

**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 2015-16



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017

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) 2015-16 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 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 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, 2015-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Florida Department of Education		
Address: 325 W Gaines St, Suite 352 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Sonya Morris		
Telephone: (850)245-9614		
Fax: (850)245-0479		
e-mail: sonya.morris@fldoe.org		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Pam Stewart		
		<u>Thursday, May 11, 2017, 6:15:03 PM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 09, 2017
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	132,086	S	54.0
4	123,760	S	50.4
5	115,599	S	47.4
6	91,773	S	38.7
7	88,342	S	43.1
8	94,113	S	50.2
High School	129,545	S	29.2
Total	775,218	S	44.8

Comments: NOTE: Florida implemented new alternate assessments in 2015-16. PSC was notified that the achievement/proficiency data would not be available in time to meet the EDFacts deadlines as well as the CSPR deadlines. The new alternate assessments require a standard setting process that includes recommendations from educators and LEAs to set Achievement Levels for the new assessments. The Florida State Board of Education will ultimately establish Achievement Level standards in rule based on recommendations from these groups. It is anticipated that the standard setting process and the adoption of new achievement level standards will not be completed until April 2017.

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	132,033	S	45.2
4	123,364	S	42.8
5	116,065	S	42.9
6	93,772	S	40.0
7	90,252	S	37.1
8	92,569	S	45.5
High School	119,844	S	37.9
Total	767,899	S	41.8

Comments: NOTE: Florida implemented new alternate assessments in 2015-16. PSC was notified that the achievement/proficiency data would not be available in time to meet the EDFacts deadlines as well as the CSPR deadlines. The new alternate assessments require a standard setting process that includes recommendations from educators and LEAs to set Achievement Levels for the new assessments. The Florida State Board of Education will ultimately establish Achievement Level standards in rule based on recommendations from these groups. It is anticipated that the standard setting process and the adoption of new achievement level standards will not be completed until April 2017.

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	741	S	76
4	722	S	79
5	711	S	72
6	81	S	90
7	77	S	91
8	70	S	90
High School	111	S	>=95
Total	2,513	S	78

Comments: NOTE: Florida implemented new alternate assessments in 2015-16. PSC was notified that the achievement/proficiency data would not be available in time to meet the EDFacts deadlines as well as the CSPR deadlines. The new alternate assessments require a standard setting process that includes recommendations from educators and LEAs to set Achievement Levels for the new assessments. The Florida State Board of Education will ultimately establish Achievement Level standards in rule based on recommendations from these groups. It is anticipated that the standard setting process and the adoption of new achievement level standards will not be completed until April 2017.

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	739	S	74
4	720	S	68
5	716	S	70
6	82	S	88
7	78	S	82
8	72	S	92
High School	256	S	>=95
Total	2,663	S	75

Comments: NOTE: Florida implemented new alternate assessments in 2015-16. PSC was notified that the achievement/proficiency data would not be available in time to meet the EDFacts deadlines as well as the CSPR deadlines. The new alternate assessments require a standard setting process that includes recommendations from educators and LEAs to set Achievement Levels for the new assessments. The Florida State Board of Education will ultimately establish Achievement Level standards in rule based on recommendations from these groups. It is anticipated that the standard setting process and the adoption of new achievement level standards will not be completed until April 2017.

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>)	206,075
Limited English proficient students	192,876
Students who are homeless	47,388
Migratory students	15,674
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	4,841
Asian	23,580
Black or African American	430,265
Hispanic or Latino	515,400
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	2,222
White	396,437
Two or more races	44,949
Total	1,417,694
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)	0	0	0	0	0
K	44	265,890	891	0	266,825
1	61	283,072	1,119	4	284,256
2	92	287,418	1,133	4	288,647
3	271	293,676	1,171	8	295,126
4	275	275,264	1,111	11	276,661
5	295	257,018	917	13	258,243
6	6	214,904	751	40	215,701
7	2	206,774	613	52	207,441
8	4	211,888	447	95	212,434
9	7	148,834	102	742	149,685
10	1	141,298	66	119	141,484
11	0	125,062	65	176	125,303
12	0	122,118	39	90	122,247
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	1,058	2,833,216	8,425	1,354	2,844,053
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	601
Reading/language arts	311
Science	
Social studies	
Vocational/career	
Other instructional services	177
Comments: PERA reviewed file 134 and re-did, however the results were the same. File 036 was re-done and re-submitted. The unduplication process was not done correctly.	

