

**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 2014-15



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2016

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) 2014-15 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2014-15 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 17, 2015**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 11, 2016**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2014-15, 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 2014-15 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 2014-15 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | OMB Number: 1810-0724 |
| | | Expiration Date: 5/31/2018 |
| 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, 2014-15 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2014-15 | | |
| Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Maryland State Department of Education | | |
| Address: 200 West Baltimore Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201 | | |
| Person to contact about this report: | | |
| Name: Mary L. Gable, Assistant State Superintendent Academic Policy | | |
| Telephone: 410-767-0472 | | |
| Fax: 410-333-2275 | | |
| e-mail: mary.gable@maryland.gov | | |
| Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Jack R. Smith | | |
| | | <u>Monday, March 28, 2016, 1:07:02 PM</u> |
| _____ Signature | | _____ Date |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2014-15



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 11, 2016
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 | 22,387 | S | 20.5 |
| 4 | 20,838 | S | 15.1 |
| 5 | 20,014 | S | 15.1 |
| 6 | 8,337 | S | 8.5 |
| 7 | 8,204 | S | 7.0 |
| 8 | 8,234 | S | 9.4 |
| High School | 683 | S | 44 |
| Total | 88,697 | S | 14.8 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or above Proficient | Percentage at or above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 22,080 | S | 21.4 |
| 4 | 20,549 | S | 21.9 |
| 5 | 19,727 | S | 22.0 |
| 6 | 8,145 | S | 16.8 |
| 7 | 8,104 | S | 14.5 |
| 8 | 8,020 | S | 15.1 |
| High School | 685 | S | 41 |
| Total | 87,310 | S | 20.2 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or above Proficient | Percentage at or above Proficient |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 2,663 | S | 25 |
| 4 | 2,545 | S | 19 |
| 5 | 2,480 | S | 19 |
| 6 | 1,462 | S | 8 |
| 7 | 1,373 | S | 9 |
| 8 | 1,169 | S | 12 |
| High School | 336 | S | 44 |
| Total | 12,028 | S | 17.9 |

Comments:

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

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

| Grade | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or above Proficient | Percentage at or above Proficient |
|-------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 2,643 | S | 28 |
| 4 | 2,511 | S | 26 |
| 5 | 2,460 | S | 27 |
| 6 | 1,466 | S | 19 |
| 7 | 1,280 | S | 18 |
| 8 | 1,069 | S | 22 |
| High School | 340 | S | 46 |
| Total | 11,769 | S | 24.9 |

Comments:

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

| Special Services or Programs | # Students Served |
|--|--------------------------|
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 27,259 |
| Limited English proficient students | 29,077 |
| Students who are homeless | 6,574 |
| Migratory students | 62 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

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

| Race/Ethnicity | # Students Served |
|---|--------------------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 791 |
| Asian | 5,080 |
| Black or African American | 102,604 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 46,148 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 396 |
| White | 35,847 |
| Two or more races | 6,726 |
| Total | 197,592 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| Age/Grade | Public TAS | Public SWP | Private | Local Neglected | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| Age Birth through 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Age 3- through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 25 | 16,846 | 77 | 0 | 16,948 |
| K | 330 | 25,945 | 128 | 0 | 26,403 |
| 1 | 614 | 26,349 | 228 | 0 | 27,191 |
| 2 | 727 | 25,372 | 184 | 0 | 26,283 |
| 3 | 605 | 23,843 | 208 | 3 | 24,659 |
| 4 | 670 | 22,098 | 187 | 2 | 22,957 |
| 5 | 525 | 21,235 | 129 | 2 | 21,891 |
| 6 | 340 | 9,065 | 88 | 13 | 9,506 |
| 7 | 274 | 9,072 | 48 | 27 | 9,421 |
| 8 | 193 | 9,042 | 25 | 49 | 9,309 |
| 9 | 0 | 1,641 | 4 | 144 | 1,789 |
| 10 | 0 | 1,098 | 2 | 159 | 1,259 |
| 11 | 0 | 913 | 4 | 117 | 1,034 |
| 12 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 53 | 823 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 54 |
| TOTALS | 4,303 | 193,289 | 1,312 | 623 | 199,527 |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

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

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

| TAS instructional service | # Students Served |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Mathematics | 2,597 |
| Reading/language arts | 2,898 |
| Science | 87 |
| Social studies | 0 |
| Vocational/career | 0 |
| Other instructional services | 0 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

| TAS Support Service | # Students Served |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Health, dental, and eye care | 0 |
| Supporting guidance/advocacy | 0 |
| Other support services | 0 |
| Comments: | |

