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:
California Department of Education

Address:
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Sonya Edwards

Telephone: 916-327-2014

Fax: 916-323-5110

e-mail: sedwards@cde.ca.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Keric Ashley

_____ __Friday, April 3, 2015, 3:06:01 PM__
Signature Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II

For reporting on

School Year 2013-14

☒

PART II DUE FEBRUARY 13, 2015
5PM EST

2.1 Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,730	S	73.00
4	2,605	S	68.00
5	2,591	S	73.00
6	2,306	S	63.00
7	2,128	S	71.00
8	2,104	S	73.00
High School	166,433	S	55.30
Total	180,897	S	56.50
Comments: The SBAC Field test did not produce student scores, performance levels were not assigned to these students.			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,734	S	84.00
4	2,612	S	86.00
5	2,593	S	89.00
6	2,316	S	76.00
7	2,137	S	80.00
8	2,113	S	81.00
High School	166,900	S	47.70
Total	181,405	S	50.50
Comments: The SBAC Field test did not produce student scores, performance levels were not assigned to these students.			

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	240	S	75.00
4	235	S	71.00
5	262	S	76.00
6	196	S	64.00
7	228	S	73.00
8	225	S	81.00
High School	36,118	S	67.40
Total	37,504	S	67.60
Comments: The SBAC Field test did not produce student scores, performance levels were not assigned to these students.			

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	240	S	88.00
4	235	S	89.00
5	262	S	94.00
6	196	S	83.00
7	228	S	85.00
8	226	S	83.00
High School	36,261	S	63.30
Total	37,648	S	64.10
Comments: The SBAC Field test did not produce student scores, performance levels were not assigned to these students.			

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*)	424,106
Limited English proficient students	1,159,663
Students who are homeless	234,409
Migratory students	65,915
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	22,523
Asian	248,025
Black or African American	244,890
Hispanic or Latino	2,418,527
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	17,759
White	467,230
Two or more races	77,927
Total	3,496,881
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	149	0	429	59	637
K	9,668	318,542	1,638	175	330,023
1	12,470	292,655	1,883	154	307,162
2	13,830	301,817	2,055	150	317,852
3	14,790	291,502	2,096	132	308,520
4	15,327	285,149	2,038	120	302,634
5	14,236	283,174	1,953	151	299,514
6	13,049	261,648	1,741	133	276,571
7	13,763	245,480	1,399	164	260,806
8	15,317	248,121	1,307	195	264,940
9	24,062	193,612	899	280	218,853
10	26,642	185,363	523	354	212,882
11	28,394	177,832	470	475	207,171
12	28,851	180,033	457	531	209,872
Ungraded	106	1,294	5	27	1,432
TOTALS	230,654	3,266,222	18,893	3,100	3,518,869
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	116,519
Reading/language arts	138,496
Science	13,176
Social studies	13,703
Vocational/career	4,539
Other instructional services	52,092
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	5,456
Supporting guidance/advocacy	9,989
Other support services	57,410
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	583.20	
Paraprofessionals[1]	805.98	97.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	127.48	
Clerical support staff	150.68	
Administrators (non-clerical)	31.33	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
   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]	10,619.30	98.70
Comments:		

[3] Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 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*	561	369
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	340,173	21,940,343
Sum of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations	87,944,698	1,401,503,660
Percentage of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	0.39	1.57

*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.

California does not annually collect examples of how local educational agencies in the State use their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during the school year.