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	
Supporting guidance/advocacy	772
Other support services	164
Comments: Please see above	

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	99.91	
Paraprofessionals ¹	30.63	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²		
Clerical support staff	10.51	
Administrators (non-clerical)	2.89	
Comments: Please see above.		

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	1,924.00	99.00
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 2015 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) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	12	62
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	115,169	16,252,626
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	3,860,990	740,495,306
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	2.98	2.19

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2015 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 2015-16.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Poverty Simulation Workshops- Through better understanding of the specific needs of students in poverty, their academic skills will increase. Teacher training related to Parent Involvement- Through increased parent involvement, parents will be equipped to assist students with academic achievement. Family Reading Night- The district supports the research that achievement will increase if the parents are an active part of the learning process. College and Career Nights - Guidance Counselors and key staff will meet with parents to provide information on college, career information. Family Math Nights- Teachers will host parent nights to teach engaging strategies to help improve the parents ability to work with their child. This activity will result in improved academic achievement in math. GED Preparation- Parents will be offered the opportunity to participate in GED prep classes offered at the high school. Migrant Family Activities- Basic language development and literacy activities. Bullying Prevention and Cyber Bullying Prevention parents workshops- provide parents with information for recognizing and preventing bullying. Assessment conferences-Teacher/parent meetings to discuss the student's assessment results, expectations, and goals for the school year. Student/Parent Handbook- Increase home to school and school to home communication.

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, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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.

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, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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, 2014 - August 31, 2015), 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:

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, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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)	3,748
K	1,642
1	1,818
2	1,709
3	1,807
4	1,654
5	1,412
6	1,348
7	1,255
8	1,282
9	1,274

10	1,085
11	922
12	828
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3,612
Total	25,396
Comments: Decrease reported.	

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: Decrease reported

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, 2015 through August 31, 2016.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	1,173
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, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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)	544
K	354
1	418
2	368
3	376
4	306
5	225
6	143
7	105
8	119
9	110
10	76
11	77
12	11
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	57
Total	3,289
Comments: File 122 has been submitted per guidance from OME. OME reviewed the updated counts in April and were instructed to re-submit during this round of updates.	

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:

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, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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	42
Comments:	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	No
MIS 2000	No
COEStar	No
MAPS	No
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	Yes
<p>All local student data is submitted to the state via an automated Student Database System. The data are collected by the school districts through their local systems and submitted to the state at legislatively approved survey dates throughout the year, with a window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. The districts use this same system to transmit the data used to calculate the migrant count. This year's count was generated from the automated system from data submitted by the districts by August 26, 2016 (end-of-year survey data) with an additional window for corrections through October 7, 2016. The end-of-year survey is a cumulative count of all students served in all programs during the preceding school year, and therefore captures all migrant students. Districts have until February 24, 2017 to submit updates, however, the counts were pulled using data submitted by October 7, 2016 in order to meet CSPR and EDFacts timelines. District staff were notified in advance of this cutoff date and program staff worked with district staff to ensure the most accurate data were submitted as of that date. Data elements are included in the system to indicate whether the migrant child was served in the regular term, summer term or both. A separate data element is collected for those migrant students, but received no academic or support services. Another data element indicates that the migrant child was served in the regular term and was enrolled/served with services provided during the regular school day only or that the migrant child was enrolled/served with some or all services provided during the extended day/week. Extensive technical assistance is provided to school districts to ensure the accuracy of the data reporting, including regional workshops and presentations at the annual Information Database Workshops held every summer, and at technical assistance meetings/workshops during the fall.</p>	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same automated system was used to collect, maintain, and generate the state's Category 2 count.