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

| Staff Category | Staff FTE | Percentage Qualified |
|---|-----------|----------------------|
| Teachers | 85.14 | |
| Paraprofessionals ¹ | 14.53 | 100.00 |
| Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ² | 5.50 | |
| Clerical support staff | 0.60 | |
| Administrators (non-clerical) | 1.50 | |
| Comments: | | |

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
1. Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 2. Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 3. Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 4. Conducting parental involvement activities;
 5. Providing support in a library or media center;
 6. Acting as a translator; or
 7. Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

¹ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

² Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

| Paraprofessional Information | Paraprofessionals FTE | Percentage Qualified |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Paraprofessionals ³ | 1,746.50 | 100.00 |
| Comments: | | |

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2014 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) 2014 (School Year 2014-15) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less | LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2014 (School Year 2014-15) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000 |
|---|---|---|
| Number of LEAs* | | 25 |
| Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement | | 3,741,035 |
| Sum of LEA's FY 2014 Title I, Part A allocations | | 186,911,818 |
| Percentage of LEA's FY 2014 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement | | 2.00 |

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2014 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 2014–2015.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Parent Family Nights/Reading and Math Nights/Parent Community Night/Science Outreach
 Teacher Stipends
 Materials/supplies/mailings/Parent Library materials/subscriptions/postage/Summer Transition Backpack
 Parent liaisons/coordinators
 Transportation/mileage
 Food/refreshments
 Conferences/workshops
 Translation/translators
 Family Literacy Activities
 Parent Information/Training
 Child Care/Support Services

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015. 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, 2014 through August 31, 2015. 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, 2013 - August 31, 2014), youth who are working on a HSED 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 HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: N/A

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have received 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) | 57 |
| K | 19 |
| 1 | 15 |
| 2 | 15 |
| 3 | 20 |
| 4 | 11 |
| 5 | 12 |
| 6 | 12 |
| 7 | 5 |
| 8 | 9 |

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| 9 | 11 |
| 10 | 12 |
| 11 | 6 |
| 12 | 4 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 26 |
| Total | 234 |

Comments: There was a decrease of identified migrant students in 2014-2015 by 20% from the identified students in 2013-2014. Recruitment in both regions of the Eastern Shore remained the same in intensity. The following resulted in a reduction of identified students:

- Housing for watermelon workers was limited to none resulting in very few families arriving for that harvest in Wicomico County.
- Two sectors of the Westover Labor Camp (Somerset County) were not opened for workers and some of the housing was only for single adults (most of which were over 21)
- Arnold Farms (Queen Anne's County) reduced the amount of produce planted, sold part of their farming equipment to stay in business. They did not house any families (last year there were 17 children served from this farm).
- Friel's Cannery (Queen Anne's County) used workers from a neighboring oyster cannery to work during the corn season and then return to oysters during that season. This impacted the number of eligible students.
- Immigration Issues continue to impact the movement of workers.

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: There was a decrease of identified migrant students in 2014-2015 by 20% from the identified students in 2013-2014. Recruitment in both regions of the Eastern Shore remained the same in intensity. The following resulted in a reduction of identified students:

- Housing for watermelon workers was limited to none resulting in very few families arriving for that harvest in Wicomico County.
- Two sectors of the Westover Labor Camp (Somerset County) were not opened for workers and some of the housing was only for single adults (most of which were over 21)
- Arnold Farms (Queen Anne's County) reduced the amount of produce planted, sold part of their farming equipment to stay in business. They did not house any families (last year there were 17 children served from this farm).
- Friel's Cannery (Queen Anne's County) used workers from a neighboring oyster cannery to work during the corn season and then return to oysters during that season. This impacted the number of eligible students.
- Immigration Issues continue to impact the movement of workers.

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015.

| Age/Grade | Eligible Migrant Children |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Age birth through 2 | 37 |
| Comments: | |

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015. 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) | 39 |
| K | 11 |
| 1 | 10 |
| 2 | 10 |
| 3 | 14 |
| 4 | 7 |
| 5 | 8 |
| 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 8 | 7 |
| 9 | 8 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 4 |
| Total | 132 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: There was a decrease of served migrant students in 2014-2015 by 13% from the served students in 2013-2014. This reduction is directly related to the fact that 20% less students ages 3-21 were identified due to the lack of agricultural business, housing and increase of over 21 year old workers as described under Category 1.

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, 2014 through August 31, 2015. 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 | 9 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

| Student Information System | (Yes/No) |
|---|-----------------|
| NGS | <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> |
| | |

| 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.

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maryland operates one central data base. All COEs are processed at the State Migrant Education Service Center. All data (enrollments, withdrawals, supplemental programs, needs assessments) submitted to the Center are entered and maintained in one system (MIS 2000). (Trained migrant recruiters can only complete COEs.)

