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 ED*Facts* submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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:
___Part I, 2015-16 __X__Part II, 2015-16

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
MO Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

Address:
205 Jefferson Street
Jefferson City MO 65101

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Kim Oligschlaeger

Telephone: 573-751-3543

Fax: 573-751-9438

e-mail: kim.oligschlaeger@dese.mo.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Kim Oligschlaeger

_____ __Tuesday, May 9, 2017, 8:15:15 AM__
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	42,848	S	45.9
4	41,259	S	45.4
5	34,300	S	38.7
6	18,820	S	32.6
7	10,634	S	24.3
8	10,565	S	26.0
High School	4,830	S	40.5
Total	163,256	S	39.9
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	42,771	S	54.1
4	41,211	S	56.9
5	34,256	S	54.6
6	18,789	S	48.1
7	10,662	S	42.3
8	10,576	S	43.7
High School	5,045	S	58.5
Total	163,310	S	52.9
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	11,328	S	59.2
4	11,057	S	62.2
5	10,731	S	54.2
6	6,632	S	48.2
7	3,908	S	38.8
8	3,837	S	41.1
High School	911	S	72
Total	48,404	S	54.4
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	11,284	S	67.8
4	11,029	S	70.5
5	10,713	S	69.0
6	6,625	S	63.7
7	3,945	S	56.6
8	3,862	S	58.0
High School	880	S	79
Total	48,338	S	66.6
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	66,204
Limited English proficient students	21,085
Students who are homeless	19,752
Migratory students	173
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	1,796
Asian	4,701
Black or African American	107,989
Hispanic or Latino	30,788
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,053
White	246,126
Two or more races	14,548
Total	407,001
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	4	71	75
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	544	21,574	50	186	22,354
K	1,704	48,849	142	169	50,864
1	3,143	51,240	181	230	54,794
2	3,169	51,266	194	240	54,869
3	3,035	49,916	177	103	53,231
4	2,740	47,739	165	131	50,775
5	2,476	39,802	111	172	42,561
6	2,317	22,046	53	182	24,598
7	1,538	12,470	46	218	14,272
8	1,409	12,282	35	287	14,013
9	498	7,917	7	402	8,824
10	473	6,784	1	394	7,652
11	372	5,545	0	319	6,236
12	353	5,800	0	222	6,375
Ungraded	0	0	10	27	37
TOTALS	23,771	383,230	1,176	3,353	411,530
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	3,554
Reading/language arts	15,097
Science	11
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	0
Comments:	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	37
Supporting guidance/advocacy	127
Other support services	1,531
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	397.48	
Paraprofessionals[1]	93.94	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	2.16	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.02	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
   (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
   (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
   (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
   (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
   (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
   (6) Acting as a translator; or
   (7) Providing instructional services to students.

b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.

c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	984.48	99.49
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*	451	104
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	296,485	3,008,264
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	73,274,452	155,058,982
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	0.40	1.94

*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.

During school year 2015-2016, LEAs used their Title I.A set-aside for parental involvement for parent meetings, materials and supplies for literacy activities, school/home parent liaison, professional development for parent liaisons, Parent Advisory Committee meeting, parent newsletters, and educational resources for the Parent Resource Center (books, videos, etc.).

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: The SEA has no reservations as to the accuracy of the child count.

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)	119
K	77
1	64
2	74
3	64
4	58
5	69
6	56
7	55
8	60
9	67

10	53
11	32
12	20
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	81
Total	949
Comments: Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year.	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: There was an increase in the number of students due to being proactive and increasing recruiters in the southern region of Missouri during the peak harvest season. In addition, Missouri has contracted with ESCORT which has allowed better collaboration and recruitment resulting in an increase in families identified. As part of the contract with ESCORT to upgrade our recruiting efforts, four additional Identification and Recruitment Specialists from within Missouri, and two from Florida were used locate families throughout the entire region during the reporting period.

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	57
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)	5
K	13
1	9
2	13
3	11
4	4
5	4
6	7
7	1
8	2
9	0
10	1
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	70
Comments: There was a decrease of 24 migrant students served by the MEP summer/intersession term. This is due to a lack of coordinated recruiting in the month of June 2016, that led to a larger number of students not being found until after the summer school had started or was over.	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: There was a decrease of 24 migrant students served by the MEP summer/intersession term. This is due to a lack of coordinated recruiting in the month of June 2016, that led to a larger number of students not being found until after the summer school had started or was over.

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	0
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
Missouri uses MSSQL 2008 Database Server to compile and generate the total number of students for Category 1. Each Category 1 child count was calculated by their age and grade using the MSSQL 2008 Database Server. The Category 1 child count data was entered into the MSSQL 2008 Database Server from each child's Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE's were verified by the recruiter, supervisor of identification and recruitment, and state migrant director. Missouri queried the migrant database to ensure that the children counted were eligible, between the ages of 3-21, resided in the state at least one day during the reporting period, and were only counted once. Missouri accounted for those children who were two years old in the previous reporting period by entering all COEs in the migrant database regardless of age and when the query was run for the current reporting period it would have included those children.	