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. Only 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.
- | Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The database was queried for all children between the ages of and 22 (Date of Birth range 09/02/1993 through 08/31/2016 (to include the under 3), inclusive, which captures those who were Under 3, 2 and turned 3 and those who were 21 and turned 22), whose Qualifying Arrival Date is greater than 09/02/2012, with a valid Migrant Status Term Code, and any services provided for with Regular or Summer session. This process is applied to all migrant child cases identified in the state student database and then the cases sorted by Category I or II using the Migrant Status Term data element. Edit checks for Category I and Category II are performed on the data file generated by this query to delete children who may be included in error. With regards to verifying that those children whose 3rd birthday occurs during the eligibility period are still residing in the State before including them in the child count. It is a standard procedure that children who will turn 3 during the eligibility period are flagged by the data clerk (whose responsibility it is to input student data into the district database) at the beginning of each school year or at the time or interview or re-interview of a family. Before data submitted for the reporting period (Survey 5), data clerks confer with recruiters to ensure that these children/families are still in the district. The date values indicated throughout this comment guarantee that all children who were eligible and resident for at least one day during the performance period, such as those who reached age 22 or graduated from high school/attained a GED, are included in the Category 1 Count.

The query used finds all migrant children identified within the eligibility reporting period. Since Survey 5 data are cumulative for the entire school year, all those meeting the eligibility requirements are captured, regardless of their length of stay. Recruiters are in constant contact with their families so that when a child turns three during the reporting period, district MEP staff will then identify that child as migrant on the student database. The data element Migrant Status Term identifies which term(s) a migratory child was served and/or identified. Further, migratory children selected for inclusion in the count from the State Student Database had to have a Qualifying Arrival Date greater than 09/02/2012. FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "Continuation of Services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations. In addition to the Migrant Status Term data element contained in the Student Demographic Format, data elements in the Federal/School Compensatory Evaluation Format, also transmitted in Survey 5, provide information regarding summer services to migrant students. The Summer school code (Category II) cannot be entered on a student without a link to a code for summer services. Each year, a comprehensive presentation made at the Florida Association of Management Information System (FAMIS) State Database Workshop. This presentation targets migrant staff, data clerks, and MIS staff and covers all reporting requirements for migrant students and migrant program data. When the specific Migrant Status Term data element was created, very explicit definitions were developed and disseminated to MEP/MIS staff. Two of the codes were created to identify students who received services during the summer. The codes are "B" -- students who were served in both the regular 180 day school year AND the summer term and "S" -- students that were served only in the summer term. The definition for summer services states that a student must be served in a Federally Funded (partially or fully) program designed (in whole or part) especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Students enrolled in a conventional summer school must, additionally or concurrently, be provided services that are fully or partially Federally Funded and designed especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Summer programs and services funded partially or fully by migrant program funds are clearly highlighted in district Migrant Education Program Project applications and are corroborated by district logs and reviewed during on-site MEP monitoring visits. Districts provided guidance clarifying those children who receive instructional packets as a one-time act of providing instructional or support services cannot be included in their "summer count". All students in Florida are assigned a unique, ten-digit Student Number Identifier, Florida (SID) number, consisting of the student's Social Security number followed by an "X". Those without Social Security numbers assigned a SID by the local school district using a state defined methodology, which then becomes the student's State SID. Should a student move, the receiving district is required to search the State's Student Locator system to determine if the student has prior enrollment history in any of Florida's public schools. If so, the SID, which was originally assigned as the student's SID is to be assigned to the student in the receiving district. Please refer to: <http://fldoe.org/accountability/data-sys/database-manuals-updates>. Because the SID is unique to each student, further matching is not performed at the state level. For this year's count, the following process was used: A master file containing all the students in the state was generated and the students that met the federal criteria were coded as "Migrant". A separate data file containing only migrant students served in Regular and Summer sessions was generated. All records were matched and unduplicated by data element fields: Migrant Status Term, SID, District Number, and School Number. Because of the uniqueness of each student's SID, there is an assurance that data are unique for each student based upon Migrant Status Term data element and Florida Student Number Identifier. By using the SID and Migrant Status Term and matching for duplicate SID's, this methodology insures the data tables produce an unduplicated count for each session. When students are initially enrolled by district data staff, THEY must ensure that if a pre-existing SID is selected for a student, it must match on all variables, i.e., name, DOB, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, home language, and parent names, at a minimum, before assigning a new SID. An additional measure to ensure that districts do not generate a new SID for a student with an existing SID is to disseminate extensive guidance to district MEP and district data staff on nuances of Hispanic names and strongly encourage an in-depth probe of the State Student Locator system to identify such students before a new SID is issued.