The State Data Specialist is responsible for providing a list of currently enrolled students to recruiters so they can verify if the students are still residing in the area. The recruiter visits the families and reports the information back to the State Data Specialist. The Data Specialist will then enter a new student history line into the data base with the updated information. If the student has left the area, then no new entry is made for that student.

Student's enrollment is evaluated annually. Students are not counted automatically from one year to the next the recruiter(s) are required to visit the family at least once a year to determine eligibility.

Summer enrollment flag is attached to students who receive direct services. Students who do not participate in a summer program are residency enrolled.

The State Migrant Service Center generates a student list reporting any summer enrollment flags not having supplemental service reported. The student missing supplemental service are checked against the summer sites attendance rosters and supplemental input form. Students that were missing input information are updated, students that did not receive services had the summer flag removed and counted in Category 1.

The following MIS 2000 logic is used to produce Maryland's Count:

Select distinct count (distinct schlhst.studentseq) from ":MIS2000:student" student0

For a given student you can, and most likely will, have multiple school enrollments. In many cases, several of a student's enrollments will fall within the twelve-month reporting period.

The word "distinct" as used in context of the above sentence will count only one of several possible matches based on the criteria outlined below

MIS2000:student refers to that part of the database containing "one time" information on students such as name, address, etc.

,":MIS2000:schlhist" schlhst0

MIS2000:schlhist refers to that part of the database containing multiple occurrences of school related information (school history lines) associated with a particular student record. This includes the School ID, enrollment date, withdrawal date, etc.

Where student0.StudentSeq=schlhist0.StudentSeq

This statement is linking, for example, Juan Garcia's student Record with his related school history records.

The !StartDate and !EndDate fields referenced below contain the beginning and ending dates of the performance report period. These dates are September 1st of a given year and August 31st of the following year.

The following statements check certain dates to ensure that at least one of them is within the twelve-month report period therefore establishing that the child was there for one or more days.

And ((schlhst0.FundingDate>=!StartDate and schlhst0.Funding Date <=!EndDate)

Determines if Funding Date is within the period

or

(schlhst0.WithdrawDate>=!StartDate and schlhst0.WithdrawDate<=!EndDate)

Determines if Withdraw Date is within the period

or

(schlhst0.LQMDate>=!StartDate and schlhst0.LQMDate <=!EndDate)

Determines if LQM Date is within the period

or

(schlhist0.ResDate>=!StartDate and schlhist0.ResDate <=!EndDate))

Determines if Residence Date is within the period

In addition to satisfying one of the above date criteria, the following statements must all be true before the student is counted.

And (schlhist0.LQM3Date>=!StartDate)

LQM3Date is the last qualifying move date plus 3 years. This date is compared with the report period start date and must be equal to or greater than to ensure that the student had at least one day of eligibility remaining during the report period.

And (student0.ThirdBDay<=!EndDate)

The ThirdBDay field is the date the student will be three years Old and is compared with the end of the report period to ensure that the child turned three before the end of the period.

And (student0.TwentySecondBDay>=!StartDate)

The TwentySecondBDay field is the date the student will turn twenty two and is compared with the start of the report period to ensure that the student was still eligible. There is a filter on this report for "Type=S." Maryland gives summer Students with migrant-funded supplemental programs an SH type of "S". So the "Type=S" filter is added to the above logic to generate the Category 2 count.

In addition, the enrollment type field must contain an "S" for the student to be counted as a summer school enrollment.

Note: MIS2000 logic assures that a student is only counted one time even if they have multiple enrollments (different schools, summer, fall and spring etc). Duplicate enrollment (same child different last name i.e. Juan Garcia vs Juan Garcia-Alvarez is checked at the time of enrollment as described in 1.10.3.2)

Definitions

LQM3Date is the date on which the student's End of Eligibility (EOE) is reached.

Start Date and End Date allow the user to enter variable dates at runtime. Maryland used a start date of September 1st and an end date of August 31st of funding year on this Category 1 count report.

StudentSeq is a number that MIS 2000 assigns to each student in the database to uniquely identify each student.

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)?

EDEN file data is collected and prepared using MIS2000. Migrant Data Specialist works with MIS2000 to run the data required specifications for EDEN files. Status reports, LEA attendance records, student input data, supplemental program data to account for all students and all services reported are reviewed. The results are reviewed with the MEP Director and once the report is verified it is uploaded to a secured site at MSDE. The Research and Evaluation Coordinator for Program Improvement and Family Support Branch will run a test and review the data submitted and will contact the Migrant Director if there is any question related to the files submitted. The Coordinator then puts the data into EdFacts format and submitted to MSDE's EdFacts Coordinator at MSDE to transmit to the Department.

| 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? | No |

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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. | 69 |
| The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed. | 53 |
| The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible. | 53 |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

16 of 69 had left the state and were not reachable by telephone for 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>SY2014-15</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.

