

**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 2013-14



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2014
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2015

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION

SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.

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) 2013-14 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required 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 2013-14 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 18, 2014**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2013-14, 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 2013-14 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 2013-14 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: 7/31/2015
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2013-14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2013-14		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Alabama Department of Education		
Address: 50 North Ripley Street Montgomery, AL 36104		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Sherlisa Barnes		
Telephone: 334-242-8199		
Fax: 334-242-0496		
e-mail: sbarnes@alsde.edu		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Edmund Moore		
		Friday, April 3, 2015, 12:57:16 PM
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2013-14



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 13, 2015
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	40,067	S	46.30
4	40,121	S	40.10
5	38,535	S	33.70
6	34,250	S	36.80
7	31,039	S	23.90
8	30,831	S	20.30
High School	18,888		
Total	233,731	S	31.60
Comments: N/A			

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	40,056	S	29.00
4	40,054	S	33.10
5	38,534	S	28.40
6	34,242	S	36.00
7	31,040	S	28.90
8	30,769	S	40.30
High School	18,903		
Total	233,598	S	29.80
Comments: N/A			

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	1,652	S	73.00
4	1,613	S	65.00
5	1,515	S	61.00
6	1,049	S	74.00
7	499	S	57.00
8	506	S	44.00
High School			
Total	6,834	S	65.40

Comments: N/A

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	1,643	S	56.00
4	1,608	S	60.00
5	1,512	S	57.00
6	1,046	S	70.00
7	497	S	57.00
8	506	S	63.00
High School			
Total	6,812	S	59.90

Comments: N/A

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>)	62,839
Limited English proficient students	17,572
Students who are homeless	17,995
Migratory students	1,988
Comments: Improvements to automated data collection system.	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,873
Asian	3,950
Black or African American	187,201
Hispanic or Latino	28,954
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	365
White	232,706
Two or more races	10,609
Total	468,658
Comments: Improvements to automated data collection system.	

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	244	0	0	244
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	24	7,004	137	0	7,165
K	279	46,289	276	0	46,844
1	312	47,413	265	9	47,999
2	311	43,616	236	13	44,176
3	412	42,336	211	15	42,974
4	262	42,142	222	16	42,642
5	217	40,717	226	27	41,187
6	132	35,491	248	32	35,903
7	24	33,188	197	69	33,478
8	23	33,450	216	153	33,842
9	0	26,262	79	282	26,623
10	0	23,616	70	323	24,009
11	0	21,107	62	322	21,491
12	0	21,356	58	247	21,661
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	1,996	464,231	2,503	1,508	470,238

Comments: Improvements to automated data collection system.

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	1,861
Reading/language arts	2,402
Science	0
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	0
Comments: N/A	

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	334
Supporting guidance/advocacy	2,965
Other support services	46
Comments: N/A	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	0.00	
Paraprofessionals ¹	0.00	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0.00	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.00	
Comments: The FTEs were not rolled up to SEA when the file was submitted. This will be corrected when Part II is re-opened for file submission		

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:
1. Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 2. Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 3. Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 4. Conducting parental involvement activities;
 5. Providing support in a library or media center;
 6. Acting as a translator; or
 7. Providing instructional services to students.
- 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	593.00	100.00
Comments: N/A		

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 2013 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) 2013 (School Year 2013-14) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2013 (School Year 2013-14) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	26	106
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	547,244	8,141,911
Sum of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations	9,204,034	200,708,355
Percentage of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	6.00	4.10

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2013 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 2013–2014.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title I, Part A funds for Parental Involvement are spent in various ways. Each LEA has the right to use funds at their own discretion, as long as federal guidelines are followed. Selected LEAs have established a resource room to provide training and/or offer resources for parents. LEAs have set-aside funds to provide transportation and day care so parents can attend parent activities. LEAs have provided workshops, purchased literature and other materials for use in conducting training sessions to increase family literacy. Also Parental Involvement funds have been used to communicate with parents by purchasing postal stamps for mailing, advertising and, supplies/equipment (ink, paper, printer, etc.) to support parenting programs.