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)?

Florida has, in a State Board of Education rule, the database reporting requirements that requires districts to supply the information necessary to capture migrant students who are enrolled or identified. Data quality assurance is conducted during the survey reporting periods throughout the program year. Data are compared to the prior year and sent to school districts on a weekly basis during the survey windows so that, through early discovery, districts will have numerous opportunities to review and verify accuracy of the counts and the information supported by these data quality reports and ample time for correction of any migrant reporting problems . This process then helps to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served.

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? If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.	No

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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/intersession 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.	660
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	486
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	484

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

From the rolling re-interviews conducted by the districts during the 2015-16 school year, a total of 660 children were randomly selected locally for re-interview process. Of these, a total of 486 re-interviews were completed. There were 147 non-response re-interview attempts. Of these, 71 of the children in the sample had moved away, 75 were not available/were not found, and 1 declined to be re-interviewed. The non-response rates are largely due to migratory lifestyle and mobility patterns of migrant families and youth, which is that they are highly mobile.

Procedures	
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)?	SY 2014-15
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sampling procedure for the independent re-interview was a statewide, randomly selected sample.
Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to draw a systematic random sample for the 2014-15 external re-interview study, the independent re-interview team determined that the sample needed in order to obtain 100 completed re-interviews could be achieved by randomly drawing 225 student names from the entire migrant population in the state. The sampling universe for this re-interview process was all Florida MEP children, ages 3 to 21, whose eligibility was newly determined from September 1 2014 to August 31, 2015. For this type of re-interview study, Florida MEP drew a systemic random sample that was separate from the annual rolling re-interview samples.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	<u>Both</u>
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	Yes/No

Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	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.

Independent re-interviews were not conducted during this reporting period (2015-16 school year); they were conducted during the 2014-15 school year. 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.

As a result of the 2014-15 external, independent re-interview, the state implemented the following corrective actions:

- Remove the names of the children that resulted in "not eligible" determinations according to the re-interview.
- Provide training on interviewing skills during the April 2016 ID&R statewide training as well as during local district onsite professional development opportunities.

Since the five re-interviews from the external process (2014-15) that resulted in non-eligible determinations were not located in one particular district, it was the conclusion of the external re-interview team that there was no systematic or large-scale concern regarding the misidentification of migrant children in the state. The team did not suggest additional corrective training in ID&R, interview skills and eligibility determinations.

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61
K	487
1	636
2	502
3	505
4	422
5	439
6	375
7	344
8	370
9	368
10	347
11	266
12	208
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	18
Total	5,348
Comments:	

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)	397
K	1,162
1	1,317
2	1,118
3	890
4	757
5	525
6	384
7	300
8	287
9	275
10	203
11	157
12	100
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	297
Total	8,169
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)	229
K	157
1	200
2	183
3	293
4	289
5	236
6	227
7	194
8	165
9	151
10	146
11	139
12	102
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	65
Total	2,776
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, 2016 (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	687
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,430
K	488
1	532
2	436
3	435
4	384
5	316
6	295
7	269
8	245
9	242
10	181
11	146
12	102
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,467
Total	8,655

Comments: 1415 = 10,328
1516 = 6071

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 2015-16 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	650
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,352
K	478
1	523
2	433
3	426
4	372
5	314
6	291
7	266
8	243
9	239
10	176
11	142
12	101
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2,274
Total	8,280

Comments: It was discovered in our data verification process that the business rules had captured these data incorrectly last year. The program has been corrected.