Maryland sampling is done with COEs. The total number of COEs from September 1 and July 31 is generated annually. The sample size has been identified to be 50 COEs and a random sample of 69 COE's (which was 75% from each recruiter) was pulled to assure re-interviews of 50. This method insures that MSDE is receiving a sampling from all recruiters.

The process is:

- Generate a list of COEs during the date range using MIS2000.
- The total number of COEs identified during the date range is sorted by individual recruiter.
- A calculation of selection is determined for each recruiter. (Total number of COEs generated by recruiter times 75% = the number needed from each recruiter
- Every 10th COE was pulled from each recruiter until the sample size was met and each COE was sequentially numbered.
- The number assigned during the pull is used on the interview form and on the copy of the COE. Once assigned the numbers cannot be altered.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

If the response rate would be below 50, the original list would be used and the counting of every 10th COE would be applied on the remaining COEs that had not be selected in the original pull.

Maryland did not have to do a sample replacement because of the large number pulled for re-interview and the response rate result of 53.

| Obtaining Data From Families |
|---|
| Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted |
| Face-to-face re-interviews |

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The independent re-interview was conducted by Michael Toole, Kansas IDR Coordinator. As in the past Maryland has coordinated this effort with other highly experienced migrant recruitment staff from other States. This ensured that the individual was experienced with migrant education and recruitment requirements but had no connection to the MEP in Maryland or familiarity with any of the families.

The initial orientation/training for the re-interview took place on August 7, 2015 by the Maryland Director and Data Specialist and attended by two local recruiters. Re-interviews were conducted for the State on August 7, 2015 thru August 11, 2015 with a debriefing on August 12, 2015.

The following is a summary of the protocol:

- In each area the local recruiters would take the re-interviewer to the home of the migrant family, after the introducing the re-interviewer, the local recruiter would leave so the re-interview could take place without their participation.
- For each COE to be checked, the re-interviewer was provided a copy of the COE with ALL the qualifying move and work information in Section III of the COE removed. The re-interviewer was to verify all of Section II Child Data at the beginning of the interview. After this verification, the re-interviewer would then ask pertinent questions to complete Section III, Qualifying Move and Work. At the completion of this re-interview the re-interview form would then be signed and dated by the re-interviewer, who would also provide any clarifying comments about the re-interview.
- Upon completion of the re-interview, the re-interviewer would then open sealed envelopes containing copies of the original COEs and use these copies to see if the information gathered during the re-interview verified or contradicted qualifying move information on the original COE. A final determination by the independent re-interviewer would then be made if the workers/families documented on the COE did indeed qualify for Migrant services.
- The findings by the re-interviewer were presented to the State Director on August 12 and a summary report was submitted. In all of the 53 re-interviews that were conducted, there were NO discrepancies that indicated that the children or workers (OSY) did not qualify for migrant services. The re-interviewer determined that for each COE reviewed, the family or OSY did indeed qualify to receive services through Title I, Part C, Migrant Education.

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.

N/A an independent re-interview was conducted.

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Performance Period |
|--|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 0 |
| K | 8 |
| 1 | 5 |
| 2 | 7 |
| 3 | 10 |
| 4 | 5 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 6 | 2 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 6 |
| 9 | 6 |
| 10 | 1 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 2 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 61 |
| Comments: Migrant students by nature of the program definition are a mobile population. They are not the same children year to year. What impacts the interruption of education during the regular school year is related to the family's economic situation. | |

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) | 25 |
| K | 4 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 5 |
| 3 | 14 |
| 4 | 5 |
| 5 | 4 |
| 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 0 |
| 8 | 6 |
| 9 | 7 |
| 10 | 3 |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 3 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 15 |
| Total | 101 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

| Age/Grade | Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 0 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 1 |
| K | 0 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 |
| 11 | 0 |
| 12 | 1 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 4 |

Comments:

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2015 (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 | 20 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 23 |
| K | 9 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 5 |
| 3 | 7 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 5 |
| 7 | 0 |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 4 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 3 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 16 |
| Total | 110 |

Comments:

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2014-15 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | 9 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 10 |
| K | 2 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 |
| 6 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 |
| 10 | 0 |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 5 |
| Total | 32 |
| Comments: | |

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 | 2 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 4 |
| K | 0 |
| 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 |
| 6 | 0 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 |
| 10 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 14 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

| Grade | Dropouts During the Performance Period |
|------------------|--|
| 7 | S |
| 8 | S |
| 9 | S |
| 10 | S |
| 11 | S |
| 12 | S |
| Ungraded | |
| Total | S |
| Comments: | |

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 2014-15 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

| Obtained HSED | # |
|---|---|
| Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period | S |
| Comments: | |

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

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

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs
- Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)2-3).

