

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2013-14



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2013-14 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2013-14 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 18, 2014**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2013-14, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2013-14 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2013-14 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 7/31/2015
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2013-14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2013-14		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Maine		
Address: 23 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0023		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Rachelle Tome		
Telephone: 207-624-6708		
Fax: 207-624-6706		
e-mail: rachelle.tome@maine.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Rachelle Tome		
		<u>Monday, March 30, 2015, 2:41:06 PM</u>
Signature _____		Date

This section of the 2013-14 CSPR was certified by Rachelle Tome rachelle.tome@maine.gov 207-624-6708

**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	2,475	S	50.00
4	2,153	S	54.00
5	1,968	S	54.00
6	1,301	S	54.00
7	1,107	S	52.00
8	1,035	S	48.00
High School	368	S	42.00
Total	10,407	S	51.80
Comments: N/C			

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	2,455	S	60.00
4	2,139	S	58.00
5	1,954	S	65.00
6	1,298	S	65.00
7	1,098	S	60.00
8	1,030	S	67.00
High School	369	S	40.00
Total	10,343	S	61.10
Comments: N/C			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	9,224	S	61.80
4	9,035	S	63.40
5	7,745	S	62.80
6	4,994	S	59.60
7	3,823	S	58.50
8	3,956	S	54.50
High School	493	S	46.00
Total	39,270	S	60.80
Comments: N/C			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	9,227	S	69.10
4	9,034	S	66.20
5	7,748	S	70.40
6	4,986	S	71.00
7	3,814	S	69.80
8	3,952	S	72.70
High School	492	S	47.00
Total	39,253	S	69.10
Comments: N/C			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,239
Limited English proficient students	2,664
Students who are homeless	457
Migratory students	5
Comments: Increased LEP due to increased schoolwide programs. Homeless students served with Title I funds remains a volatile number	

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	285
Asian	455
Black or African American	2,101
Hispanic or Latino	747
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	24
White	31,099
Two or more races	638
Total	35,349
Comments: Data appears accurate. Hawaii/Pacific Islander is such a small group that a small change creates a significant percentage change. The two or more race category appears to be in increasing use.	

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)	164	905	0	0	1,069
K	2,100	2,304	17	0	4,421
1	3,089	2,327	43	0	5,459
2	2,562	2,211	41	0	4,814
3	2,204	2,423	22	0	4,649
4	1,956	2,196	21	0	4,173
5	1,435	2,035	19	0	3,489
6	626	1,283	13	0	1,922
7	387	1,005	7	0	1,399
8	380	1,029	3	0	1,412
9	65	448	2	0	515
10	37	412	11	0	460
11	19	426	4	0	449
12	11	397	3	0	411
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	15,035	19,401	206	0	34,642

Comments: The percentage variances are due either to the increased schoolwide schools (SWPs) reporting all students in the 6-12 grade span and the decrease in the targeted (TAS) numbers in those same grade spans. The changes in the non-public category are due to the change in small numbers that can create large variances.

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

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

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

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

TAS instructional service	# Students Served
Mathematics	6,089
Reading/language arts	11,842
Science	264
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	261
Comments: 4yo academic support, ASL instruction, Study Support Skills	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	3
Supporting guidance/advocacy	53
Other support services	21
Comments: Clothing/school supplies, after school programming	

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	420.45	
Paraprofessionals ¹	483.90	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	17.01	
Clerical support staff	7.27	
Administrators (non-clerical)	19.80	
Comments: N/C		

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	506.00	97.20
Comments: This equates to 14 Ed Techs and 6 have been deemed HQ. The remaining 8 are scheduled for ParaPro test and are in one LEA. The LEA had a large staff turnover and we are working with them to ensure HQ status.		

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*	199	32
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	26,182	287,521
Sum of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations	20,989,871	27,559,184
Percentage of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.12	1.04

*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.

Sessions in order to assist parents in boosting their children's literacy learning. These sessions may involve "make-and-take" activities, demonstration of reading-to-children sessions, guest speakers, and videos.