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- ┆ Population data of eligible migrant children
- ┆ Academic data of eligible migrant students
- ┆ Data of migrant children served during the performance period
- ┆ 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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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, 2012 - August 31, 2013), 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: N/A

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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)	342
K	215
1	242
2	233
3	190
4	162
5	153
6	149
7	133
8	129

9	141
10	102
11	74
12	91
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	76
Total	2,432

Comments: The number of eligible children exceeds the number of eligible children who participated in statewide assessments in grades 5,6,7, and 8 in 1.3.1. Our numbers are off because the numbers reported in the 1.3.1 report are generated from the State's INOW reporting system through the state's accountability section. Our migrant data is reported using MIS2000. The two data programs are not tied together. We do have a procedure in place for notifying school systems that they have eligible migrant students. Each regional migrant coordinator sends out a system notification in the fall and again in the spring to all systems that have eligible migrant students. The districts are to check for the identified migrant students in their systems. If the students are present in their school district, they mark the identified migrant students in the INOW data program. The school systems are not to mark any student as migrant unless they have received a migrant eligible report from the state. Next year, we will increase our efforts to ensure that only districts with eligible migrant students are marking students as migrant in the INOW data system.

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: N/A

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from 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, 2013 through August 31, 2014.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	147

Comments: N/A

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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)	66
K	52
1	60
2	55
3	59
4	59
5	40
6	42
7	23
8	15
9	28
10	19
11	8
12	14
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	541

Comments: The increase in number of migrant students in the Category 2 Child Count is because more migrant students took part in the summer sessions offered. That count does vary from year to year. We have noticed over the last couple of years that more families are coming into our state during the summer crop seasons. When they bring their school aged children with them we are able to include their children in our summer migrant session. Our recruiters have been successful in finding the eligible students and encouraging them to participate in the summer session offered.

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: N/A

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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	0

Comments: N/A

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

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

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

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.

N/A

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:

- l The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- l Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- l Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- l 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
- l Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Alabama uses Management Services for Education Data (MSEDD) for our data collection. The data system we use is called the MIS2000 system. The purpose of MIS2000 is to collect all data relevant to the MEP in Alabama from the schools and districts that serve the students and to compile it into a single database at the state level so that unduplicated counts can be produced for the CSPR. MIS2000 maintains all data from all programs and sites throughout the state. MIS2000 utilizes the procedure listed below to determine if a student is counted in Category 1 or 2. The procedure also counts only students who meet the program eligibility during the selected time period such as September 1 through August 31. It also only lists eligible students who are ages 3 through 21 and are within 3 years of a last qualifying move and had a qualifying activity. The process also ensures that each student has a residency of at least 1 day during the eligibility period and is counted only once per age/grade level for each of the child count categories. The program automatically identifies and counts children who turn three years of age during the specified time period (September 1-August 31). MIS2000 Data Collection Filters for Child Count:

- 1.) Enroll Date, Funding Date, LQM Date (last qualifying move), Res Date (residency date), or Withdraw Date is between the Start Date and End Date (Student has activity during the date range.)
- 2.) LQM3 Date (last qualifying move date) is greater than the Start Date (Student's LQM was within 3 years of the Start Date.)
- 3.) Twenty Second Birthday is greater than the Start Date (Student turns 22 after the Start Date.)
- 4.) Third birthday is less than the End Date (Student turns 3 before the End Date.)

Category 2 Summer or Intersession MEP-Funded Services: Summer school enrollment information is collected at the beginning of the migrant summer program from the local MEPs by the regional migrant coordinators. The regional migrant coordinator enrolls all eligible students with an enroll date in MIS2000. At the end of the summer program, the regional migrant coordinator enters a withdrawal date in MIS2000 for all participating students. A list of summer and/or intersession services are kept by the local LEAs and the services are entered on MIS2000 by the regional migrant coordinators at the end of the summer

programs. An MIS2000 Child Count 2 report can be compiled to indicate all migrant summer school participants. The same MIS2000 data collection filters above are utilized for Category 2 child count.

Unduplicated Counts: To ensure that eligible migrant students are only counted once per age/grade level for each child count category, a list of potential duplicate students is checked before each child count is taken. MIS2000 has the capability to print a list of any duplicate migrant students. After verification, any duplicate students are merged in MIS2000. The MIS2000 provides a report for "potential duplicate students." The "potential duplicate students" can be filtered by the any of the following: matching

DOB, close DOB, matching DOB + last or first name, matching DOB + last + first name, potentially adopted duplicates, same social security number (not available in our database), or Soundex match. The system also allows a filter for "only recent records," if needed. If students on the list of matching DOBs are found, the report provides a "y" if the students are multiple births. The state also receives e-mail notifications from MSIX of possible duplicate students. The student's information is checked and merged if deemed duplicates. If not, the merge is rejected, and the two students remain separate on MSIX. If the duplicate student reports on MSIX are both from Alabama, then the students are merged on MIS2000.