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:

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)	12,121
K	6,735
1	7,101
2	7,544
3	7,409
4	7,093
5	6,874
6	6,490
7	6,317
8	6,376

9	5,785
10	5,734
11	5,621
12	7,820
Ungraded	130
Out-of-school	12,980
Total	112,130
Comments:	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from 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	5,016
Comments:	

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 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)	4,473
K	3,133
1	3,870
2	3,985
3	4,072
4	3,932
5	3,796
6	3,592
7	3,349
8	3,253
9	2,825
10	2,818
11	2,709
12	2,364
Ungraded	24
Out-of-school	2,222
Total	50,417
Comments:	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: California had a 10.8 percent decline in the counts of students served during the summer/intersession, primarily as the result of a dramatic reduction in numbers in five regions that are subgrantees of the state. The main reasons for the decline in numbers served during the summer and intersession are as follows:
The severe drought in California resulted in fewer summer jobs in some areas, and a significant number of families moved up to Oregon and Washington for work before summer Migrant Education (ME) programs were offered and returned after those services concluded. This trend likely will continue next year on the basis of the predicted drought conditions.
In one region, California's local control action plan (LCAP) resulted in the local school districts offering more educational programs and other services during the summer and other school breaks at the district sites and ME families took advantage of those district services and programs instead of the ME program services. The area ME program office is working on ways to serve families outside of the LCAP programs while remaining supplemental.
Another regional ME program transitioned from offering home-based services and programs to offering only site-based programs during summer/intersession. Transportation was made available but the families did not take advantage of it. In the second year, the area's families are likely to become more comfortable with the transition to site-based programs and services and utilize the transportation available to participate. A different - but similar - situation occurred in another region where the regional ME program absorbed a neighboring ME subgrantee in September 2013. In the process of the transition, the communication between the regional offices and the ME families of the absorbed ME program was apparently confusing for families. This communication issue should be resolved with the completion of the transition.
Finally, as the result of the technical assistance that the State provided to the subgrantees, one subgrantee region correctly recorded the number of students served for 2013-14 which resulted in a decrease from prior years; in other words, the subgrantee had incorrectly denoted A2 data in prior years.

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	297
Comments:	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	No
MIS 2000	No
COEStar	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.

Children who were between 3 and 21

An automated procedure in the COEStar Performance Reporter produces a table that contains a list of all students who might be eligible to be counted or served by the program. One condition the child count algorithm searches for is if the child turned three years of age during the reporting period or had not turned twenty-two years of age before the start of the reporting period. Any student record not included in this table cannot be considered for eligibility.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria

To verify residence in years two and three of eligibility, California requires that subgrantees make contact with all families and youths in their geographic areas at least once each year (typically on the anniversary of their qualifying arrival date). The subgrantees must: document the nature of the contact (phone or in person), verify that child(ren) on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) are still at the residence, verify if additional, age-eligible, children have joined the residence, and document if a worker has moved to seek or obtain employment. If a new qualifying move has been made, the recruiter must make a personal visit to the residence to complete a new COE. Children are not counted unless they have one or more of the following: valid qualifying move date, new residency date, or enrollment date (residency enrollment for non-attendees or a school enrollment for attendees) during the period in question.

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period

For a child to be counted, one of the following events must take place and be documented: qualifying move, residency move or an enrollment (either non-attendee or school enrollment).
For 12th graders, school records are checked at the end of the school year to determine if they received a high school diploma.
If they did, their migrant student record is flagged with a Termination Flag (code "G") to indicate the student graduated and date of graduation. The child count algorithm searches for this flag and if present, excludes said student from the child count in subsequent years.
Similarly, for Out-of-School-Youth that complete the GED, their migrant student record is flagged with a Termination Flag (code "E") to indicate the student has received the GED and the date of completion. The child count algorithm checks for this flag and if present, excludes said student from the child count.

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

A child's enrollment record must explicitly indicate enrollment and services in a summer or intersession term in order to be counted in the Category 2 count. A description indicating the nature of service is also required. In addition, summer or intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the three year eligibility period when the service began.
The algorithm that produce the Category 2 child count checks for termination flags of "G", "E", or "D" (deceased). Any service with a start date after the termination flag date is excluded from the Category 2 student counts. A report is generated to notify the affected subgrantee that an invalid enrollment was entered after the termination date and that the entry needs to be removed.

Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category

To avoid reporting duplicates, the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) performs a duplicate student test. The duplicate student test is an automated process that examines names, birth dates, sex, and parent names for possible duplicate records between or within subgrantee regions. The results are compiled into lists that are presented to the subgrantees' data stewards on a management Web site for resolution. The data stewards compare the records and make a determination if the students listed are the same or different. Once all involved data stewards have made a final determination, the records are either kept separately or merged together depending on the outcome of the determination.
The potential duplicates that are presented to the data stewards for resolution are monitored by the California Department of Education on the MSIN web site.
In addition, each student has a unique identification number that is used to determine the unique set of students for the state.
Each child's school record history is examined to determine the highest grade attained during the regular term and summer term, at both the state level and each local educational agency the child attended. For Part I reports, each unique child is reported by the maximum grade attained in the state.

Children two years of age that turned three during the performance period

The child count algorithm searches for children that turned three years of age during the reporting period and includes them in the child count.

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)?

California has two separate student-level data collection systems that do not directly interact with each other and were built for different purposes. One is the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS), which collects student-level data for all K-12 enrolled students, including migrant students. Local educational agencies (LEAs) submit data to CALPADS.
The other is the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN), which collects student-level and migrant family data required for Title I Part C. Subgrantee migrant regional centers submit data on migrant students and their families to MSIN. It is the subgrantees' responsibility to coordinate with the districts in their regions to identify migrant students for the purposes of providing services and reporting to CALPADS. Depending on the EDFacts file, the source of the migrant data varies. California makes sure that all migrant students that are reflected in the source system are accounted for in the EDFacts produced from that source.

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 California Department of Education (CDE) utilizes MSIX for data quality purposes to work on near-match students with other states. When necessary, CDE requires that its subgrantees find resolutions to near-match situations.

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.	1,007
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	635
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	610

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The primary reason for non-response during the re-interview process was that the re-interview contractor was unable to contact or locate the families or individuals. A very small number of the families/individuals who were contacted (17) refused to participate.

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.

For the California Migrant Education Program (MEP) 2013-14 re-interviews, Johnson, Bassin and Shaw (JBS) designed a stratified, random sample of the universe of MEP students with Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) created beginning September 1, 2013 and added to the state database through July 31, 2014. Regional samples were drawn by allocating a minimum of 30 interviews to each subgrantee, then allocating the remaining budgeted interviews among subgrantee regions proportionate to the numbers of students with COEs signed. Within each regional stratum, students were selected with equal probabilities.

The sampling universe

The sampling universe was defined to be children determined eligible for California's MEP during the 2013-14 program year beginning September 1, 2013. The operational definition of the sampling frame was all children (ages 3 through 21) included in the state's child count who had a COE signature date on or after September 1, 2013 and could realistically be sampled within the time frame required by Office of Migrant Education (OME). The sample was drawn in two waves: The first wave consisted of students with COEs signed on or after September 1, 2013 and added to the database before July 1, 2014. The second wave consisted of students with COEs signed during the MEP year and added to the database between July 1, 2014 and July 31, 2014.

Sources of sampling data

The sampling universe list consisted of all children in the state's COEStar database that met the sampling universe definition. To ensure that the sampling list was complete, WestEd, CDE's database contractor, worked with subgrantee regions to resolve pending COEs and make sure data were complete. Before drawing the sample, JBS confirmed the numbers in the state and regional sampling universes received from WestEd summed to the counts provided by WestEd.
To verify that the sampling universe was complete, WestEd ran queries of the total count of eligible students and confirmed that the sum of the students on the sampling universe list contained at least 99 percent of the total. A small number of students had COEs still being verified and thus were not in the database at the time of sampling. These students constituted less than one percent of the sampling universe.