Activities that can be done at home to help with reading and mathematics such as ...K-3 Literacy Night (Guest: Lindsey and Her Puppet Pals) Extend Your Child's Learning through Conversations; GR 4-5 Family Literacy Breakfast, Reading in the Intermediate Grades-Guest Author Chris Van Dusen; GR 4-5 Math Breakfast, Multi-digit Multiplication and Fraction/Decimal Concepts from CCSS; K-3 Literacy Night (Maine Author/Illustrator Ryan T. Higgins), How Writers Get Ideas: An Interactive Writing Experience; Family Literacy Breakfast, Exploring Poetry- Guest Author Ralph Fletcher; K-3 Math Night.

Title I evening event with over 100 Title I family members and students in attendance. The focus was on the literacy genre of plays/theater and students had prior learning experiences with their Title I teachers before coming to a production by the Monmouth Theater production of My Father's Dragon. The production was followed by information for parents regarding how literacy in plays supports the Common Core State Standards in ELA and how imaginative theater can be an engagement tool for learners as a way to foster increased student achievement. All Title I students were provided with a book in play format to share with their families.

Family involvement events were held such as the Willard Literacy and Math nights, the Meet the Local Author Night at Carl J. Lamb School, the Around the World Literacy Night at Lafayette, and Reading Under the Stars at Margaret Chase Smith School. All of these events emphasized how parents can help their children in literacy and math.

An inter-agency committee of agencies that already provide some type of parent education services was formed. Adult education and Augusta public preschool representatives will serve on the committee, along with other identified community service providers. This committee meets regularly to coordinate services. The inter-agency committee meets a minimum of four times during the school year. Families who chose to participate attended four parent education sessions focusing on building connections between home and school and how to increase literacy skills.

Family Involvement events were designed to involve parents in their children's learning at school: provide literacy/math curriculum and instruction information for parents, educate parents regarding grade level expectations, provide parents with specific ways to engage in their child's literacy and math development at home. Through an interactive format, each family event provided an integration of literacy and/or math skills and strategies, along with opportunities for real- life application. During each event, strategies and skills related to specific topics were modeled for families. Using engaging learning activities easily replicated or reinforced at home, families had opportunities to put new learning into practice. Guest authors were often a part of the sessions. Many classroom teachers and technicians volunteered their time to prepare materials and/or attend the sessions beyond school hours. Each family in attendance received literacy or math resources which may have included: parent friendly articles, practical strategies and/or activities to reinforce learning at home, a book (by the guest author or choice), and writing materials.

King Middle School: Our main objective is to continue to fund the Partnership Developer position to actively seek involvement of parents and the community. The activities include: (1) to create a process for parent volunteers, (2) to create welcoming activities to increase involvement, and (3) to conduct annual events like the Evening International Pot Luck Supper and Faculty/ Student Talent Show for parent participation. Funds will be allocated to support the Parent Developer, outreach and communication to all families, and to support events at the school involving families and community members.

Greg Tang math author was welcomed. He presented to 20 families (75-80 people), in which he taught parents and children how to effectively and efficiently solve math problems. He also read one of his books and showed how literacy and math are linked. At the conclusion of his presentation, students went back to their respective classrooms where their teachers met them and guided them through math games and examples used in the classroom.

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: No comment necessary.

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)	37
K	18
1	20
2	25
3	21
4	22
5	18
6	23
7	29
8	21

9	20
10	36
11	23
12	37
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	90
Total	440
Comments: No comment necessary.	

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: The twelve percent increase in the Category 1 Child Count from CSPR reporting period 2012-2013 to reporting period 2013-2014 is a result of seasoned recruiters and improved ID&R practices, consistent ID&R administrators, and more efficient service provision from 9/1/2013 - 8/31/2014.
 1) Much of the recruiting staff for the 2014 summer season were veteran recruiters and are versed in the Maine MEP's largest qualifying industries: the broccoli and blueberry harvests. Along with the personnel, the continuous improvement of ID&R practices included the advocacy of community "elders" who travel with many families for the relatively short season of the blueberry harvest. One elder in particular was crucial in the recruitment of OSY and older students. She acted as a liaison between recruiters and the community of families that travel each summer to work in the blueberry barrens. These community elders were the catalyst for many OSY or families to sign up for the Migrant Education Program that were usually reluctant.
 2) The SEA State Director for the MEP is a former ID&R coordinator and the SEA's contractor ESCORT has hired the same ID&R coordinator for five consecutive blueberry harvests. This administration helped deliver efficient and effective results during Maine's most crucial qualifying industries.
 3) The increase in child count is additionally due to the program's emphasis on service provision to all eligible migrant students throughout the regular school year and summer/intercession. The program has particularly grown in service provision for OSY and older youth during the regular school year.

