latino	81.3
White	89.8
Two or more races	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	67.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	73
Economically disadvantaged students	80.7

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.

Tennessee's definition of graduation rate includes only those students who receive diplomas within the standard number of years including summer school terms. The graduation rate is calculated using the US DOE 4-year adjusted cohort formula, based on the students' year entered ninth grade. Per our Accountability Workbook, graduation rates are calculated using the following race/ethnicity - Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, Native American, and White.

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>.