Sampling design including random component

The re-interview plan called for random samples of 30 interviews per subgrantee region, and an additional 140 interviews to be drawn among regions proportional to the number of signed COEs, for a total of 740 budgeted interviews statewide. JBS used data on the actual numbers of new COEs signed between September 1, 2013 and June 30, 2014 and the projected numbers of COEs that would be added to the database between July 1, 2014 and July 31, 2014 to calculate the sample sizes needed. Allocations across sampling waves were based on the relative proportions of students recruited in September 2013 through June 2014 compared to July 2013. This plan resulted in a complex stratified random sampling design that required sampling weights. The design was less efficient than a simple random sample or probability proportional to size design; however, the sample size was sufficient to achieve the desired confidence interval for a 95 percent confidence interval of plus or minus four percentage points for the State.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

While the survey design included several components to address potential non-response (see below), it was prudent to plan for non-response when setting up the sample. In addition to the usual reasons that sampling migrant students is difficult, it was felt that this survey had additional non-response factors. One of these was the long lag between initial interview and re-interview. Since the survey was a snapshot survey conducted in the summer, students could have had lags as long as 11 months between recruitment and re-interview. In addition, given the large size of California and its climate variations, at all times of the year, students are migrating. Therefore it was likely that in at least a few locations, migrant students would be absent during the survey time.
To account for potential non-response, oversampling was included in the sample design. The required sample sizes were adjusted using a 70 percent response rate rounded to the nearest whole number of interviews.

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 California Department of Education (CDE) issued a Request for Proposals to solicit bids for the re-interview work product and, last year, issued an extension of the contract for the successful bidder, JBS. JBS conducted prospective re-interviews for a random sample of children identified as eligible during the 2013-14 program year. JBS did not hire recruiters employed by the California Migrant Education Program (MEP) to perform re-interviews, and JBS staff did not have any affiliation with the CDE's MEP. JBS affirmed in their contract they followed the Office of Migrant Education's Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing.

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.

To improve the accuracy of eligibility determinations in California, the California Department of Education (CDE) implements three separate, but interlinked, processes for improvement. The first is a state-led training requirement for every recruiter and designated state educational agency reviewer in the state. Without this training a recruiter may not engage in recruitment activities. In 2013-14, these trainings occurred in February and March of 2014. Second, these state-led trainings include content on the findings of the most recent state reinterview results. In 2013-14, the state-led recruiter training included content on the most common reasons for ineligibility determinations in performance period 2012-13, making eligibility determinations on whether the family did or did not move and determining if a worker did not seek or obtain qualifying work. Other content areas of the training includes lessons learned from the re-interviews, appropriate documentation to record as evidence of moves, recruitment interviewing techniques, fundamental eligibility criteria, and ethics. Finally, the third process is the corrective action process outlined in the California Identification and Recruitment Quality Control Plan (QCP). Per the QCP, once the re-interview report is completed the CDE requires subgrantees with the highest discrepancy rates to participate in the corrective action process. This process includes the following: a conference call with the subgrantee staff, review of findings by the subgrantees, the development of a mutually agreed upon Corrective Action Plan, quarterly progress reports to CDE from participating subgrantees, and a CDE review of ten percent of new Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) submitted by the subgrantees every month for the duration of the corrective action. Per the QCP, if a subgrantee meets the performance goals agreed upon in the Corrective Action Plan, the CDE may end the corrective actions. However, if eligibility determinations problems persist, the CDE will meet with the subgrantee to create a new Corrective Action Plan, require the subgrantee to attend additional mandatory training, or implement additional corrective actions for the subgrantee as needed.
Specifically in 2013-14, the CDE utilized re-interview results for performance periods 2011-12 and 2012-13 to identify subgrantees for technical assistance/corrective actions. Of the twelve subgrantees that participated in this process, two remain in corrective actions. The results of the 2013-14 statewide re-interviews will be used to select the next subgrantees required to participate in the QCP corrective action process that will commence in the spring of 2015.