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	30
Comments: No comment necessary.	

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)	27
K	11
1	12
2	17
3	15
4	16
5	12
6	11
7	17
8	14
9	14
10	28
11	17
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	28
Total	254
Comments: No comment necessary.	

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: No comment necessary.

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	15
Comments: No comment necessary.	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No comment necessary.

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

- l The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- l Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- l Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- l Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were serviced for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods
- l Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Maine Data Quality/Validation Procedures:

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

Category 1 and 2

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

Eligibility information:

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

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

MEP Project Data:

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

COLLECTION OF DATA: METHODOLOGY/PROCESS

Category 1

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

Maine's MEP hired and deployed additional summer ID&R staff. One 30 week recruiter and two University of Maine interns/recruiters were hired for the duration of the summer in order to ensure all eligible migratory children and youth were recruited and were provided with the opportunity to access the services they were entitled to receive during Maine's busiest crops, the broccoli and blueberry harvests. In addition, during the blueberry harvest (first three weeks in August), the SEA hired additional, temporary experienced Summer recruiters and an onsite ID&R coordinator through ESCORT. Summer interviews were conducted by teams of two recruiters using an initial screening tool in paper form (the field script), followed by tablet technology and electronic COEs. The recruiter collected and inputted data directly into MIS2000 tablet system; making the process more efficient and effective for the guardian or worker, the recruiter and the reviewer(s). Once a recruiter determined eligibility and entered the information it would be assigned a pending status; then the Field Leader would review the COE, followed by the ID&R coordinator. Lastly, the State Director reviewed the COE for verification. The data only becomes visible once this

approval takes place. Only at that point, the data is populated into the system of record, MIS2000. Any cases with questions, inconsistencies, or missing data would be returned to the previous reviewer for additional clarifications. The system would alert reviewers and the recruiter that the COE was rejected. If the reviewers lack sufficient information to clarify questions or inconsistencies, the COE was returned to the original recruiter, who would have to re-interview the family again. The

MIS2000 system also flags any field that would create a potential duplicate within the system based upon input data: first/last name, birthdate, gender, etc. The reviewer ensures the student does not already exist within the system with these checks.

Additional quality assurance checks are completed with the MSIX portal for assurances of no duplication of records.

Category 2:

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

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

All of the Maine MEP's reports are built utilizing our Migrant Student Information System Database - MIS 2000. This ensures migrant data accurately accounts for all migrant children in each ED Facts data file; since all the data is contained in our MIS2000 system, and we use this system to produce our EDEN reports. MIS 2000 is the system used for the Maine MEP's electronic COEs and our MIS 2000 web-interface application houses service data to ensure the correct student is linked to the appropriate service. Additional quality checks and assurances are also utilized by checking source level documentation to validate the aggregated totals produced by MIS2000 and, subsequently uploaded to EDEN - to ensure quality and accuracy of our reports.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The matching capability of MSIX allows the state another data system to ensure checks and balances, using different decision logic, to ensure there are no duplications in our final data counts submitted through EDEN for the CSPR. If there are students that come up as potential duplicates in the MSIX system, MSIX will notify both the state data administrator and the state MEP Director. The student's record on MSIX is then compared to the MIS2000 database to determine if there is duplication. If there is duplication, the student's record will be merged. If there is no duplication the records will stand unaltered with separate MSIX IDs for each child. This helps to ensure we have no duplications in our data set and improves our data quality overall. The Maine MEP also checks the student information submitted from other states to ensure qualifying arrival dates, names, ages, and other data are correctly identified in Maine.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	<u>Yes</u>
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/inter-session projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	<u>Yes</u>

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	100
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	67
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	65

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The overall response rate for thee ME re-interview was 73%. A total of 92 interviews were attempted and a total of 67 interviews were completed - 41 from the regular sample and 26 from the alternate sample. The entire field review was conducted between 8/10-8/18/2014.

Non-response specifics:
To limit non-response, this prospective re-interview was performed soon after the original interview. This increased the chances that families and students would be present for this follow-up review. A certain percentage of non-response was expected when conducting the re-interview, to prepare for this the total sample was initially overdrawn by 100%.