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 (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

The SDE is responsible for identifying migrant students and ensuring that the migrant data is entered accurately into the MS2000 system. The SDE helps ensure that MS2000 transmits accurate data to the ED Facts data file by requiring that the most current file specifications are given to the MS2000 data specialist. Once the data is compiled and transmitted to the SDE, the information is checked using the file specifications to make sure that the information requested is in the file submitted. The SDE verifies that the files sent to the Department are accurate and received without loss of 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.

Data quality reports from MSIX are used to provide the percentage and identification of records which have missing or invalid data elements. This information is utilized to determine data collection issues which need to be addressed through training. The MSIX data reports denote potential duplicate students. There is also data completeness and data validity information on enrollments, demographics, assessments, course histories, and enrollments. The missing required minimum data elements are corrected by the state data administrator which ensures that there is a timely electronic transfer of valid, accurate student information to MSIX.

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?	<u>Yes</u>
Does 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.?	<u>Yes</u>
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 initiated by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer (s)]?	<u>Yes</u>
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/inter-session projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
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?	<u>Yes</u>

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.	69
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	52
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	49

Describe any reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The goal of the Alabama 2014 re-interview initiative was to complete at least 50 re-interviews; 52 were completed. A total of 69 interviews were attempted, resulting in a 75.3% response rate (52 out of 69). There was a total of 17 interviews that were attempted but could not be completed.

The sample consisted of 50 students identified as main sample and 60 students identified as alternate sample. Forty-two (42) interviews on the main sample were completed, as well as 10 interviews from the "alternate" sample.

The non-responses are summarized below:

Response Rate Table

Number of interviews attempted 69

Number of interviews completed 52

Non-Responses:

Moved Away 8

Not found 8

Declined 1

Total Non-Responses 17

Of the non-response situations, eight students moved (per neighbor, empty house, etc.), eight students were not found after three attempts by the re-interview team, and one student declined to be re-interviewed.

The re-interview was conducted on July 21-25, 2014 on students for whom a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) was completed between September 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. It was determined that the majority of the state's migrant children (over 90%) would be recruited and identified by mid-June. Given the state's significant seasonal employment in the northeast region, the decision was made to conduct the re-interviews in July to increase the chances of contacting as many families as possible. By using this timeframe, the 75.3% response rate was obtained.

Procedures	Yes/No
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	<u>SY2013-14</u>
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

- What are independent prospective re-interviews?* Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migrant children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migrant children.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Alabama 2013-14 external evaluation used a statewide random sample procedure. The SEA provided the external agency conducting the evaluation with a list of all the students for whom a COE had been completed between Sept. 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. It was determined that over 90% of the state's student population had been identified at this time which enabled the re-interview team to conduct the visits at a time when the seasonal families were still residing in the state (mid-July). All the students in the sample were obtained from the same source, the state's migrant database, currently administered by MIS2000.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sample for the 2013-14 external re-interview was randomly selected from the state's migrant student population for whom a COE was completed between September 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014. This timeframe ensured that over 90% of the migrant students in the state, with a new COE, would be identified and entered into the state's migrant database system. A total of 50 students were selected for the main sample and 60 students were selected for the alternate sample.

All the students meeting the parameter were selected and exported into an Excel file. Using the software's random number generator program, a random number between 1 and 5000 (including decimal places) was assigned to each row (student). The list was then sorted in ascending order by the random number and the first 110 students were numbered 1 to 110. The first 50 students were identified as the main sample and the remaining 60 students were identified as the alternate sample. This process provided both a random selection and a random order.

During the re-interview, sample lists were provided to all of the re-interviewers. The lists contained both main and alternate sample students and were organized by region. The re-interviewers were instructed to interview all of the main sample students first - the main sample was listed in bold typeface to facilitate the process. Re-interviewers were asked to make three attempts before indicating that the family was not found on the re-interview form. In some instances, recruiters were able to determine after the first visit that the family had moved away and was no longer in the area for a number of reasons (house was empty/abandoned, there were new tenants in the residence or a neighbor told the re-interviewer that the family had moved).

