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 EDFacts 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:
___Part I, 2013-14 __X__Part II, 2013-14

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Arizona Department of Education

Address:
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Robert Gold

Telephone: (602) 542-4288

Fax: (602) 542-3050

e-mail: robert.gold@azed.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Robert Gold

_____ __Wednesday, May 13, 2015, 11:18:36 AM__
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	46,617	S	61.60
4	45,988	S	52.30
5	45,803	S	53.70
6	44,462	S	52.20
7	42,451	S	54.80
8	42,379	S	49.80
High School	30,541	S	53.70
Total	298,241	S	54.10
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	46,645	S	70.60
4	45,990	S	67.30
5	45,821	S	73.00
6	44,465	S	73.00
7	42,465	S	81.40
8	42,390	S	61.20
High School	30,891	S	80.30
Total	298,667	S	72.00
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	10,570	S	74.00
4	10,521	S	65.60
5	10,355	S	66.30
6	8,947	S	63.50
7	7,330	S	65.30
8	7,238	S	58.30
High School	5,723	S	55.70
Total	60,684	S	65.00
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	10,570	S	82.00
4	10,521	S	80.60
5	10,355	S	83.70
6	8,951	S	83.60
7	7,332	S	87.50
8	7,238	S	70.40
High School	5,757	S	83.70
Total	60,724	S	81.70
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	44,309
Limited English proficient students	39,102
Students who are homeless	12,831
Migratory students	1,853
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	15,239
Asian	5,287
Black or African American	23,281
Hispanic or Latino	208,801
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,119
White	75,189
Two or more races	6,925
Total	335,841
Comments:	

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	1	80	0	0	81
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	113	2,836	2	39	2,990
K	3,121	25,577	939	191	29,828
1	3,336	25,978	844	189	30,347
2	3,151	24,967	790	182	29,090
3	3,236	25,206	804	193	29,439
4	2,769	24,334	733	203	28,039
5	2,677	24,185	725	202	27,789
6	1,988	23,294	702	213	26,197
7	2,318	22,431	725	226	25,700
8	2,254	22,015	657	255	25,181
9	1,495	22,939	153	205	24,792
10	1,479	21,008	174	246	22,907
11	1,544	19,428	131	321	21,424
12	1,662	20,327	131	299	22,419
Ungraded	5	91			96
TOTALS	31,149	304,696	7,510	2,964	346,319
Comments:					

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

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

TAS instructional service	# Students Served
Mathematics	16,748
Reading/language arts	25,600
Science	2,866
Social studies	2,836
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	2,529
Comments:	

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

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

TAS Suport Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	4
Other support services	29
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	341.57	
Paraprofessionals[1]	265.18	0.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	12.15	
Clerical support staff	15.55	
Administrators (non-clerical)	46.55	
Comments: The State of Arizona has a new system this year for reporting the staff counts and we will be working to obtain the percentage paraprofessionals qualified from our LEAs with Title I TA schools.		

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]	265.20	0.00
Comments: The State of Arizona has a new system this year for reporting the staff counts and we will be working to obtain the percentage paraprofessionals qualified from our LEAs with Title I TA schools.		

[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*	474	101
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	309,269	2,576,948
Sum of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations	41,994,082	259,035,776
Percentage of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	0.74	0.99

*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.

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

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 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)	711
K	482
1	568
2	591
3	597
4	587
5	529
6	617
7	610
8	521

9	599
10	730
11	717
12	1,084
Ungraded	345
Out-of-school	64
Total	9,352
Comments: N/A	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: N/A

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from 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	358
Comments: The Arizona MEP recruiters were diligent when interviewing families to ask if there were children who were in the category of birth through age 2 who made the qualifying move. More families identified had children within this age range.	