There were no red flags identified regarding the non-response of students and families in this prospective re-interview. The primary reason for non-response was due to families/workers moving (returning home). This particular reason for non-response was anticipated as some families leave the camps before the full harvest is over, others leave as it is winding down. The two external field re-interviewers arrived and began the review during peak harvest and stayed for the following 10 days which entered into the winding down phase of the harvest. The results of this study confirm a reasonable non-response rate for the total students randomly selected for a statewide re-interview.

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

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sampling was not stratified. This re-interview was a simple random sample. MSIX provided the total 'universe' which confirmed 202 students were recruited and enrolled into the Maine MEP between the date ranges of 9/1/2013 - 8/8/2014. Each student recruited in Maine during this time frame were possibles for the random re-interview sample selection.
Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This re-interview was a simple random sample which selected 50 primary targets and 50 replacements from the state's total current ME MEP population. The selection process included all students for whom a COE was completed between the date range of 9/1/2013 and 8/8/2014. MIS2000 provided the total 'universe' which confirmed 202 students were recruited and enrolled into the Maine MEP and were possibles for re-interview selection.

All 202 students were exported into an Excel file and assigned a random number via the program software. The random numbers were then ordered sequentially 1-202. The first 100 student names were selected for the sample. Of the 100 students selected, numbers 1-50 were designated as the 'primary' targets and the remaining students numbered 51-100 were pre-identified as 'replacement' students. On a statewide level every child had an equal chance of being randomly selected for this prospective re-interview.

All field re-interviews were conducted during an intensive one week period in early August 2014 by two independent, out-of-state MEP field experts. The state suggested a re-interview target of early August, since 94% of the 202 students and families only reside in the state during the summer working seasonally in blueberries and broccoli. Targeting roughly the peak of the harvest allowed time for recruiters to enroll new children into the MEP while also providing ample time for re-interviews to find them again this summer.

Efforts were first made to re-interview all of the students selected for the 'primary' sample - of those 50 students, 41 were successfully re-interviewed. Of the nine (9) who were not re-interviewed, four (4) appeared to have moved away (the residence was found to be empty) and five (5) of the qualifying activities (tree tipping and apple picking) are not performed in August when the re-interviews took place and therefore could not be located for an interview when the re-interviews went to the corresponding locations. In each of the nine cases where the students were unable to be located for an interview, the re-interviewer did physically go to the camp and/or agricultural facility to confirm they were not there prior to moving on to replacement student samples. All attempted visits to a student in the sample were documented on the field re-interview sheet. In these cases, after two or three visits seeking a family with no response (or when it is confirmed by a third party; neighbor in the camp, employer, etc.) a replacement student was selected from the corresponding replacement list. Since the student sample lists were sorted and targeted by region for logistical purposes, all students (both primary and replacements) were also sorted by region. Re-interviewers therefore replaced missing 'primary' sample names with a 'replacement' who was within the same region.

This prospective external re-interview was designed and conducted following the recommendations from the Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing.

(U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Migrant Education, Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing: Washington, D.C., 20202)

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to ensure that the Maine re-interview process was independent, an external Principal Investigator (PI) was contracted to manage the state's triennial prospective re-interview. The independent PI allowed for greater transparency throughout all stages of the review process. The PI managed the entire collection of program eligibility data that was collected during the review and provided a clear separation between the external review panel and the State educational agency SEA. None of the re-interviewers used in this study were SEA or local operating agency staff members for the ME MEP. Furthermore, no other individual who worked on the initial eligibility determinations of the students being reviewed in this study participated in the final eligibility determinations for this review. This process ensured that each student selected and reviewed for this prospective re-interview was validated independently from the state.

The contracted scope of work included a minimum of 50 face-to-face re-interviews of migrant workers and youth who were enrolled in the ME MEP during the 2013-2014 reporting period. This study referenced both guidance and protocols established by the U.S. Office of Migrant Education in its design and completion.

Of the 67 re-interviews conducted; 54 were completed by the PI and 13 were completed by an additional external enumerator; both re-interviewers work and live outside of Maine. Purely for logistical ease, local ME MEP staff were utilized to facilitate the visits by accompanying the out-of-state re-interviewers to the family/youths' residence. Once the local MEP representative introduced the re-interviewer to the family or youth, the local staff excused themselves from the room in order to not affect the interview.