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	406
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,202
K	569
1	672
2	629
3	655
4	545
5	455
6	439
7	363
8	401
9	399
10	277
11	245
12	217
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	434
Total	7,908
Comments: Updated file C145 will be submitted.	

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	9
8	19
9	24
10	34
11	43
12	34
Ungraded	
Total	163
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 2015-16 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)	33
K	317
1	410
2	312
3	303
4	268
5	305
6	261
7	247
8	265
9	305
10	282
11	227
12	180
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	4
Total	3,719
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)	1
K	65
1	105
2	68
3	74
4	60
5	48
6	26
7	22
8	27
9	29
10	24
11	20
12	4
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	3
Total	576
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	40
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	856
K	1,258
1	1,431
2	1,329
3	1,442
4	1,326
5	1,140
6	1,090
7	1,062
8	1,062
9	1,118
10	982
11	830
12	756
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	257
Total	15,979
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)	34
K	380
1	508
2	377
3	370
4	324
5	351
6	284
7	268
8	292
9	333
10	305
11	245
12	184
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	7
Total	4,262
Comments: explain difference.	

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	3
1	7
2	3
3	
4	1
5	3
6	2
7	
8	2
9	
10	3
11	
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	26
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	529
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,485
K	1,561
1	1,749
2	1,621
3	1,743
4	1,566
5	1,342
6	1,274
7	1,202
8	1,217
9	1,195
10	1,035
11	869
12	784
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,933
Total	22,105
Comments: Data are correct.	

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	17	14	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	334	138	////////////////////////////////////
K	461	130	////////////////////////////////////
1	559	176	////////////////////////////////////
2	517	167	////////////////////////////////////
3	562	138	////////////////////////////////////
4	505	159	////////////////////////////////////
5	446	175	////////////////////////////////////
6	251	104	////////////////////////////////////
7	226	108	////////////////////////////////////
8	228	115	////////////////////////////////////
9	146	97	50
10	123	131	43
11	124	103	76
12	100	81	39
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	21	12	1
Total	4,620	1,848	209

Comments: File 145 was replicated and verified. The revised file reflects an increase from 1,276 in 2014-15 to 1,848 in 2015-16 (572 more students, 44.8% increase)in math. For HS Accrual, an increase from 198 in 2014-15 to 248 in 2015-16 (50 more students, 25.2% increase)

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	525	514
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,501	2,426
K	1,555	1,544
1	1,749	1,735
2	1,635	1,623
3	1,739	1,720
4	1,574	1,558
5	1,342	1,338
6	1,290	1,285
7	1,205	1,193
8	1,227	1,220
9	1,203	1,193
10	1,031	1,024
11	872	866
12	779	776
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	2,283	2,238
Total	22,510	22,253
Comments: Florida did not anticipate decreases or increases and is reviewing this data.		

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	993
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	20,101
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	45	12,805
Regular school year - school day/extended day	15	621
Summer/intersession only	7	46
Year round	32	2,635

Comments: The state MIS/IT and MEP offices provided technical assistance in this area this year on proper coding of migrant student services and the time period in which the service(s) occurred. The numbers reported this year were a result of those efforts.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.8.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	41	29.03	18	17.84	59
Counselors					
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	13	10.39	5	5.00	18
Qualified paraprofessionals	13	10.83	11	9.83	24
Recruiters	1	1.00			1
Records transfer staff					
Administrators	2	1.29	1	0.49	3

Comments: Florida did not anticipate an increase or decrease.