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)	46
K	73
1	113
2	111
3	120
4	115
5	110
6	116
7	104
8	88
9	43
10	120
11	122
12	135
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	2
Total	1,419
Comments: LEAs who have a Migrant Education Program (MEP) reported holding specifically MEP funded summer school projects which accounts for the increase in Migrant students' participation during the Summer/Intersession Term.	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: LEAs who have a Migrant Education Program (MEP) reported holding specifically MEP funded summer school projects which accounts for the increase in Migrant students' participation during the Summer/Intersession Term.

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

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 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	No
MIS 2000	No
COEStar	Yes
MAPS	No
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	No

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

COEstar, Migrant student data base, and the Arizona state system for child counts, SAIS, communicate with each other. COEstar and SAIS match using the unique identifier, SAIS Number. This is how eligible Migrant students are identified and reported in Statewide assessments.

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)?

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

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

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

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	73
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	58
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	58

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The re-interview was conducted from October 19-24, 2014. The sample was randomly selected from students reported in the 2013-14 school year by Arizona as eligible and for whom a new Certificate of Eligibility (COE) (prompted by a new qualifying arrival date) had been completed within that timeframe.

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)?	SY2013-14
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes
Was the sampling statewide?	Yes

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

a. *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 sampling method used for the Arizona re-interview was actually performed in school year 2014-2015. The CSPR information above is hard coded for SY2013-14 and this is incorrect. The date the sample was drawn, October 16, 2014, falls in the 2014-15 school year.
The sampling method used for the Arizona 2013-14 re-interview was not stratified. Instead, a statewide random sampling procedure was used. The State Education Agency (SEA) provided a list of randomly selected students - 50 as the main sample and 60 as the alternate sample to the external agency conducting the re-interview. All the students in the sample were obtained from the total number of students in the state's database meeting the parameter as of the date the sample was drawn, October 16, 2014.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sample selected for the 2013-2014 Arizona re-interview was randomly selected from the state's migrant database. The state's migrant database provider, also an external agency, selected the sample, using the following process:

The sample list was randomly selected by TROMIK, the state's migrant database provider. COEStar is the state's database. The data was randomized 4 times. The first random number used either the SAIS ID or the digits in the last four places of the COEStar Id and Sibling number if no SAIS Id was available. That result was multiplied by the number 77. The data selected were students who appear eligible for the 2014 count at this time and who had a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) during the performance period. The result of the first draw was saved and a new random number was generated using the random ID created in the first set as a seed. The second draw was then saved. The result of the second draw was used to create a third level random number using the result of the second draw as a seed to the randomizer. The third draw was saved. The third draw was then used to select the first 50 students used in the sample based on the third draw random number. The third draw was then input to another randomizer run using the third draw random number generated to create a fourth set of random keys. The result of this fourth set was saved. The fourth draw was then used to select the second 60 students

used in the sample based on the fourth draw random number. Note that there could have been duplicates in the draws but none appeared. The first 50 and second 60 sets were joined with school data, identification data, and enrollment data to produce the output sets in the above two mentioned files.

During the re-interview, the interview teams received sample lists divided by districts throughout the state. The lists included both main and alternate students. Re-interviewers were instructed to ensure that all the students in the main sample were interviewed first. They were asked to make up to three attempts before indicating in the re-interview form that they were unable to find the family. In some instances, the recruiters we able to determine that the family had moved away, either because there were new tenants in the residence or it appeared empty.

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

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

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 Arizona re-interview was conducted by an independent, external agency. Three out-of-state interviewers with experience in identification and recruitment were used to conduct the re-interviews of the randomly selected sample. None of the re-interviewers had any relationship with the Arizona Migrant Education Program (AZ-MEP) staff or the state's migrant families.

The interviews were conducted using a protocol and form that has been used by the external agency in other states with the same purpose. The forms were reviewed and accepted by the AZ-MEP.