A standardized re-interview form and protocol was used for the re-interview process and can be provided upon request. This process allowed the interviewer to systematically collect the necessary data to be analyzed later by a third party (the expert review panel).

All 67 completed re-interviews were compiled and presented to the independent review panel comprised of three ID&R experts who also work and live outside of Maine. The role of the panel was to look at the field re-interview forms and compare them to the COEs. Based on their review, the panel indicated on an eligibility rating sheet whether the student selected in the sample on the COE was eligible, not eligible, or if additional information was needed.

All initial responses from the panelists were submitted to the PI, compiled into one excel document, and re-distributed back to the panel for a formal discussion. During this conference the panel worked to reach consensus for an initial eligibility determination or agreed more information was needed from the state of Maine. Once the state provided additional clarification for these selected children, the panel was able to finalize their eligibility determinations.

The goal of the panel was to meet a consensus for each student re-interviewed, present their initial results to the state while allowing due process for their response, then review the results once again. It was the panel which ultimately determined the final eligibility results and identified possible areas for improvement in the state's recruitment process.

Neither the external field re-interviewer nor the SEA made final eligibility determination; the determination was the responsibility of the independent expert review panel. This process allowed the field re-interviewers to be responsible for information collection only. The intentional separation between the field reviewers and the three independent reviewers on the panel eliminated any room for a potential bias.

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.

During the 2013-2014 reporting period, the ME MEP contracted an external Principal Investigator (PI) to manage the state's triennial prospective re-interview. The field re-interview was conducted during August 10-18, 2014. Scope of work included a minimum of 50 field re-interviews of migrant workers and youth,

completed by an independent reviewer, per protocols established by the U.S. Office of Migrant Education. With a response rate of 73%, 67 re-interviews were completed by two external enumerators then reviewed by an additional independent review panel of three identification and recruitment (ID&R) experts. The review panel provided initial eligibility decisions on each student re-interviewed and, when necessary, requested clarifying information from the state in order to make an initial determination. Upon the state's response for clarification, a final eligibility determination was made for each student re-interviewed in the sample.

The final eligibility results were made in collaboration with the independent PI and the external review panel. None of the local ME MEP staff or the state director participated in the field re-interview process or the external review panel; they were only utilized to provide clarifying information when needed.

Of the 67 students re-interviewed, it was determined that 97% (all but 2 students from the same household) were properly identified and eligible for MEP services resulting in a discrepancy rate of 3%.

In addition to assessing the quality control processes of Maine, and verifying student numbers reported to OME are accurate, the re-interview process helped identify any ID&R practices which may need additional training. Very few COE errors were found during this review of student records, those that were identified are provided below.

COE Completion Errors

The following table indicates specific errors found and their frequency. Errors were few (2 of 67 or 3%):

Type of Errors:

1 Case of:

Incorrect Move "from" city on COE. Initial COE missed a move from Mexico to Texas prior to the move to Maine. Correction on COE needed to be from: Texas to Maine not from Mexico to Maine as the family resided in Texas for several months (where child attended school) prior to their Maine move.

1 Case of:

COE was initially completed as a "to join" move when in fact the children moved with their mother to seek/obtain qualifying work not to join their farmworker father. COE needed new QAD under the mother. The family does not live with the father and has not since their move to Maine.

1 Case of:

Recommendation: add comment for OSY who have graduated from high school in Mexico to explain eligibility determination. For reference: this student does not have an equivalent education to a Maine high school diploma.

1 Case of:

Recommendation: add comment to clarify economic necessity for short duration moves

Two (2) errors were found in the reviewed cases. While these errors were found on completed COEs, none affected the eligibility for the students involved. The ME MEP and Local Education Agency (LEA) agreed with the panels determination of corrections needed on the COEs and stated they would make the necessary changes. It was recommended that ME MEP keep these COEs (along with the new updated COE) on file for future reference.

Discrepancy Rate

The expert panel reviewed all 67 re-interviews which were conducted by an independent reviewer and provided an initial determination for each student. During this independent panel review, 61 students were determined as "eligible," 4 students were found to require additional information prior to confirming their eligibility and 2 students (in one family unit) were found not eligible.