When a main sample was not found or unable to be interviewed, the re-interviewer selected a name from the alternate sample. Since all the students in the sample were randomly selected, and the lists were organized by district, the re-interviewer was able to select an alternate from within the same area.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	<u>Both</u>
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	
	Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	<u>Yes</u>
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	<u>Yes</u>

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2013-14 external re-interview was conducted by an external, independent agency. Three out-of-state individuals were used to conduct the re-interviews. The three individuals are recruiters in their state with over three years of experience in making eligibility determinations and all three have experience conducting re-interview efforts in their respective SEA.

A standardized re-interview protocol and form was used by the re-interviewers to collect the information obtained during the interviews. The form and protocol have been used effectively in other states for the same purpose and were accepted by the AL MEP as the form to be used in the state.

Recruiters completed the form as census-takers - that is, they were instructed to enter all of the information obtained through the re-interview but without making an eligibility determination. This enabled recruiters to collect and document the information without the added pressure of having to make a determination at the time. However, re-interviewers were instructed to provide additional information in separate notes if they wanted to include additional pertinent details.

Staff from the local MEPs were used to accompany the out-of-state interviewers and to help with introductions to families and youth. Local staff understood that their role was to guide the out-of-state re-interviewers and were instructed not to interfere during the interview. The local staff was not the person who conducted the original interview and local programs made arrangements to ensure an appropriate interpreter was available when necessary.

Of the total re-interviews, 49 were conducted face-to-face, while 3 were conducted via phone interview.

Copies of all the COEs, the re-interview forms, and any notes from the re-interviewers were reviewed by an out-of-state review panel comprised of three ID&R experts. To ensure absolute autonomy, the out-of-state review panel had no relationship with either the re-interviewers or the AL MEP staff.

Once the information was reviewed, the panel provided the state with an initial determination. The state then provided clarification, if needed, to assist the review panel in making a final determination. A consensus was reached by the panel to make the final determinations, and the findings were shared with the state for all the cases in the 2013-14 external re-interview.

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.

The 2013-14 AL MEP external re-interview was conducted by an external agency on July 21-25, 2014. A total of 52 re-interviews of randomly selected students were interviewed. Of these, a total of three (or 5.8%) were determined not eligible. In addition, there were some COE errors and recommendations made as part of the final results by the external agency conducting the re-interview.

COE Errors

There were a number of errors repeated in different COEs. These include:

- Using Section III, #4a (moved to obtain and obtained) instead of Section III, 4ci (unable to obtain but family has previous history). There were two instances when the recruiter used #4a to document eligibility. However, the re-interview determined that the work was not obtained but the worker had prior history. The COE could have been completed, therefore, as a "#4ci". The COEs in question were corrected by the AL MEP.
- Documenting temporary work. Three COEs were marked as "temporary work" but no statement from the worker or the employer regarding the length of employment was included. These COEs were corrected by the AL MEP.

- Discrepancy between the Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and residency date. There were two instances where the QAD was erroneously entered as the residency date. These two COEs were corrected by the AL MEP.

The students in all these cases were deemed eligible and the COE error did not affect their eligibility.

Discrepancy Rate

The review panel determined that three cases were deemed not eligible. After reviewing these re-interviews and conducting their own interview, the AL SEA agreed with the panel's determinations.

In all three cases it was determined that the student(s) in the sample did not move to seek or obtain qualifying work or to accompany a parent or guardian to seek or obtain qualifying work. In two of these cases, the worker was engaged in qualifying work (fishing), but both parents confirmed that the children did not travel in the boat nor did they travel overnight to meet the worker. Travel, if any, was "same day" travel and did not meet the MEP eligibility criteria. The third not eligible case was a family that traveled to visit a sick relative. The parent did not seek or engage in qualifying work during his travel.

As a result of the re-interview, the SEA has removed these three children from their migrant database and are not being reported in the child count for the 2013-14 school year.

Additional Recommendations

As a result of the 2013-14 external re-interview, additional recommendations were made by the external agency conducting the re-interviews. These recommendations were made with the goal of enhancing the ID&R process and to ease future re-interview and eligibility validation efforts.