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

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 State's Category 2 count was generated using the same system as the Category 1 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.

Each child count was calculated by their age and grade using the MSSQL 2008 Database Server. The child count data was entered into the MSSQL 2008 Database Server from each child's Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE's were verified by the recruiter, supervisor of identification and recruitment, and state migrant director. After initial identification, all school districts in the state with migrant children residing in their district are required to verify migrant children are still residing within the district boundaries. The State of Missouri requires all LEAs to re-certify each year the residency status of all identified migrant children including two-year olds after they turn three. School districts log on to our online COE system and update the status of all children that have been identified in their areas. The State of Missouri MEP has developed an on line system that presents all LEAs with information pulled from the state database with the names and student identification numbers to ensure an accurate child count. School district personnel are then required to make any changes or updates to the records and submit the file back to the state MEP. The data is then reviewed and checked by either the State Migrant Director or the data coordinator. The online system provides an alphabetical listing of eligible children, ages 3-20 who, within three years of making a qualifying move, resided in the LEA boundaries for one or more days during the period from September 1, 2015-August 31, 2016. The unduplicated count is run by name, Student ID, and birth date. For the summer count, students are included into the system. The summer count includes only those students already in the system, the information is collect using the same on line system after the initial verification process is completed. Therefore, if a student is not an eligible migrant student the system does not allow them to be counted. Districts are also required to maintain documentation of services provided on-site. These are reviewed as part of the program reviews conducted by the Grants and Resources section of the Office of Quality Schools. The regular term unduplicated report pulls unduplicated students using the following fields: student identification number, student name, birth date, QAD, residency date, enrollment date, EOE date, withdrawal date. The report pulls students who had a QAD within last three years. We then review the report and check for termination codes and graduates. We also verify with districts on 12th graders not graduated. Next we pull a report for unduplicated birth through 2 year olds using the same fields to provide the unduplicated birth through 2 count. The state migrant database has built in reports that look for duplication. When duplication occurs, our state data coordinator examines the COE data to make clarifications and deletes redundant files if necessary. If additional clarification is needed, Missouri MEP staff contact the district or family directly to resolve whether the data reflects two separate students or is duplicate information for the same student. All duplicates are identified and removed (or merged, if appropriate) in the state migrant database, so they do not appear in the final eligible student list or eligible student count reports. Missouri MEP staff runs additional queries to find students or COEs that are flagged as ineligible, inactive or not determined. The final eligible student list is edited so it does not include students who are flagged as pending, inactive or ineligible. Missouri MEP staff double check the final eligible student list against the final count report to verify that the number of students on each report is identical. In 2015 the Missouri MEP added a function that checks the data base for possible duplicates and other data issues.

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)?

Missouri ensures that the system that transmits migrant data for the performance period to the Department accurately accounts for all migrant children in every EdFacts file by cross-referencing eligible migrant students for the performance period from our migrant COE database with our student information system. Those students identified as eligible migrant children in our migrant database are then reported as migrant students in EdFacts files.

In addition, the State can run reports from migrant COE system to pull an EDEN Report at any time to review for accuracy and a report that cross references our migrant COE database to our student information system.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All recruiters have access and are trained in the use of MSIX. Recruiters use MSIX to gather information prior to interviews. State data entry personnel also use MSIX to verify names and to communicate with other states/schools when a child leaves Missouri for another state. The State MEP Director uses MSIX to communicate with recruiters about possible students who were not identified in Missouri but were reported by others states to have a qualifying move to/from Missouri.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

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

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	55
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	34
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	34

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 2015-16
Procedures	**Yes/No**
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	No
Was the sampling statewide?	No

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 independent review was conducted by ESCORT of the State University of New York. ESCORT implemented the following steps in order to conduct the re-interviews of migrant families in Missouri:
• Develop sampling plan
• Develop/modify re-interview form and protocol
• Identify and prepare independent re-interviewers
• Interview families
• Review re-interview forms to validate determinations using an independent review panel
• Provide due process to challenge review determinations
• Calculate response rate and discrepancy rate
• Report findings and recommendations

Develop Sampling Plan
ESCORT reviewed the state's migrant-specific database in coordination with the SEA to ascertain the estimated numbers of migrant children residing in Missouri. It was determined that the sample for this study would be selected from migrant children for whom a COE had been completed between September 1, 2014 and August 31, 2015. The interviews were conducted the week of October 26-30, 2015, after the reporting period had ended. Appendix A shows the state's different regions, the counties served, and the contact person for each area.