Based on the findings from the re-interview team and the clarifying information presented by the State of Maine, the study determined that a proper eligibility determination was made in all but the 2 identified cases, resulting in a 2.98% deficiency rate for the ME MEP for their 2014 Prospective Re-interview.

Non-Eligible Students /Total Students Interviewed Percent Ineligible
2 students / 67 re-interviews 2.98%

As a result of this study, Maine removed the 2 misidentified children prior to submitting their 2014 state child count report.

The following additional observations and recommendations for improvement were made by the independent re-interview team and shared with the ME MEP.

- Consider conducting a micro-re-interview which targets the tree tipping and apple worker population who were unable to be reviewed in this study due to the August timing. A random sample of wreath and apple workers during their prospective months of operation (October/November) would provide eligibility verification for students recruited in these particular qualifying activities.
- Document Maine education eligibility policy or provide a clarifying comment on the COE when an OSY has completed High School from their sending country but is still determined to be eligible for a public education in Maine. This will clarify the state's certification process for an external reviewer.
- Provide training to staff regarding appropriate documentation and/or comments for moves of a short duration to confirm the move was due to economic necessity.
- Review 'to join' moves with recruitment team to clarify QAD determinations and a thorough interview process. Training should emphasize it is the completion of to- join moves which prompts a COE.

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)	
K	
1	
2	
3	2
4	1
5	2
6	1
7	3
8	1
9	1
10	
11	
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	12
Comments: No comment necessary.	

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	1
1	
2	4
3	2
4	5
5	5
6	1
7	2
8	1
9	1
10	4
11	3
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	31

Comments: There was a total increase of 11 students from 2012-2013 reporting period to 2013-2014 reporting period. Due to the small figures of 20 students to 31 students, the Maine MEP believes this increase is minimal and any increase is related to the reasons given in the increased Category 1 count. There continues to be more efficient ID&R and service provision for the Maine MEP. The state-wide service provision has also become better in collecting school age children information and their LEP status.

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	1
1	
2	2
3	3
4	2
5	
6	
7	1
8	1
9	
10	1
11	1
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	13

Comments: No comment necessary.

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	29
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	21
K	12
1	16
2	23
3	16
4	15
5	12
6	16
7	21
8	14
9	17
10	30
11	19
12	23
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	68
Total	352

Comments: No comment necessary.

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	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	
1	
2	3
3	
4	
5	1
6	
7	2
8	
9	
10	
11	1
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	20
Total	38

Comments: There was a total decrease of ten students from 2012-2013 reporting period to 2013-2014 reporting period. Due to the small figures of 48 students to 38 students, the Maine MEP believes this decrease is minimal. The vast majority of students eligible for migrant services in Maine arrive for the blueberry harvest in Hancock and Washington Counties. The harvest runs throughout the month of August and overlaps between the Summer/Intercession and Regular School Year. There were more students recruited overall during the 2014 blueberry harvest than the 2013 harvest. The increased efficiency in ID&R is a reason for an increased overall student count and signing students up before the August 15th date.

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	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	2
2	2
3	1
4	
5	
6	
7	1
8	
9	1
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	7
Comments: No comment necessary.	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	S
8	S
9	S
10	S
11	S
12	8
Ungraded	
Total	8

Comments: The Maine MEP dropout numbers are very low in recent years (1 in 2012 and 3 in 2013). Additionally, 2 of the 3 students that were listed as Dropouts for 2013 actually were pursuing other educational endeavors through the High School Equivalency Program (HEP). The number of zero dropouts for the 2013-2014 reporting period therefore is not an anomaly.

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	
Comments: No comment necessary.	

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

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

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs
- Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)).

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	1
4	0
5	0
6	1
7	2
8	0
9	1
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	5
Comments: No comment necessary.	

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	1
4	0
5	0
6	
7	1
8	0
9	1
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	3
Comments: No comment necessary.	