- Provide guidance regarding moves by workers who engage in fishing qualifying work. Individuals working in the fishing industry typically have short term moves and often make a series of moves within the fishing season. Older children may or may not accompany their parents to assist in the process and may have short term moves or a series of short moves within a period of time and may be eligible (if all other eligibility criteria are met). The state should provide guidance to staff on how to complete COEs for children who meet these situations.
- Provide training on completing COEs accurately. A number of COEs had erroneous information (discrepancy between QAD and residency date) or were missing information (missing worker or employer statement for temporary work; missing prior history). Ongoing training should be provided to staff in completing COEs accurately and consistently.
- Corroborate prior moves using MSIX. Recruitment staff should use MSIX to check if children show prior qualifying moves in other states. This will help recruiters corroborate information provided by the worker (parent or guardian).
- The SEA should engage in an interstate coordination effort with the purpose of conducting a desktop review of a limited number of randomly selected COEs on an annual basis as part of their quality control efforts. By reviewing COEs from other states, the AL MEP staff will increase their knowledge and expertise thus enhancing all the state's internal review efforts.
- Maintain the practice of conducting internal re-interviews in a continuous manner to ensure the accuracy of eligibility determinations.

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

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	<u>Yes</u>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	2
1	6
2	9
3	8
4	10
5	8
6	7
7	10
8	5
9	4
10	7
11	4
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	83

Comments: For students to be Priority for Service they must have both an interrupted school year and also failing academically. The movement of our migrant families causes fluctuations in these numbers yearly. The decrease in this number from the previous year could be that some of our PFS students moved out of our state and students moving in to our state did not have academic issues in school that put them in danger of failure. With many of our families settling out some of the student who were PFS may have reached in end of their migrant eligibility and would no longer be reflected in our numbers. Also, many of our families are waiting until the end of the school year before they move their children. Therefore they could be struggling with academics but they do not have an interrupted school year. Each of the above factors has an impact on our PFS count each year.

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	53
1	128
2	102
3	81
4	46
5	39
6	29
7	28
8	24
9	41
10	26
11	14
12	15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	633
Comments: N/A	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	1
1	3
2	11
3	9
4	10
5	12
6	11
7	8
8	6
9	10
10	1
11	6
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2
Total	93
Comments: N/A	

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, 2014 (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	78
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	100
K	85
1	57
2	66
3	63
4	58
5	47
6	52
7	38
8	45
9	41
10	23
11	23
12	17
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	20
Total	813

Comments: N/A

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 qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2013-14 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	37
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61
K	51
1	34
2	29
3	32
4	26
5	21
6	29
7	20
8	24
9	20
10	14
11	13
12	11
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	13
Total	435

Comments: The decrease in Qualifying Arrival Date during the regular school year is again linked to what we have been seeing over the last couple of year. Many of our families are waiting until the end of the regular school year to move. So not as many of our families are arriving during the regular school year. We have encouraged families to try to keep their children in stable environments during the school year and now many of them are trying to let the student complete a school year before moving.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, 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 Performance Period
Age birth through 2	17
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	183
K	135
1	162
2	137
3	119
4	104
5	78
6	83
7	73
8	61
9	66
10	65
11	38
12	49
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	46
Total	1,416
Comments: N/A	

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	
8	
9	S
10	S
11	S
12	S
Ungraded	
Total	10
Comments: N/A	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2012-13 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g. GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	S
Comments: N/A	

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to eligible migrant children during the performance period.

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.

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 served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs
- Children who were 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)).

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5	0
K	0
1	5
2	4
3	5
4	8
5	7
6	6
7	7
8	5
9	4
10	7
11	2
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	62

Comments: The decrease in the Priority for Service Regular School Year would be the same as the reason given in 2.3.2.1. For students to be Priority for Service they must have both an interrupted school year and also failing academically. The movement of our migrant families causes fluctuations in these numbers yearly. The decrease in this number from the previous year could be that some of our PFS students moved out of our state and students moving in to our state did not have academic issues in school that put them in danger of failure. With many of our families settling out some of the student who were PFS may have reached in end of their migrant eligibility and would no longer be reflected in our numbers. Also, many of our families are waiting until the end of the school year before they move their children. Therefore they could be struggling with academics but they do not have an interrupted school year. Each of the above factors has an impact on our PFS count each year. Also, Alabama believes that the reason that our PFS numbers exceed the PFS children reported in 2.3.5.1 by one student in both fifth and tenth grade is that one of the dates used in the report filter was different than the dates used in the other reports contributing to the count in 2.3.3.2.