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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	1	140
Adult corrections	15	57
Other		
Total	16	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	1
Adult corrections	15
Other	
Total	16
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			150	2,606	
Total Long Term Students Served			106	894	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)			42	1,423	
LEP Students			5	57	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			1	2	
Asian			0	3	
Black or African American			97	1,702	
Hispanic or Latino			22	305	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			23	594	
Two or more races			7	0	
Total			150	2,606	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			150	2,421	
Female			0	185	
Total			150	2,606	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			0	0	
13			2	0	
14			5	0	
15			24	9	
16			54	48	
17			65	137	
18			0	388	
19			0	507	
20			0	775	
21			0	742	
Total			150	2,606	

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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

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	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			150	1,006	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: File 182 pre-populates this section

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					104		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					S	S	330	S		
Obtained high school diploma					4	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					118	84	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					S	S	407	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					S	S	7	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					S	S	400	S		
Obtained employment					S	S	31	129		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: check this count

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, 2015, 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			4	253	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			26	26	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			8	136	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			25	302	
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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

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			9	171	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			17	19	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			17	181	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			20	376	
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	79	135
Neglected programs	8	130
Juvenile detention	18	5
Juvenile corrections	93	137
Other		
Total	198	////////////////////
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	79
Neglected programs	8
Juvenile detention	18
Juvenile corrections	93
Other	
Total	198
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	6,999	290	9,399	4,821	
Total Long Term Students Served	4,022	203	286	2,935	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,517	65	2,436	1,228	
LEP Students	372	16	193	66	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	6	24	10	
Asian	20	2	17	4	
Black or African American	2,783	121	5,298	2,662	
Hispanic or Latino	2,115	22	1,302	644	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	9		8	2	
White	1,798	119	2,439	1,370	
Two or more races	248	20	311	129	
Total	6,999	290	9,399	4,821	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	4,798	135	7,684	3,079	
Female	2,201	155	1,715	1,742	
Total	6,999	290	9,399	4,821	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6	5	10			
7	13	13			
8	23	10	2		
9	60	16	3		
10	68	9	10		
11	120	13	39	4	
12	383	8	123	51	
13	761	18	399	222	
14	1,083	19	940	423	
15	1,266	47	1,911	956	
16	1,543	72	2,787	1,459	
17	1,674	55	3,185	1,706	
18					
19					
20					
21					
Total	6,999	290	9,399	4,821	

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

All students receive transition services.

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, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

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.	6,293	281	8,214	3,562	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: All students receive transition services.

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	4,471		198		4,102		2,238			
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED	S	S	S	S	5	S	S	S		
Obtained high school diploma	43	S	S	S	6	S	47	S		
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	2,162	1,651	107	76	1,952	1,034	2,341	1,255		
Enrolled in a GED program	15	S	S	S	41	S	S	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	14	10	S	4	32	41	12	21		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	5	S	S	S	7	S	S		
Obtained employment	150	243	8	S	196	152	90	79		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: ok

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, 2015, 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			6	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	263	5	S	32	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	34	S		14	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	18	5	S	33	
Comments: At-Risk: 1418 students were tested in reading. Neglected: 528 students were tested in reading. Juvenile Detention: 264 students were tested in reading. Juvenile Corrections: 2064 students were tested in reading. At-Risk: 642 students made improvements in reading. Neglected: 270 students made improvements in reading.					

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, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

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.

2.4.2.6.2 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	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S			9	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	253	5	S	22	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	35	4		21	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	24	4	S	28	
Comments: At-Risk: 1459 students were tested in math. Neglected: 184 students were tested in math. Juvenile Detention: 66 students were tested in math. Juvenile Corrections: 2088 students were tested in math.					

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, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	5
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	1
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	16
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
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.