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	452
1	396
2	477
3	469
4	493
5	410
6	402
7	374
8	381
9	340
10	359
11	320
12	158
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	45
Total	5,084

Comments: California had two primary contributions to the reduction in PFS students for 2013-14. The first was the reduced number of moves during the regular school year. California saw a reduction in regular school year moves from 20,288 in 2012-13 to 15,662 in 2013-14 for a decline of 22.8 percent. The second factor was the absence of 2013-14 state assessment data. California used the 2012-13 state assessment data to determine those students at risk of failing to replace the data from the missing 2013-14 assessments. This resulted in a reduction in identifying students at risk of failing; incoming second graders had no scores (California assessments are given in second through eleventh grades), and the students who were new arrivals to the California MEP were not assessed during the year.

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	5,135
1	4,458
2	5,352
3	5,310
4	4,693
5	4,098
6	3,286
7	2,863
8	2,610
9	2,295
10	2,068
11	2,086
12	989
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	45,243
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	19
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	319
K	292
1	321
2	437
3	498
4	574
5	608
6	624
7	638
8	589
9	615
10	541
11	524
12	535
Ungraded	12
Out-of-school	146
Total	7,292
Comments:	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 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	2,837
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,278
K	1,804
1	1,700
2	1,757
3	1,735
4	1,663
5	1,618
6	1,536
7	1,425
8	1,522
9	1,515
10	1,280
11	1,202
12	1,058
Ungraded	23
Out-of-school	4,587
Total	30,540
Comments:	

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose 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	1,616
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,938
K	985
1	894
2	879
3	862
4	790
5	761
6	728
7	666
8	722
9	615
10	577
11	518
12	494
Ungraded	15
Out-of-school	2,602
Total	15,662

Comments: For the 2012-13 CSPR, California reported the data for students that had a qualifying arrival date during the regular year for the last three performance periods. The comparison between the three-year number calculated for the prior year, and the one-year number reported for 2013-14 CSPR, accounts for the 71 percent decrease.

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	177
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,097
K	693
1	1,069
2	1,255
3	1,219
4	1,285
5	1,218
6	1,239
7	1,286
8	1,283
9	1,186
10	1,281
11	1,261
12	1,829
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	1,985
Total	19,369
Comments:	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migrant students.

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	
Comments: The data required for the final 13-14 dropouts will not be finalized until June 30, 2015. Once the data are finalized, it will take the California Department of Education a few weeks to compile the data EDFacts Reporting.	

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	227
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	
K	379
1	301
2	370
3	365
4	367
5	311
6	298
7	256
8	280
9	270
10	293
11	255
12	136
Ungraded	4
Out-of-school	24
Total	3,909
Comments:	

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	
K	259
1	280
2	290
3	312
4	322
5	273
6	260
7	242
8	255
9	204
10	190
11	196
12	66
Ungraded	3
Out-of-school	30
Total	3,182
Comments:	

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	960
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6,328
K	4,735
1	5,543
2	6,039
3	5,930
4	5,723
5	5,499
6	5,266
7	5,038
8	5,011
9	4,533
10	4,560
11	4,536
12	6,408
Ungraded	91
Out-of-school	4,910
Total	81,110
Comments:	

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	403
1	370
2	429
3	414
4	448
5	367
6	364
7	325
8	332
9	320
10	314
11	288
12	142
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	34
Total	4,556
Comments:	

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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	8
10	5
11	3
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	5
Total	21
Comments:	

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	190
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,004
K	3,722
1	4,460
2	4,939
3	4,954
4	4,758
5	4,571
6	4,267
7	3,945
8	3,848
9	3,107
10	2,883
11	2,922
12	3,684
Ungraded	50
Out-of-school	2,197
Total	59,501
Comments:	

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	58	34	//
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,345	2,091	//
K	1,948	1,981	//
1	2,864	2,828	//
2	3,241	3,142	//
3	3,440	3,252	//
4	3,251	2,991	//
5	3,157	2,884	//
6	2,876	2,632	//
7	2,526	2,346	//
8	2,378	2,194	//
9	1,695	1,434	983
10	1,406	1,106	1,263
11	1,458	1,129	1,321
12	1,652	1,106	956
Ungraded	17	9	
Out-of-school	722	469	
Total	35,034	31,628	4,523
Comments:			