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/annual measurable objectives. 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 (not Kindergarten) | 0 |
| K | 2 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 9 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 |
| 9 | 4 |
| 10 | 1 |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 2 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 36 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 0 |
| K | 7 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 5 |
| 3 | 8 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 |
| 10 | 1 |
| 11 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 43 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

| Age/Grade | Served During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age Birth through 2 | 15 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 41 |
| K | 13 |
| 1 | 13 |
| 2 | 10 |
| 3 | 17 |
| 4 | 10 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 7 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 10 |
| 10 | 9 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 4 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 4 |
| Total | 177 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Priority for Services During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 0 |
| K | 7 |
| 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 5 |
| 3 | 9 |
| 4 | 5 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 5 |
| 9 | 6 |
| 10 | 1 |
| 11 | 1 |
| 12 | 2 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 53 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Continuation of Services During the performance period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 0 |
| K | 0 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 0 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Instructional Service During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 13 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 40 |
| K | 13 |
| 1 | 13 |
| 2 | 10 |
| 3 | 17 |
| 4 | 10 |
| 5 | 11 |
| 6 | 7 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 10 |
| 10 | 9 |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 | 4 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 170 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

| Age/Grade | Reading Instruction During the Performance Period | Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period | High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Age Birth through 2 | 0 | 0 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 37 | 37 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| K | 11 | 11 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 1 | 10 | 10 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 2 | 10 | 10 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 3 | 14 | 14 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 4 | 7 | 7 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 5 | 8 | 8 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 8 | 7 | 7 | //////////////////////////////////// |
| 9 | 8 | 8 | 4 |
| 10 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 126 | 126 | 15 |
| Comments: | | | |

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

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

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the 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 | 13 | 0 |
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 40 | 0 |
| K | 12 | 0 |
| 1 | 12 | 0 |
| 2 | 10 | 0 |
| 3 | 17 | 0 |
| 4 | 9 | 0 |
| 5 | 10 | 0 |
| 6 | 7 | 0 |
| 7 | 3 | 0 |
| 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 9 | 10 | 0 |
| 10 | 8 | 0 |
| 11 | 2 | 0 |
| 12 | 4 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 4 | 0 |
| Total | 169 | 0 |
| Comments: | | |

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

| Schools | # |
|---|-----|
| Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children | 29 |
| Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools | 142 |
| Comments: | |

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

| Schools | # |
|---|---|
| Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program | |
| Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools | |
| Comments: | |

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

Also, provide the number of migrant children **served** in the projects. Since children may receive services 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Summer/intersession only | 0 | 0 |
| Year round | 2 | 225 |
| Comments: | | |

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

| | |
|--|------|
| State Director FTE | 0.20 |
| Comments: The MEP Director FTE decreased in 2014-2015 due to an increase in Title I Part A responsibilities in 2014-2015. | |

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 | 22 | 17.00 | 22 |
| Counselors | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Non-qualified paraprofessionals | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Qualified paraprofessionals | 3 | 1.42 | 14 | 11.20 | 17 |
| Recruiters | 1 | 1.00 | 3 | 3.00 | 3 |
| Records transfer staff | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 |
| Administrators | 1 | 0.50 | 2 | 2.00 | 2 |
| Comments: | | | | | |

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your 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, 2014 through June 30, 2015.
- | 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 | 7 | 24 |
| Juvenile corrections | 7 | 152 |
| Adult corrections | 14 | 153 |
| Other | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 28 | //////////////////// |
| Comments: | | |

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

| State Program/Facility Type | # Reporting Data |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Neglected Programs | 0 |
| Juvenile Detention | 7 |
| Juvenile Corrections | 7 |
| Adult Corrections | 14 |
| Other | 0 |
| Total | 28 |
| Comments: | |