Re-interviewers were instructed to complete the forms as if they were census takers - in other words, they would only enter the information provided by the family without making any eligibility determinations. After interviewing the families, they were to review the COE forms (kept in a manila envelope) and ask clarifying questions to the families if necessary. After completing the interview, the re-interviewers were to place the re-interview form, COE, and any other additional notes into the manila envelope without making an eligibility determination. This allowed re-interviewers to just collect the needed information without the pressure of making a determination at the time.

Local staff from the AZ MEP was used during the re-interview to assist the out-of-state individuals in locating and introducing them to the families. Local staff was asked to avoid interfering into the re-interview process by not participating in the actual interview. If possible, they were asked to excuse themselves from where the interview was taking place. Also, districts were asked to ensure that the local staff was not the recruiter who completed the original COE being used during the re-interview. Local programs were not informed of the names of the students in the sample until October 20, 2014, during the first day of the re-interview effort.

Of the total re-interviews, 74 were conducted face-to-face, and only one was conducted over the phone.

Copies of all the completed forms, COEs and re-interviewer notes were sent to a review panel comprised of three ID&R experts. To ensure additional independence, none of the members of the review panel had any relationships with the re-interviewers or the staff from the AZ MEP.

The panel provided the AZ MEP with an initial determination after reviewing the materials obtained through the interviews. The determination from the panel included requests for additional information that will help them clarify any eligibility determination that could not be reached by the panel. The panel was able to provide information for all the re-interviews and, after reviewing the information received from the AZ MEP, the panel was able to reach a consensus to make the final determinations.

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 AZ MEP external re-interview was conducted by an external agency on October 19-24, 2014. A total of 58 re-interviews were conducted from a statewide sample of randomly selected migrant children. After revising all the completed forms and clarifying information provided by the state, a review panel determined that all the children in the sample were eligible, for a 0% defect rate.

During the review, the independent panel found a number of COE errors and requested clarification from the state in a number of cases. Although these issues did not affect the eligibility of any child in the sample, the external agency provided a summary of these errors and offered a number of recommendations to the AZ MEP.

COE Errors

• Early moves. Many families in Arizona move early for a number of reasons - starting school on time, securing employment, AZ is their home state. The COEs completed for families who moved early were inconsistent. The SEA produced state-specific guidance regarding the eligibility of children who moved early, however, and all the cases were clarified with additional documentation (Migrant Student Records Exchange Initiative (MSIX) records, corrected COEs).
• Worker or employer statement missing when "temporary qualifying work" was determined. There was a small number of COEs marked as "temporary employment" that were missing an employer or worker statement as to why employment was temporary. Corrected COEs were provided by the SEA.
• Moves based on economic necessity. Given its proximity to Mexico, a number of families often move there once employment is over because they are unable to find another employment. These families then return to the state when work is about to start, resulting in moves based on economic necessity.
• Moves "From/To." The review panel had difficulty identifying where the family or child had moved "from" or "to", and/or where work was obtained. This difficulty occurred as the panel compared the COEs to the notes from the re-interviewer. The SEA was able to provide clarifying documentation (MSIX records) to assist the panel in making appropriate determinations in this matter.
• Work in dairy farms identified as seasonal employment. A number of COEs identified work obtained in dairy farms as seasonal employment. The SEA was able to provide state-specific guidance as to why these determinations were made as seasonal instead of temporary.

The AZ MEP was able to address all the questions raised by the panel in a satisfactory manner.

Discrepancy Rate

The review panel determined that all the children in the randomly selected sample were eligible for the AZ MEP, resulting in a 0% rate.