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	16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	32
K	16
1	14
2	19
3	19
4	18
5	13
6	16
7	21
8	16
9	16
10	29
11	19
12	28
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	62
Total	354

Comments: The increase of 283 students from the 2012-2013 reporting period to 354 students in the 2013-2014 reporting period is in line with the recent growth of the Maine Migrant Education Program. Since the Maine MEP went under restructuring with a new Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Service Delivery Plan in 2011, there has been consistent growth in both recruitment numbers and service numbers for those eligible children. During this time, the program has received two independent re-interviews (2011 and 2014) with eligibility rates of 100% and 97%. Once students are identified their eligibility status is viewable by our service provision coordinators in the MIS2000 web-interface system as well as a separate services website for the tutors and advocates. Program administrators can easily track all services and update our program's contact with our students to capture all service hours.

Additionally, service participation, not just service provision continues to be a goal for the Maine MEP. Our Service Delivery Plan lists the percentage of eligible migrant students participating in summer services needs to be 75%. Due to program's two largest crops being in the summer, this goal has continued to increase our MEP services.

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5	
K	
1	
2	
3	1
4	
5	
6	1
7	2
8	
9	1
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	5
Comments: No comment necessary.	

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2–3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the performance period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: No comment necessary.	

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	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	28
K	15
1	12
2	17
3	18
4	17
5	13
6	11
7	15
8	6
9	10
10	9
11	9
12	14
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	36
Total	244
Comments: No comment necessary.	

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2			////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4	4	////////////////////////////////////
K	6	6	////////////////////////////////////
1	8	8	////////////////////////////////////
2	13	13	////////////////////////////////////
3	14	14	////////////////////////////////////
4	13	13	////////////////////////////////////
5	8	8	////////////////////////////////////
6			////////////////////////////////////
7			////////////////////////////////////
8			////////////////////////////////////
9			
10			
11			
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	66	66	

Comments: No comment necessary.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

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

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	26	15
K	14	9
1	14	10
2	17	12
3	18	9
4	18	10
5	13	7
6	16	6
7	19	6
8	16	2
9	16	2
10	28	1
11	19	2
12	28	3
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	40	4
Total	312	98
Comments: No comment necessary.		

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	22
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	43
Comments: No comment necessary.	

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

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	2	204
Summer/intersession only	3	254
Year round	2	354

Comments: The increase in Regular School Year - school day/extended day services and Year Round services are attributed to the Maine MEP's goals of increased service provision during the 2013-2014 reporting period and continued partnerships with schools that consistently enroll the majority of the MEP students throughout the school year.

The three year trend for CSPR data points to a continuous growth in efficient ID&R and service provision. The program saw a 12.4% increase in total eligible and present numbers from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014 reporting periods. There was a 25% increase in total served students from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014 reporting periods. The combination of consistent personnel in the Maine MEP, the goal of greater services, and an increased eligible population led to an increase in Regular School Year and Year round figures.

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: No comment necessary.	

FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.

2.3.8.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Qualified paraprofessionals	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Recruiters	3	0.28	3	3.00	6
Records transfer staff	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Administrators	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

Comments: During the 2013-2014 reporting period, the Maine Migrant Education Program was administered solely by the SEA. RSY ID&R was contracted through SUNY/ESCORT. In May 2014, the SEA hired two MEP funded recruiters and one more recruiter in July which totaled 0.28 FTE for RSY and 3.0 for the summer/intersession term. Our data is based on a definition of MEP funded-staff as those paid directly by MEP, and not indirectly through contracts. ALL Maine MEP staff who provided services to Maine's eligible population, including teachers and para professionals, were contracted staff.

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
 1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).
- f. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- g. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.
- h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

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

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

Throughout this section:

- | Report data for the program year of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	1	16
Juvenile corrections	2	365
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	3	////////////////////
Comments: N/C		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	1
Juvenile Corrections	2
Adult Corrections	0
Other	0
Total	3
Comments: N/C	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served		97	172		
Total Long Term Students Served		0	163		

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)		46	57		
LEP Students		0	4		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native		2	5		
Asian		0	0		
Black or African American		6	41		
Hispanic or Latino		0	1		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		0	0		
White		81	122		
Two or more races		8	3		
Total		97	172		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		85	159		
Female		12	13		
Total		97	172		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		0	0		
6		0	0		
7		0	0		
8		0	0		
9		0	0		
10		0	0		
11		0	0		
12		0	0		
13		1	1		
14		7	3		
15		7	9		
16		13	63		
17		30	51		
18		34	29		
19		4	14		
20		1	2		
21		0	0		
Total		97	172		

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: No State Agency neglected or adult programs.