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

2.3.5.3.2 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	940	275
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4,990	1,400
K	3,981	1,429
1	4,774	1,881
2	5,155	2,069
3	5,068	2,094
4	4,950	1,996
5	4,773	1,960
6	4,632	1,957
7	4,464	2,254
8	4,409	2,406
9	4,130	2,490
10	4,333	2,876
11	4,318	2,963
12	6,203	4,296
Ungraded	82	60
Out-of-school	4,737	3,523
Total	71,939	35,929
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.

b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.6 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	3,600
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	79,271
Comments:	

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:	

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	0	0
Regular school year - school day/extended day	4	31
Summer/intersession only	16	848
Year round	202	99,194
Comments: There is a reported decrease of 82.77 percent in the number of students served by summer/intersession projects from last year. This decrease in the number of students served in dedicated Summer or Intersession projects is the result of a subgrantee region that, as of this year, shifted serving student in dedicated Summer or Intersession projects to serving them in projects that operate year round. This subgrantee operates the MEP in a large region and accounted for almost the entire student count in this data change.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the 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	1,576	246.78	1,603	1,040.56	
Counselors	150	66.59	89	28.77	
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	238	81.70	286	156.10	404
Qualified paraprofessionals	699	286.80	745	489.60	1,065
Recruiters	286	203.45	213	110.61	
Records transfer staff	100	55.22	73	36.52	
Administrators	184	107.92	188	112.42	
Comments: California confirmed with EDFacts Partner Support in ticket #15-00961 that due to a technical issue with EDFacts File C065, in school year 2013-14, states cannot report staff counts for "Performance Period" for school year 2013-14. Due to this issue, the last column of CSPR, Section 2.3.8.2 will be blank for Teachers, Counselors, Recruiters, Records Transfer Staff and Administrators.					

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		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	4	282
Adult corrections	7	167
Other		
Total	11	//////////////////////////////
Comments: California does not serve students in Neglected, Juvenile Detention or Other programs with Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds.		

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	
Juvenile Detention	
Juvenile Corrections	4
Adult Corrections	7
Other	
Total	11
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			468	1,007	
Total Long Term Students Served			352	655	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			142	21	
LEP Students			115	43	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			2	9	
Asian			14	23	
Black or African American			129	241	
Hispanic or Latino			279	646	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			6	6	
White			38	82	
Two or more races			0	0	
Total			468	1,007	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			448	962	
Female			20	45	
Total			468	1,007	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14			1		
15			11		
16			61		
17			168		
18			106	102	
19			64	349	
20			41	556	
21			16		
Total			468	1,007	

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	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			468	1,007	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Prior to 2011, CDCR Division of Juvenile Justice had the reasonable ability to obtain information on parolees through the CDCR Juvenile Parole system. Under the Public Safety Act of 2010, the State transferred supervision of released DJJ offenders to the County Probation Offices beginning in February 2011. Obtaining student transition data among the 58 county probation systems that have varied local policies and procedures for tracking and reporting youth activities after release from the State juvenile system greatly impacts ability to obtain data.

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	//////////////////////		//////////////////////		//////////////////////	14	//////////////////////		//////////////////////	
Earned high school course credits					462		47			
Enrolled in a GED program					77		171			
Earned a GED					49		45			
Obtained high school diploma					75		14			
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					46		25			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					286		53			
Obtained employment					S		60			

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			80	41	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			12	122	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			46	13	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			72	109	
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			90	32	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			22	117	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			57	12	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			75	92	
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	114	
Neglected programs	110	
Juvenile detention	161	
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total	385	//////////////////////////////
Comments: Historically, Average Length of Stay data have not been available and will not be available for SY 13-14. The collection of these data is slated for SY 14-15, allowing adequate time to provide technical assistance to local educational agencies.		

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	113
Neglected programs	110
Juvenile detention	161
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	384
Comments: One At Risk facility program that served students did not report data. The facility indicated that the district no longer funds this facility and the responsibility has been taken over by the county office of education.	