Recommendations

• Train staff across the AZ MEP to properly and consistently complete the COE in cases where families and children move early. Since Arizona is considered the "homebase" for many families, the number of those who move early will continue to be present in the state and their move and rational for eligibility determination needs to be properly documented.
• Train AZ MEP staff to clearly indicate in the COE why moves to Mexico by families and children and their subsequent return to the state are to be considered as "economic necessity."
• Strengthen state-specific guidance determining dairy employment as qualifying work in particular cases. Review current research and consult with dairy farmers on the timing of calving season in the state and include the information in the state's ID&R manual.
• Include state-specific guidance regarding short distance and short duration moves in the state's ID&R manual. Many Arizona districts are located closely to each other within the same city, and recruiters (or individuals unfamiliar with district zones) may be unable to determine when children and their families have moved into another district. In addition, these moves may be for a short period of time, and qualifying moves may be missed. Training for staff is needed on how to recognize and properly document in the COE these short term and short duration moves.
• 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 AZ 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)?	Yes

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)	0
K	26
1	39
2	40
3	38
4	36
5	34
6	42
7	46
8	36
9	34
10	52
11	55
12	54
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	4
Total	544
Comments: For the 2013-2014 school year, Arizona has identified an increase of students moving to our state. Mobility is a consideration for Priority for Service. Therefore, there has been an increase in Priority for Service.	

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)	
K	127
1	287
2	347
3	334
4	290
5	243
6	211
7	190
8	153
9	80
10	104
11	100
12	84
Ungraded	28
Out-of-school	4
Total	2,582
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)	8
K	11
1	29
2	33
3	37
4	43
5	37
6	47
7	42
8	40
9	30
10	18
11	8
12	31
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	
Total	416
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	238
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	327
K	254
1	274
2	278
3	262
4	277
5	275
6	295
7	291
8	267
9	315
10	282
11	342
12	435
Ungraded	132
Out-of-school	44
Total	4,588

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

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	113
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	186
K	120
1	128
2	119
3	112
4	118
5	128
6	125
7	125
8	115
9	111
10	109
11	134
12	207
Ungraded	63
Out-of-school	18
Total	2,031

Comments: Arizona has seen a decrease of students moving during the regular school year. Students are making the move early to begin school on time and staying through the end of the school year before moving to join the worker. This is evidenced in the early moves found during the re-interview this year.

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	12
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87
K	52
1	95
2	84
3	80
4	99
5	69
6	86
7	82
8	68
9	42
10	35
11	37
12	36
Ungraded	16
Out-of-school	3
Total	983

Comments: Arizona has seen an increase in the Migrant student population. Therefore, we have also seen an increase in the referrals to students. This increase is also due to the data collection period being changed from the Regular School Year to the Performance Period. The SEA has reviewed and held trainings with the LEAs regarding the referral service.

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	26
8	27
9	14
10	21
11	23
12	86
Ungraded	
Total	197
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:	

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	22
1	32
2	31
3	32
4	30
5	30
6	37
7	38
8	31
9	26
10	35
11	41
12	41
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	3
Total	435
Comments: Arizona has seen an increase in Priority for Service students due to the increase of students moving to our state. We have also concentrated training efforts on identifying Priority for Service students.	

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	2
1	0
2	1
3	0
4	3
5	0
6	1
7	0
8	0
9	1
10	5
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	14

Comments: Arizona has seen an increase in Priority for Service students due to the increase of students moving to our state. We have also concentrated training efforts on identifying Priority for Service students. Priority for Services students have been attending intersession classes.

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	10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	199
K	259
1	376
2	406
3	415
4	406
5	393
6	439
7	443
8	369
9	322
10	494
11	498
12	805
Ungraded	90
Out-of-school	9
Total	5,933

Comments: Arizona has seen an increase in the Migrant student population since the last reporting period. Therefore, the number of student services has also increased. Parents are seeing the value of instructional and support services and are encouraging their students to participate in these services.

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	0
K	24
1	33
2	32
3	32
4	31
5	30
6	38
7	38
8	31
9	28
10	36
11	41
12	42
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	3
Total	445

Comments: Arizona has seen an increase in the number of Priority of Services students who have received MEP-funded instructional or support services. The increase may be due to the change in the report period from Regular School Year to Performance Period. Arizona has concentrated its efforts on identifying Priority for Service students.