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	YES		
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.		25	172		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: This data will be reviewed and corrected if needed when the report reopens.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

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

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

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school	//////////		//////////	25	//////////	18	//////////		//////////	
Earned high school course credits			S	S	115	S				
Enrolled in a GED program			S	S	36	S				
Earned a GED			S	S	26	S				
Obtained high school diploma			S	S	21	S				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			S	S	4	5				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			S	S	95	S				
Obtained employment			S	S	15	S				

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: No State Agency Neglected or Adult Programs.

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		S	2		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		S	0		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		S	12		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		S	27		
Comments: No State Agency Neglected or Adult programs.					

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		0	5		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	0		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	6		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	39		
Comments: No State Agency Neglected or Adult programs.					

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		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	3	230
Other		
Total	3	////////////////////
Comments: Maine has only Juvenile Corrections for Subpart 2		

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	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	3
Other	
Total	3
Comments: Subpart 2 is only about the Juvenile Corrections.	

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				35	
Total Long Term Students Served				34	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)				22	
LEP Students					

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American				1	
Hispanic or Latino					
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White				32	
Two or more races				2	
Total				35	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				18	
Female				17	
Total				35	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13				2	
14				4	
15				5	
16				6	
17				13	
18				4	
19				1	
20					
21					
Total				35	

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

There are no LEP students served within the Subpart 2 facilities and Subpart 2 has only Juvenile Corrections.

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	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.				35	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: This data will be corrected when the report reopens.

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

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

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

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school	//////////		//////////		//////////		//////////	5	//////////	
Earned high school course credits							23	12		
Enrolled in a GED program										
Earned a GED										
Obtained high school diploma							S			
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education										
Enrolled in job training courses/programs										
Obtained employment										

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Maine has only JC Subpart 2 facilities.

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				S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				S	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				18	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				7	
Comments: Maine has only the JC Subpart 2 facilities.					

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				2	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				4	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				19	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams				2	

Comments: Maine has only the JC Subpart 2 facilities.

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	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	24
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	30
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	15
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	13
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 -- Rural and Low-Income School
Program Goals

- a. Programs to improve student achievement: to prepare to meet AYP. During SY 2013-14, 13 districts that received Title VI grants allocated \$185,087 to support and create innovative programs that provided additional support for Title IA students struggling in identified content areas. According to the 2014 Maine accountability system data, within these 13 districts, 10 schools have been identified as progressing towards their growth goals and two schools are identified as meeting their projected growth goals.
- b. For technology support: integrators, hardware, software, laptop program support to improve achievement of all students and help all schools meet the AYP standards. During the SY 2013-14, Title VI grantees allocated \$151,622 to purchase additional equipment to improve student achievement.
- c. Lower the dropout rate. For SY 2013-14, Maine's graduation rate was 86%. (2013-14 data is not yet available). Title VI grantees allocated \$34,476 in projects to support and encourage all Maine students to graduate.
- d. Improve teacher quality through staff development programs. During SY 2013-14, highly qualified percentages by content areas: General Elementary 99.24%; Secondary ELA 98.63%; Secondary Math 97.52%; Secondary Special Education 93.25%.

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

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

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2013-14?	<u>No</u>
Comments: No comment	

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).	27
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)	34	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		34

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)	623,522.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		623,522.00
Total	623,522.00	623,522.00
Comments: No comment		

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	86.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	80.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	95.00
<i>Asian</i>	S
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	>=50
Black or African American	79.00
Hispanic or Latino	72.00
White	87.00
Two or more races	79.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	71.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	72.00
Economically disadvantaged students	77.80

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.

NA

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

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

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

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools⁵ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

⁵ The definition of reward schools is provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/eSEA/flexibility/documents/eSEA-flexibility.doc>

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁶ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Status for SY 2014-15 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

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

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools**Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools⁷ with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 :**

Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

⁷ The definitions of reward, priority, and focus schools are provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>.

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2014-15: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment/Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Status for SY 2014-15 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))⁸
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

⁸ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District name
- | District NCES ID code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | State-specific status for SY 2014-15 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward 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 EDEN030 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action⁹ under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2014-15: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Improvement status for SY 2014-15 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

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

⁹ The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.