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

| # of Students Served | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Total Unduplicated Students Served | 0 | 3,020 | 544 | 701 | 0 |
| Total Long Term Students Served | 0 | 193 | 451 | 632 | 0 |

| Student Subgroups | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 0 | 722 | 180 | 143 | 0 |
| LEP Students | 0 | 25 | 86 | 12 | 0 |

| Race/Ethnicity | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Asian | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Black or African American | 0 | 2,398 | 410 | 604 | 0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 0 | 168 | 42 | 28 | 0 |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| White | 0 | 442 | 89 | 63 | 0 |
| Two or more races | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 3,020 | 544 | 701 | 0 |

| Sex | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Male | 0 | 2,493 | 513 | 678 | 0 |
| Female | 0 | 527 | 31 | 23 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 3,020 | 544 | 701 | 0 |

| Age | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Adult Corrections | Other Programs |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 3 through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 125 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 0 | 252 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 0 | 511 | 69 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 0 | 740 | 129 | 4 | 0 |
| 17 | 0 | 850 | 151 | 23 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 372 | 135 | 61 | 0 |
| 19 | 0 | 89 | 47 | 223 | 0 |
| 20 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 339 | 0 |
| 21 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 3,020 | 544 | 701 | 0 |

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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) | N/A | Yes | Yes | No | N/A |
| Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment. | 0 | 3,020 | 544 | 698 | 0 |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Some facilities are not able to track student outcomes after leaving the program due to current data systems and some policies and/or processes in place. There is currently work being done which will impact both data systems and policies in the state.

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 tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column 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 reported once in each column.

| Outcomes (once per student, only after exit) | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Adult Corrections | | Other Programs | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| # of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit | | | 2,966 | | 415 | | S | | | |
| Outcomes (once per student) | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Adult Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit |
| Earned a GED | | | 11 | S | 43 | S | 32 | S | | |
| Obtained high school diploma | | | S | S | S | S | S | S | | |
| Outcomes (once per student per time period) | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Adult Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit |
| Earned high school course credits | | | 73 | S | 428 | S | S | S | | |
| Enrolled in a GED program | | | 25 | S | 137 | S | 701 | S | | |
| Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education | | | S | S | 9 | S | S | S | | |
| Enrolled in job training courses/programs | | | 608 | S | 119 | S | 24 | S | | |
| Obtained employment | | | S | S | S | S | S | S | | |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2014, 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 | | 26 | 95 | 22 | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 8 | 22 | 60 | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 121 | 60 | 218 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 15 | 144 | 314 | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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 | | 29 | 72 | 19 | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 8 | 26 | 73 | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 118 | 59 | 263 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | | 15 | 175 | 259 | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

| LEA Program/Facility Type | # Programs/Facilities | Average Length of Stay (# days) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| At-risk programs | 3 | 163 |
| Neglected programs | 5 | 203 |
| Juvenile detention | 2 | 56 |
| Juvenile corrections | 5 | 289 |
| Other | 0 | |
| Total | 15 | //////////////////// |
| Comments: | | |

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

| LEA Program/Facility Type | # Reporting Data |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| At-risk programs | 3 |
| Neglected programs | 5 |
| Juvenile detention | 2 |
| Juvenile corrections | 5 |
| Other | 0 |
| Total | 15 |
| Comments: | |

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

| # of Students Served | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Total Unduplicated Students Served | 435 | 88 | 119 | 121 | |
| Total Long Term Students Served | 316 | 68 | 60 | 102 | |

| Student Subgroups | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 80 | 55 | 31 | 101 | |
| LEP Students | 37 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |

| Race/Ethnicity | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Asian | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Black or African American | 226 | 46 | 106 | 66 | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 118 | 14 | 4 | 3 | |
| Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| White | 74 | 25 | 9 | 46 | |
| Two or more races | 11 | 3 | 0 | 6 | |
| Total | 435 | 88 | 119 | 121 | |

| Sex | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Male | 318 | 61 | 114 | 116 | |
| Female | 117 | 27 | 5 | 5 | |
| Total | 435 | 88 | 119 | 121 | |

| Age | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 3- through 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 5 | |
| 13 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 7 | |
| 14 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 18 | |
| 15 | 43 | 1 | 2 | 21 | |
| 16 | 84 | 25 | 35 | 29 | |
| 17 | 94 | 19 | 33 | 28 | |
| 18 | 65 | 27 | 30 | 13 | |
| 19 | 46 | 8 | 12 | 0 | |
| 20 | 29 | 1 | 7 | 0 | |
| 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total | 435 | 88 | 119 | 121 | |

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

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

| Transition Services | At-Risk Programs | Neglected Programs | Juvenile Detention | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|---|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment. | 376 | 74 | 119 | 104 | |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Some facilities are not able to track student outcomes after leaving the program due to current data systems and some policies and/or processes in place. There is currently work being done which will impact both data systems and policies in the state.