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	19,748	4,130	38,805		
Total Long Term Students Served	9,214	2,108	11,915		

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	2,396	588	8,872		
LEP Students	5,065	834	8,427		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	79	564		
Asian	482	116	641		
Black or African American	2,381	1,197	9,322		
Hispanic or Latino	12,381	1,958	21,681		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	175	39	262		
White	3,410	679	5,557		
Two or more races	649	62	778		
Total	19,748	4,130	38,805		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	12,532	2,412	31,589		
Female	7,216	1,718	7,216		
Total	19,748	4,130	38,805		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10	417	512	49		
11					
12					
13					
14					
15	4,648	1,264	8,006		
16					
17					
18	12,440	2,161	29,218		
19	2,243	193	1,532		
20					
21					
Total	19,748	4,130	38,805		

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

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

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

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	19,748	4,130	38,805		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The total number of unduplicated students by program is reported in row 2. The California Department of Education deduces that enrollment in the Neglected, Delinquent or At Risk program alone indicates the number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.

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	//////////////////////////	2,910	//////////////////////////	1,208	//////////////////////////	22,058	//////////////////////////		//////////////////////////	
Earned high school course credits	14,776		1,879		30,365					
Enrolled in a GED program	80		21		840					
Earned a GED	69	14	10	S	528	46				
Obtained high school diploma	1,676	248	373	203	1,095	75				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	476	98	212		229	232				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	1,254	41	91	S	2,640	478				
Obtained employment	410	164	119	S	388	781				

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	884	106	1,400		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	490	173	482		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	1,011	476	1,211		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	815	113	1,519		
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	769	97	1,276		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	493	176	552		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	1,026	485	1,133		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	770	117	1,488		
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	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	17
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	19
Parental involvement activities	8
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	24
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	10
Comments: Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A) is not applicable because California stopped spending those funds in school year 2011-12.	

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.

For the 2013-14 school year, the state educational agency (SEA) participated in the rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program by awarding subgrants to 43 local educational agencies (LEAs) using a formula allocation driven by each district's average daily attendance. The CDE informs the recipient LEAs about the specific state criteria and annual targets to increase the academic performance and achievement of all students.

California's accountability system monitors progress toward ensuring that all students are achieving the state's academic content standards and meeting those targets. The measure of such student achievement is the determination of whether Title I schools and LEAs make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as required under ESEA.

The following are the four components used to make AYP determinations in California:

1) Meeting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) regarding student proficiency in English-language arts and mathematics

2) Achieving a 95 percent student participation rate on assessments in English-language arts and mathematics

3) Making or exceeding the specified growth target on the state's Academic Performance Index (API)

4) Increasing the high school graduation rate

In reviewing data of the 43 LEAs that received a FY 2013-14 RLIS grant, 38 were in Program Improvement (PI) status. Nine LEAs have entered Year 1 of PI, five LEAs are in Year 2 of PI; and twenty-four LEAs are in Year 3 of PI. When identified for PI, LEAs in California are required to:

1) Conduct a self-assessment using materials and criteria based on current research;

2) Use specific state-developed self-assessment tools to verify the fundamental teaching and learning needs in its schools and identify the specific academic problems of low-achieving students;

3) Determine why the prior LEA plan failed to bring about increased student achievement;

4) Revise the LEA plan according to the identified needs; and,

5) Work with an external entity to ensure that the district is using funds appropriately to improve student achievement.

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).	44
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)	44	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		44

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)	312,296.00	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		312,296.00
Total	312,296.00	312,296.00
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	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Asian	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	
Black or African American	
Hispanic or Latino	
White	
Two or more races	
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	
Economically disadvantaged students	

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.

The data required for the final 13-14 cohort determination will not be finalized until June 30, 2015. Once the data are finalized, it will take the California Department of Education a few weeks to compile the data EDFacts Reporting.

[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.