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

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

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** 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	32
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	226
K	160
1	193
2	182
3	151
4	132
5	119
6	118
7	109
8	95
9	111
10	87
11	61
12	81
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	55
Total	1,912
Comments: N/A	

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5	
K	
1	5
2	4
3	5
4	8
5	6
6	7
7	7
8	5
9	5
10	6
11	2
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	62
Comments: Alabama believes that the reason the PFS numbers in ninth grade exceed eligible by one student is that one of the dates used in the file filter was different than the dates used in the other files contributing to the count in 2.3.5.1.	

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period 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 performance period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: N/A	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. 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 Performance Period
Age birth through 2	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	119
K	100
1	44
2	48
3	42
4	42
5	26
6	39
7	22
8	11
9	20
10	17
11	9
12	12
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2
Total	554
Comments: N/A	

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. 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 Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2			////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	32	30	////////////////////////////////////
K	39	37	////////////////////////////////////
1	36	36	////////////////////////////////////
2	42	42	////////////////////////////////////
3	33	33	////////////////////////////////////
4	35	35	////////////////////////////////////
5	20	15	////////////////////////////////////
6	33	31	////////////////////////////////////
7	18	18	////////////////////////////////////
8	8	8	////////////////////////////////////
9	15	15	7
10	5	5	12
11	2	2	7
12			12
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	1		2
Total	319	307	40
Comments: N/A			

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.

2.3.5.3.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received a counseling service during the performance period. 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 Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	32	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	222	
K	161	1
1	193	4
2	181	1
3	151	2
4	132	
5	120	
6	116	
7	109	1
8	95	
9	110	
10	86	
11	61	
12	81	1
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	56	
Total	1,906	10

Comments: Alabama believes that the reason the students receiving support services exceed the eligible number in both Kindergarten and fifth grade by one student is that one of the dates used in the file filter was different than the dates used in the other files contributing to the count.

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.

2.3.6 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	167
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	2,328
Comments: N/A	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide 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: N/A	

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 **served** 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 Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	4	29
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	144
Year round	10	2,077
Comments: N/A		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments: N/A	

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 reporting 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		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	0	0.00	0	0.00	
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00	
Non-qualified paraprofessionals					
Qualified paraprofessionals	3	3.00			
Recruiters	0	0.00	0	0.00	
Records transfer staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	
Administrators	0	0.00	0	0.00	

Comments: The reason Alabama didn't report teachers in 2.3.8.2 was that the Category Set B in File 065 would not prefill for 2013-14. The report would not allow for manual entries except in the paraprofessional areas above. Alabama does have teachers providing instructional services and those numbers are Regular school year: 8 teachers 4 FTEs, Summer/Intersession: 19 teachers 0 FTEs, Performance Period: 25 teachers

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a 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) (Section 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).
- f. *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.
- g. *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.
- h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.
- | 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	152
Adult corrections	12	103
Other	0	0
Total	15	////////////////////
Comments: N/A		

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	12
Other	0
Total	15
Comments: N/A	

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			1,508	538	
Total Long Term Students Served			409	457	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			157	284	
LEP Students			0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			2	0	
Asian			6	0	
Black or African American			950	438	
Hispanic or Latino			27	4	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			506	96	
Two or more races			13	0	
Total			1,504	538	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,508	522	
Female			0	16	
Total			1,508	538	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			9	0	
12			9	0	
13			48	0	
14			143	0	
15			287	0	
16			364	2	
17			404	19	
18			159	53	
19			75	113	
20			10	201	
21			0	150	
Total			1,508	538	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Alabama has Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention, and other programs. These programs are served through Title I D sub part 2. therefore, no data was collected. Demographic data subtotals differ due to LEAs not reporting students' identified race. This explains why the total counts differ in this section.

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

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 legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			1,508	504	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Alabama has Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention, and other programs. These programs are served through Title I D sub part 2. therefore, no data was collected.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

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 as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

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	//////////	
Earned high school course credits					261	S	280	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					129	S	142	S		
Earned a GED					29	S	54	S		
Obtained high school diploma					S	S	7	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					8	S	89	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					127	S	25	4		
Obtained employment					S	S	S	10		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Alabama has Neglected Programs, Juvenile Detention, and other programs. These programs are served through Title I D sub part 2. Therefore, no data was collected.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term 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 table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2013, 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 table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			56	55	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			83	18	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			149	19	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			75	93	
Comments: Facilities reported students who entered N or D programs and were administered pre-assessments but may have exited the program before post-assessments were administered.					