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 tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column 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 reported once in each column.

| Outcomes (once per student), only after exit | At-Risk Programs | | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Other Programs | |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| # of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit | 108 | | 33 | | 33 | | 17 | | | |
| Outcomes (once per student) | At-Risk Programs | | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who Earned a GED | 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 |
| Obtained high school diploma | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | | |
| | 63 | S | 6 | S | 9 | 15 | S | S | | |
| Outcomes (once per student per time period) | At-Risk Programs | | Neglected Programs | | Juvenile Detention | | Juvenile Corrections | | Other Programs | |
| # of Students Who Earned high school course credits | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit | In fac. | 90 days after exit |
| Enrolled in a GED program | 273 | S | 62 | 33 | 80 | 30 | 87 | S | | |
| Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education | 96 | S | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | S | S | | |
| Enrolled in job training courses/programs | 12 | S | 9 | S | S | S | S | S | | |
| Obtained employment | 60 | S | 19 | 7 | S | S | 7 | S | | |
| | 56 | S | 21 | 11 | S | S | 7 | S | | |

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent 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, 2014, 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 | Juvenile Corrections | Other Programs |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 53 | 4 | S | 6 | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 221 | 13 | 8 | 29 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 29 | 6 | 7 | 7 | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

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 | S | S | S | 0 | |
| Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 68 | S | S | 5 | |
| Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 191 | 14 | 10 | 29 | |
| Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams | 45 | 6 | 6 | 8 | |
| Comments: | | | | | |

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015.

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 | 0 |
| Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers | 1 |
| Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D | 0 |
| Parental involvement activities | 0 |
| Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A) | 0 |
| Activities authorized under Title I, Part A | 2 |
| Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students) | 0 |
| Comments: | |

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This year, two Maryland LEAs are eligible and participating in the Rural and Low Income School (RLIS) program: Caroline County Public Schools and Dorchester County Public Schools.

Caroline County is currently in their second year of implementation and the following is an evaluation of their 2014-2015 program objectives:

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Program Objectives

The data from IReady will be imported into Performance Matter, our student information system. District leadership will look for improved performance on local benchmarks by all students and a decrease in the achievement gap in the African American and Hispanic ethnicities, special education, and students who qualify for Free/Reduced Meals.

Science will use pre and post evaluations related to knowledge and skills of teachers prior to training and after training, as it relates to the content of NGSS, and the pedagogy for teaching the NGSS will also be used. In addition, baseline data will be obtained and compared to end of unit, end of course measures of student attainment of the NGSS. Also, results of student progress toward attainment of CCRS for math and ELA as evidenced on PARCC (Grades 3,4, and 5) will be considered.

Dorchester County is currently in their second year of implementation and the following is an evaluation of their 2014-2015 program objectives:

Evaluation of 2014-2015 Program Objectives

1) Increase the use of mediation in Dorchester County Public Schools

Mid Shore Community Mediation Center received 222 requests for mediation services during the 2014-2015 school year. Overall, this reflects a 5% decline in requests for mediation from the 2013-2014 school year. This small reduction in requests may be connected to increased numbers of administrators and guidance counselors at Mace's Lane Middle School. Also at Mace's Lane, for the first time since our pilot program, the Peace Team office was moved from the guidance hallway to the interior of the media center. This move reduced our visibility and accessibility to students and staff significantly. Mediators have tried several strategies to mitigate this challenge; placing a mailbox and large "Peace Team is IN/OUT" signs on the exterior of the media center door, standing in the hallways during class changes, and increasing email communication with potential referrers.

North Dorchester Middle School experienced a 187.5% increase in requests for mediation. Cambridge-South Dorchester High, the Dorchester Career and Technology Center, and New Directions Learning Academy also experienced increases.

Across the district, 210 students, staff, and family members participated in a mediation session in 2014-2015. This represents a 61.5% increase in the number of mediation participants from 2013-2014.

2) Reduce incidents of violence in Dorchester County Public Schools

Mace's Lane Middle School experienced a reduction in violent incidents by 53% and North Dorchester Middle School was reduced by 12%.

North Dorchester High School and Cambridge-South Dorchester High Schools experienced significant increases in incidents of violence, between 22%-102%. The increase at CSD is particularly alarming and indicative of an intense need for more conflict resolution services. Partnership conversations with CSD administration in preparation for the 2015-2016 school year will focus on addressing this need.

On average, our partner schools experienced an increase of violent incidents by 14% from 2013-2014. However, from the inception of our partnership in 2011 through June 2015, Mace's Lane, North Dorchester High and North Dorchester Middle schools have experienced an average reduction in incidents of violence between 30%-39%.

3) Improve attendance rates at schools receiving Attendance Mediation services

Data pending.

4) Reduce suspension and expulsion rates in Dorchester County Public Schools

On average, suspensions across the district increased by 2.2% from the 2013-2014 rate. There was one expulsion.