GOAL 1 - Decrease the proportion of the cohort of students 4th -10th grade scoring non-proficient on Florida's adopted assessment(s) in reading, mathematics, and writing by 10 percent (%) each school year.

English and Language Arts: Statewide Percent Non-Proficient

Grade 14-15 15-16 %Change

4 54 57 -3
5 57 58 -1
6 55 58 -3
7 58 61 -3
8 48 55 -7
9 50 46 4
10 41 53 -12

There was not a decrease of at 10% in the proportion of 4th - 10th grade students scoring non-proficient on this assessment.

Math: Statewide Percent Non-Proficient

Grade 14-15 15-16 %Change

4 44 41 3
5 47 45 2
6 56 55 1
7 52 51 1
8 50 44 6
9 57 54 3
10 76 80 -4

During the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, Florida adopted a comprehensive English and Language Arts assessment that encompassed a measurement of reading and writing skills. There was not a decrease of at 10% in the proportion of 4th - 10th grade students scoring non-proficient on this assessment.

GOAL 2 - Each participating LEA will decrease the proportion of all students scoring non-proficient on Florida's adopted assessment(s) in reading, mathematics, and writing by 10%.

Math Percent Proficient vs. Non-Proficient by District

2014-15 2015-16

District %Prof %Non- %Prof %Non- %Change

Prof Prof
BRADFORD 35 65 39 61 4
CALHOUN 61 39 58 42 -3
COLUMBIA 55 45 55 45 0
DESOTO 36 64 33 67 -3
DIXIE 48 52 49 51 1
FRANKLIN 47 53 44 56 -3
GILCHRIST 63 37 61 39 -2
GLADES 57 43 48 52 -9
GULF 60 40 64 36 4
HAMILTON 34 66 39 61 5
HARDEE 42 58 44 56 2
HENDRY 40 60 41 59 1
HOLMES 43 57 46 54 3
JACKSON 56 44 53 47 -3
JEFFERSON 22 78 24 76 2
LAFAYETTE 65 35 59 41 -6
LEVY 50 50 48 52 -2
LIBERTY 45 55 48 52 3
MADISON 35 65 40 60 5
MONROE 59 41 61 39 2
OKEECHOBEE 44 56 45 55 1
PUTNAM 42 58 40 60 -2
SUWANNEE 47 53 44 56 -3
TAYLOR 51 49 50 50 -1
UNION 64 36 69 31 5
WASHINGTON 48 52 53 47 5

There was not a decrease of at 10% in the proportion of all students scoring non-proficient on the math assessment.

English and Language Arts: Percent Proficient vs. Non-Proficient by District

2014-15 2015-16

District %Prof %Non- %Prof %Non- %Change

Prof Prof
BRADFORD 41 59 40 60 1
CALHOUN 59 41 57 43 2
COLUMBIA 51 49 50 50 1
DESOTO 35 65 32 68 3
DIXIE 51 49 53 47 -2

FRANKLIN 46 54 44 56 2
 GILCHRIST 61 39 56 44 5
 GLADES 47 53 43 57 4
 GULF 51 49 51 49 0
 HAMILTON 28 72 26 74 2
 HARDEE 42 58 43 57 -1
 HENDRY 40 60 40 60 0
 HOLMES 48 52 46 54 2
 JACKSON 54 46 53 47 1
 JEFFERSON 24 76 27 73 -3
 LAFAYETTE 50 50 50 50 0
 LEVY 42 58 42 58 0
 LIBERTY 51 49 49 51 2
 MADISON 34 66 34 66 0
 MONROE 58 42 57 43 1
 OKEECHOBEE 40 60 39 61 1
 PUTNAM 39 61 37 63 2
 SUWANNEE 44 56 44 56 0
 TAYLOR 43 57 41 59 2
 UNION 53 47 54 46 -1
 WASHINGTON 49 51 49 51 0

During the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, Florida adopted a comprehensive English and Language Arts assessment that encompassed a measurement of reading and writing skills. There was not a decrease of at 10% in the proportion of decrease the proportion of all students scoring non-proficient on this assessment.