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)	1
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	1
4	3
5	0
6	1
7	1
8	1
9	1
10	0
11	0
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	10
Comments: The increase is due to the change in the reporting period from Regular School Year to Performance Period.	

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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	53
K	118
1	214
2	209
3	225
4	213
5	195
6	230
7	217
8	169
9	120
10	80
11	95
12	176
Ungraded	32
Out-of-school	5
Total	2,351

Comments: Arizona has seen an increase in the Migrant student population. Therefore, we have also seen an increase in the referrals to students. This increase is also due to the data collection period being changed from the Regular School Year to the Performance Period.

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)	40	53	//
K	104	82	//
1	184	126	//
2	186	132	//
3	200	139	//
4	189	129	//
5	168	124	//
6	181	148	//
7	185	170	//
8	144	139	//
9	77	81	20
10	7	6	71
11	4	2	90
12	2		172
Ungraded			32
Out-of-school	1	1	4
Total	1,672	1,332	389

Comments: The SEA emphasized the importance of supporting migrant students in reading and math to increase student performance on state assessments. This effort is to reduce the achievement gaps between Migrant and Non-Migrant students. The increase in high school credit accrual is attributed to the growth in the 11th-12th grade students with credit deficiency. These students participated in credit accrual programs such as Arizona's PASS program. The increase is also due to the data collection period being changed from the Regular School Year to the Performance Period.

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 performace 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	10	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	192	0
K	238	0
1	330	0
2	357	0
3	375	0
4	356	0
5	361	0
6	389	0
7	393	0
8	340	0
9	298	0
10	469	0
11	474	0
12	775	0
Ungraded	85	1
Out-of-school	8	0
Total	5,450	1
Comments: The reduction in counseling services is due primarily to school districts offering limited counseling services. This is also the result of funding limitations experienced by the LEAs. The increase in support services is due to the increase in the number of students identified for the MEP and the data collection period being changed from the Regular School Year to the Performance Period.		

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	218
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	7,286
Comments: There has been an increase of migrant students eligible for the Migrant Education Program from the 2012-2013 reporting period to the 2013-2014 reporting period. There has been a slight increase in the number of schools that enrolled Migrant students. These migratory students enrolled in charter schools and not returned to the traditional school district.	

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: There are zero schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a school wide program.	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **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	6	120
Regular school year - school day/extended day	3	780
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	21	7,001
Comments: For SY 2013-2014, two small LEAs declined funding to implement a Migrant Education Program. However, Arizona's total migrant student count increased. Most LEAs held a year round project. There was a larger amount of migrant student participating during the regular school year -school day/extended day programs. These projects were in schools with a large migratory population.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.

c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).

d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.

e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

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

FAQs on the MEP State director

a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the 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	41	24.31	116	96.50	
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00	
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Qualified paraprofessionals	41	21.60	51	39.50	49
Recruiters	45	34.19	21	18.45	
Records transfer staff	22	12.53	11	7.06	
Administrators	17	13.95	10	8.40	

Comments: For this reporting period, there was an increase in the teachers, qualified paraprofessionals, recruiters and administrators for the regular school year. There was also an increase in the teachers, qualified paraprofessionals, recruiters and administrators for the summer/intersession term. The increase in FTEs is due to teachers working with a smaller class size to provide individual instruction. The Performance Period Headcount is an unduplicated count.