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

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 pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			64	45	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			93	10	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			133	39	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			73	91	
Comments: Facilities reported students who entered N or D programs and were administered pre-assessments but may have exited the program before post-assessments were administered.					

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	14	120
Neglected programs	12	177
Juvenile detention	20	71
Juvenile corrections	13	125
Other	4	131
Total	63	////////////////////
Comments: N/A		

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	14
Neglected programs	12
Juvenile detention	20
Juvenile corrections	13
Other	4
Total	63
Comments: N/A	

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	974	694	4,013	2,797	226
Total Long Term Students Served	610	420	456	426	185

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	166	114	353	522	13
LEP Students	4	3	33	0	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	1	18	4	0
Asian	3	0	4	13	4
Black or African American	650	315	2,307	1,698	71
Hispanic or Latino	10	22	113	35	12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	1
White	289	347	1,523	975	135
Two or more races	15	9	38	69	3
Total	968	694	4,003	2,794	226

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	672	455	3,243	2,120	82
Female	302	239	770	677	144
Total	974	694	4,013	2,797	226

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	3	0	0	0	0
6	4	2	0	0	0
7	3	9	0	0	0
8	2	2	0	0	0
9	3	2	2	0	0
10	17	8	7	3	1
11	14	12	24	4	1
12	44	21	84	28	4
13	81	63	275	129	10
14	117	97	515	286	21
15	191	141	837	546	36
16	247	155	1,099	817	56
17	174	132	1,024	830	53
18	58	33	125	149	26
19	15	14	21	4	8
20	0	3	0	1	5
21	1	0	0	0	5
Total	974	694	4,013	2,797	226

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

Demographic data subtotals differ due to LEAs not reporting students' identified race.

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

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 legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	250	68	1,412	130	162

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: N/A

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

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 as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

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	//////////	155	//////////	122	//////////	747	//////////	301	//////////	108
Earned high school course credits	440	101	177	26	665	584	350	151	106	S
Enrolled in a GED program	9	S	16	S	102	76	257	12	S	5
Earned a GED	4	S	7	S	30	7	64	5	S	S
Obtained high school diploma	40	16	4	7	5	15	4	S	29	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	11	12	8	S	S	17	S	5	15	16
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S	S	S	11	10	25	S	S	S
Obtained employment	5	13	S	4	9	34	5	50	S	6

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Corrected

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term 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 table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2013, 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 table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	33	16	51	30	5
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	42	44	90	196	66
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	98	52	54	129	27
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	89	27	100	114	80
Comments: Facilities reported students who entered N or D programs and were administered pre-assessments but may have exited the program before post-assessments were administered.					

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, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

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 pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	39	14	59	35	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	78	47	85	207	37
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	86	51	62	139	126
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	36	20	89	89	5
Comments: Facilities reported students who entered N or D programs and were administered pre-assessments but may have exited the program before post-assessments were administered.					

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, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

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.

2.9 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	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	4
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	29
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	23
Parental involvement activities	12
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	18
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	59
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3
Comments: N/A	

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.

RLIS funds continue to supplement personnel and programs in school districts identified through a comprehensive needs assessment. RLIS funds have allowed school districts to continue and/or expand successful programs in reading and math.

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 2013-14?	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: N/A	

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).	12
Comments: N/A	

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 2013 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)	106,373.50	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		106,373.50
Total	106,373.50	106,373.50
Comments: N/A		

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 RATES⁴

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 2013-14). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; 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 have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	86.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	88.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.00
<i>Asian</i>	
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	
Black or African American	83.80
Hispanic or Latino	85.00
White	87.80
Two or more races	82.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	64.40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	67.00
Economically disadvantaged students	81.50

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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 LISTS 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 schools⁵ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : 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.

⁵ 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 schools⁶ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : 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 2014-15 (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.

⁶ 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 schools⁷ with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 :

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.

⁷ 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 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (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))⁸
- | 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.

⁸ 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 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

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.

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 action⁹ under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (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 EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts 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 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.

⁹ The district 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>.