GOAL 3 - Cut the average gap between minority and non-minority 20% each school year.

2014-15 2015-16

Average Percentage of Whites Proficient in Math 64 65
 Average Percentage of Minorities Proficient in Math 55.4 55.8
 Gap between Whites and Minorities 8.6 9.2

Cut of Average Gap(from 2014-15 and 2015-16)= -7%
 This gap increased by 7% between 2014-15 and 2015-16.

2014-15 2015-16

Average Percentage of Whites Proficient in ELA 65 64
 Average Percentage of Minorities Proficient in ELA 54.6 54.4
 Gap between Whites and Minorities 10.4 9.6

Cut of Average Gap = 8%
 This gap decreased by 8% between 2014-15 and 2015-16.

GOAL 4 - Each participating LEA will decrease the proportion of high school students not earning a standard diploma by 10% each school year.

2014-15 2015-16 Increase/Decrease

Graduates % Graduates # Graduates % Graduates

BRADFORD 153 76.9% 169 83.7% 7%
 CALHOUN 136 84.0% 136 82.9% -1%
 COLUMBIA 445 71.0% 459 75.0% 4%
 DESOTO 171 62.2% 204 61.6% -1%
 DIXIE 94 96.9% 122 96.1% -1%
 FRANKLIN 48 49.0% 61 72.6% 24%
 GILCHRIST 156 94.0% 172 97.7% 4%
 GLADES 46 80.7% 47 78.3% -2%
 GULF 122 83.6% 128 81.5% -2%
 HAMILTON 73 73.7% 83 83.0% 9%
 HARDEE 224 59.7% 243 67.3% 8%
 HENDRY 398 76.8% 385 78.1% 1%
 HOLMES 178 80.5% 139 72.4% -8%
 JACKSON 315 69.7% 342 72.6% 3%
 JEFFERSON 33 73.3% 35 70.0% -3%
 LAFAYETTE 67 87.0% 68 93.2% 6%
 LEVY 271 81.6% 259 81.4% 0%
 LIBERTY 73 77.7% 72 75.0% -3%
 MADISON 115 58.1% 117 80.1% 22%
 MONROE 469 76.9% 479 77.9% 1%
 OKEECHOBEE 319 65.9% 297 70.5% 5%
 PUTNAM 383 54.9% 436 63.6% 9%
 SUWANNEE 287 67.5% 344 89.6% 22%
 TAYLOR 108 64.7% 123 70.7% 6%
 UNION 136 77.7% 118 72.4% -5%
 WASHINGTON 191 70.5% 209 76.3% 6%

Three of the 27 school districts served during both the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school were able to decrease the proportion of high school students not earning a standard diploma by 10% or more.

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 2015-16?	<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 the 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 2015 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 2015-16). 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 or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. 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	197,886	S	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	822	S	77
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,581	S	91.6
<i>Asian</i>	5,365	S	91.9
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	216	S	85
Black or African American	43,926	S	72.3
Hispanic or Latino	57,450	S	79.5
White	84,619	S	85.1
Two or more races	5,488	S	82.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22,544	S	61.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,195	S	62.0
Economically disadvantaged students	103,137	S	74.4

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.

These data are correct as submitted. Districts are given an additional window for review since these data are a part of our state accountability system.

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 Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. 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

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, *EDFacts* files C106, C107, C109, C111, and C130 (DGs 778 and 779) are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>.

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

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools ⁵ under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: 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 2016-17 (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: This list has been verified

⁵ 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>

2.12.2 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 2016-17: 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 2016-17 (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)⁶
- | 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: Identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring is not applicable to Florida and no longer required.

⁶ 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 2016-17: 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 2016-17 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN034 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses. 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 EDEN034 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: No longer required to submit.

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 action⁷ under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: 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 2016-17 (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: Not applicable to Florida.

⁷ 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>.