Additionally: For the last column listed, Performance Period: Headcount, the CSPR system is not allowing for data to be entered for all fields. the data should read:
Teachers - 83
Counselors - 0
Non-qualified paraprofessionals - 0
Qualified paraprofessionals - 49
Recruiters - 36
Records transfer staff - 22
Administrators - 14

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	14	30
Juvenile corrections	1	210
Adult corrections	9	365
Other	0	0
Total	24	//////////////////////////////
Comments:		

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	14
Juvenile Corrections	1
Adult Corrections	9
Other	0
Total	24
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served		3,714	354	653	
Total Long Term Students Served		228	213	653	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)		1,728	141	174	
LEP Students		0	0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native		296	12	32	
Asian		14	3	13	
Black or African American		413	56	85	
Hispanic or Latino		1,582	171	268	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	
White		1,407	108	255	
Two or more races		2	4	0	
Total		3,714	354	653	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		2,980	312	588	
Female		734	42	65	
Total		3,714	354	653	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8		1	0	0	
9		1	0	0	
10		7	0	0	
11		18	0	0	
12		50	0	0	
13		163	1	0	
14		411	7	0	
15		704	53	7	
16		1,060	119	13	
17		1,299	174	32	
18			0	78	
19			0	131	
20			0	197	
21			0	195	
Total		3,714	354	653	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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.		0	0	0	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

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	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in their local district school	//////////////////////		//////////////////////	85	//////////////////////	S	//////////////////////	S	//////////////////////	
Earned high school course credits			1,341	S	S	S	11	S		
Enrolled in a GED program			137	S	S	S	123	653		
Earned a GED			133	S	130	S	69	S		
Obtained high school diploma			S	4	33	S	S	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			S	5	S	S	550	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			40	5	S	S	550	S		
Obtained employment			7	7	S	S	S	S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent 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		22	20	23	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		10	15	71	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		148	8	424	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		48	7	135	
Comments:					

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		18	9	23	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		9	18	71	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		147	5	424	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		15	16	135	
Comments:					

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students.Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs.The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	18	121
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	2	21
Juvenile corrections	1	185
Other	0	0
Total	21	//////////////////////////////
Comments:		

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	18
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	2
Juvenile corrections	1
Other	0
Total	21
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,315		114	255	
Total Long Term Students Served	977		38	255	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	320		35	76	
LEP Students	97		2	0	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	228		78	42	
Asian	6		0	1	
Black or African American	115		2	68	
Hispanic or Latino	513		15	61	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1		0	8	
White	425		17	57	
Two or more races	27		2	18	
Total	1,315		114	255	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	768		29	0	
Female	547		85	255	
Total	1,315		114	255	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	3		0	0	
6	33		0	0	
7	44		0	0	
8	54		0	0	
9	51		0	0	
10	49		1	0	
11	48		1	0	
12	69		1	23	
13	111		1	7	
14	146		9	27	
15	152		53	44	
16	188		30	69	
17	227		13	81	
18	91		5	4	
19	35		0	0	
20	10		0	0	
21	4		0	0	
Total	1,315		114	255	

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

The total number of students by age in at-risk programs does not match the total unduplicated students served due to incomplete reporting to us from one school district. We will submit complete counts when they become available to us.

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	no	yes	yes	no
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	518		97	181	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Arizona determined data for Neglected programs had duplicated counts and was removed.