5) Increase the number of students self-selecting mediation services during conflict.

Students directly requested mediation services 40% of the time, an increase of 5% from 2013-2014.

83% of student participants reported they would try mediation again in the future and 82% said they would recommend mediation to others.

6) Increase the number of students receiving conflict management education

19 students received conflict management education in either a Peace Group or SAVE series.

7) Assist students in the development of effective communication skills

94% of students surveyed reported expressing themselves, their thoughts, and their concerns during mediation.

8) Prepare students to manage conflict in a positive way.

91% of students surveyed reported that they felt participating in mediation showed them it was possible to resolve conflict without fighting.

9) Increase the quality of student and family interaction with school personnel

100% of parents agreed that after the mediation, they were more likely to contact the school if they had a concern about their child.

86% of teachers agreed that after the mediation, they were more likely to contact the parent directly with a concern about the student.

80% of students agreed that after the mediation, they were more likely to talk to the teacher if they had a problem.

75%-100% of participants (students, teachers, and parents) agreed that they felt more understood by others and that they understood others better as a result of the mediation.

10) Facilitate conflict resolution processes which enhance each participant's understanding of the other.

78% of students surveyed reported feeling like they understood the other participant better after their mediation.

75%-100% of participants (students, teachers, and parents) agreed that they felt more understood by others and that they understood others better as a result of the mediation.

Initiative 2: Junior Aces Program

According to the MSDE document titled, "The Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Standards: Preparing our students for the world that awaits them",

"To be prepared for the challenges of work and college, students must graduate from high school equipped with the knowledge and skills to help them succeed in today's knowledge-based global economy. Maryland has led the nation in establishing strong academic standards and accompanying curriculum, but to truly provide students with a world-class education the State must continue to raise those standards and improve achievement for all."

The Junior Aces Program will provide students from grades 8 to grade 10 the opportunity to participate in a series of college and career enrichment activities that include:

- Exposure to programs at the Dorchester County Career and Technology Center to determine college and career interests.
- Field trips to colleges and business
- Presentations by local business executives, college admissions counselors, and military recruiters

The program will support the following Common Core Standards:

- Provide consistent learning goals for all students, regardless of where they live
- Are relevant to the real world
- Are anchored in college-and career-readiness
- Reflect the knowledge and skills most valued by employers and higher education

Initiative 3: Asset Development Program

Students who are in need of additional time at the end of the school year will be able to continue working on courses in hopes of earning the high school credit. This will allow students to avoid summer school and reduce the need for more remediation courses.

According to promotion data from www.marylandreportcard.org, Dorchester students are more likely to graduate once they are promoted as freshman. The Asset Development Program provides another opportunity for students to earn credits prior to summer school.

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 2014-15? | <u>No</u> |
| Comments: | |

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

| LEA Transferability of Funds | # |
|--|---|
| LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b). | 0 |
| 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) | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 |

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2014 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) | 0.00 | 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 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Comments: | | |

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2014-15). 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 | # Students in Cohort | # of Graduates | Graduation Rate |
|--|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| All Students | 63,775 | S | 87.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 164 | S | 79 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 3,964 | S | 95.9 |
| <i>Asian</i> | 3,876 | S | 96.1 |
| <i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i> | 88 | S | 90 |
| Black or African American | 22,829 | S | 82.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7,299 | S | 76.9 |
| White | 27,440 | S | 92.0 |
| Two or more races | 2,079 | S | 91 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6,210 | S | 63.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,192 | S | 49 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,379 | S | 78.6 |

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 500 characters.

LEP data has been reviewed and validated.

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 *EDFacts* 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 2015-16 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward 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.

Comments: In accordance with ED's authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, ED will not require States to submit AMOs for school year 2014-2015 in January 2016 for ED's review and approval, nor will ED require States to report performance against AMOs for the 2014-2015 school year.

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 2015-16 : 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 2015-16 (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.

Comments:

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 2015-16 : 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.

Comments: In accordance with ED's authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, ED will not require States to submit AMOs for school year 2014-2015 in January 2016 for ED's review and approval, nor will ED require States to report performance against AMOs for the 2014-2015 school year.

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 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2015-16: 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 2015-16 (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.

Comments: N/A-Maryland received ESEA Flexibility.

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 2015-16: 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 2015-16 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

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

Comments: In accordance with ED's authority to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA, ED will not require States to submit AMOs for school year 2014-2015 in January 2016 for ED's review and approval, nor will ED require States to report performance against AMOs for the 2014-2015 school year.

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 2015-16: 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 2015-16 (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.

Comments: N/A-Maryland received ESEA Flexibility.

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>.