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	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in their local district school	//////////////////////////	567	//////////////////////////		//////////////////////////	109	//////////////////////////	S	//////////////////////////	
Earned high school course credits	367	32			35	42	223	170		
Enrolled in a GED program	7	S			S	S	32	16		
Earned a GED	8	S			S	S	9	S		
Obtained high school diploma	44	S			S	S	7	14		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	10	S			S	S	S	5		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	48	S			S	S	S	123		
Obtained employment	33	S			S	S	S	122		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent 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	36		S	0	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	59		0	0	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	112		0	162	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	9		0	93	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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	42		S	0	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	98		S	54	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	47		S	176	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	9		S	25	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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	7
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	14
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	13
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	10
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Altar Valley Elementary District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 8.71% from 69.28% to 78%. Altar Valley Elementary District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 1.23% from 58% to 59.23%.
Bisbee Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Decreased by -5.35% from 67.55% to 62.2%. Bisbee Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -0.23% from 40.09% to 39.86%.
Camp Verde Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 20.14% from 36.95% to 57.09%. Camp Verde Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 17.12% from 26.25% to 43.37%.
Career Development Inc. 2014 reading AIMS scores have Decreased by -8.68% from 63.71% to 55.03%. Career Development Inc.. 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -18.27% from 29.45% to 11.18%.
Destiny School Inc. 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 6% from 79% to 85%. Destiny School Inc. 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 11% from 67% to 78%.
Douglas Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 3.22% from 65.75% to 68.96%. Douglas Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -1.21% from 43.59% to 42.38%.
Founding Fathers Academies Inc. 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 15% from 44% to 59%. Founding Fathers Academies Inc. 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 10% from 18% to 28%.
Gila County Regional School District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 9.42% from 41.51% to 50.93%. Gila County Regional School District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -1.1% from 18.43% to 17.33%.
Globe Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 1.68% from 64.76% to 66.44%. Globe Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 0.69% from 39.6% to 40.29%.
Holbrook Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 6.2% from 61.79% to 67.99%. Holbrook Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 2.98% from 47.4% to 50.38%.
Imagine Coolidge Elementary Inc. 2014 reading AIMS scores have Decreased by -4% from 70% to 66%. Imagine Coolidge Elementary Inc. 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -9% from 56% to 47%.
Legacy Traditional School-Avondale 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 4% from 90% to 94%. Legacy Traditional School-Avondale 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 10% from 77% to 87%.
Miami Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 17.36% from 50.44% to 67.8%. Miami Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 15.05% from 33.19% to 48.24%.
Nogales Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 3.25% from 76.61% to 79.86%. Nogales Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 3.56% from 60.06% to 63.62%.
Omega Alpha Academy 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 11.86% from 55% to 66.86%. Omega Alpha Academy 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 1.91% from 41% to 42.91%.
Parker Unified School District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Decreased by -10% from 67.64% to 57.64%. Parker Unified School District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -14.73% from 52.13% to 37.4%.
Payson Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Decreased by -0.89% from 61.52% to 60.62%. Payson Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -2.28% from 43.17% to 40.89%.
Pinon Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 5.54% from 53.97% to 59.51%. Pinon Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 7.51% from 33.51% to 41.02%.
Quartzsite Elementary District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Decreased by -2.7% from 63.01% to 60.31%. Quartzsite Elementary District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -9.24% from 46.01% to 36.77%.
San Carlos Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 6.57% from 27.68% to 34.24%. San Carlos Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 0.05% from 13.8% to 13.85%.
Santa Cruz Valley Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 1.77% from 77.56% to 79.33%. Santa Cruz Valley Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -1.96% from 60.09% to 58.13%.
Show Low Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 23.13% from 57.16% to 80.29%. Show Low Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 15.63% from 44.53% to 60.17%.
Snowflake Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 1.98% from 82.7% to 84.68%. Snowflake Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 3.52% from 70.04% to 73.56%.
Tombstone Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 0.89% from 54.11% to 55.01%. Tombstone Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 1.02% from 40.27% to 41.3%.
Willcox Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Increased by 3.35% from 67.26% to 70.61%. Willcox Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have increased by 4.91% from 50.08% to 55%.
Winslow Unified District 2014 reading AIMS scores have Decreased by -14.6% from 74.64% to 60.04%. Winslow Unified District 2014 math AIMS scores have decreased by -14.9% from 53.09% to 38.19%.

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?	No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	8
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	8	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		8

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)	114,765.80	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		114,765.80
Total	114,765.80	114,765.80
Comments:		

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

2.11 Graduation Rates [4]

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 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	75.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	62.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.00
Asian	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	
Black or African American	71.00
Hispanic or Latino	70.30
White	82.30
Two or more races	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	63.30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18.00
Economically disadvantaged students	69.90

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.

[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 schools[5] 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 EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward SchoolsËœ 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 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 schools [6] 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 schools [7] 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 assessmentWhether 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 EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward SchoolsËœ 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 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 action[9] 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.