The sample size drawn for this study was a set of 50 children and an additional set of 100 alternates, totaling 150 child names that were randomly selected. On October 2, 2015, SEA provided information to ESCORT on the sampling universe of children whose eligibility was newly determined during the current year (September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2015) including demographic data (child's first and last name, qualifying arrival date (QAD), county, physical address, phone number, date of birth, grade, and parent/guardian names). The SEA transmitted the information to ESCORT via email communication using secured password protection. ESCORT used a random number generator program on Excel to assign each child a random number. The random number column was then copied and the value only was pasted to a new column with the purpose of generating a static list of random numbers. The list of static

random numbers was then ordered from least to greatest. A new column was added in order to assign random sample numbers 1 to 50 to the main list and 51 to 150 to the alternate list. ESCORT provided the sample information to the SEA via email communication using the same security protection on October 12, 2015.

The use of this sampling method guaranteed that every migrant child in the state had the same probability of being selected for this studies sample.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESCORT reviewed the state's migrant-specific database in coordination with the SEA to ascertain the estimated numbers of migrant children residing in Missouri. It was determined that the sample for this study would be selected from migrant children for whom a COE had been completed between September 1, 2014 and August 31, 2015. The interviews were conducted the week of October 26-30, 2015, after the reporting period had ended. Appendix A shows the state's different regions, the counties served and the contact person for each area.

The sample size drawn for this study was a set of 50 children and an additional set of 100 alternates, totaling 150 child names that were randomly selected. On October 2, 2015, SEA provided information to ESCORT on the sampling universe of children whose eligibility was newly determined during the current year (September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2015) including demographic data (child's first and last name, qualifying arrival date (QAD), county, physical address, phone number, date of birth, grade, and parent/guardian names). The SEA transmitted the information to ESCORT via email communication using secured password protection. ESCORT used a random number generator program on Excel to assign each child a random number. The random number column was then copied and the value only was pasted to a new column with the purpose of generating a static list of random numbers. The list of static random numbers was then ordered from least to greatest. A new column was added in order to assign random sample numbers 1 to 50 to the main list and 51 to 150 to the alternate list. ESCORT provided the sample information to the SEA via email communication using the same security protection on October 12, 2015.

The use of this sampling method guaranteed that every migrant child in the state had the same probability of being selected for this studies sample.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Three independent re-interviewers were used during the Missouri re-interview process. One is an ID&R recruiter from Florida, one a migrant field services leader from Maine, and the third re-interviewer was a project manager for the Pennsylvania MEP. The re-interviewers have experience as recruiters and/or as Identification and Recruitment coordinators in their respective states.

The team was joined by the MO MEP lead recruiter on October 26, 2015, to review the re-interview form and the basic eligibility factors as well as any state-specific issues involving eligibility. The orientation also included a discussion of the qualifying activities likely to be found in the state. The three re-interviewers were provided a re-interview binder containing all the necessary materials to conduct the re-interviews in the specific regions assigned to each.

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.

Once the review process was completed, ESCORT provided the SEA with an initial report containing the review panel's initial determination findings, which included the samples who were determined eligible and those for whom a determination could not be made. Copies of the completed re-interview forms and COEs were also provided to the SEA. The report indicated the type of clarifying information that would assist the reviewers in making a proper determination. This initial determination report was provided on December 18, 2015.

After receiving the initial determinations, the SEA had sufficient time to appeal and provide additional clarifying information as a basis to appeal the panel's determinations. Since ESCORT and the review panel had agreed on the type of clarifying information needed for each case, ESCORT staff was able to review the information submitted by the SEA and make final determinations. The SEA submitted their initial responses on March 22, 2016. ESCORT informed the SEA of the final determinations via email communication on May 9, 2016.

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)	1
K	6
1	4
2	3
3	4
4	5
5	7
6	2
7	3
8	3
9	7
10	4
11	3
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	54
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)	3
K	33
1	30
2	31
3	24
4	22
5	29
6	21
7	20
8	25
9	26
10	19
11	15
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	308
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)	7
K	3
1	3
2	8
3	2
4	1
5	6
6	3
7	5
8	5
9	1
10	3
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	48
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	25
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	60
K	62
1	56
2	68
3	54
4	51
5	59
6	48
7	46
8	50
9	58
10	47
11	26
12	19
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	61
Total	790

Comments: Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year. There was an increase in the number of students due to being proactive and increasing recruiters in the southern region of Missouri during the peak harvest season. In addition, Missouri has contracted with ESCORT which has allowed better collaboration and recruitment resulting in an increase in families identified.

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	13
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	24
K	18
1	12
2	11
3	12
4	9
5	11
6	8
7	10
8	9
9	14
10	8
11	4
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	11
Total	177

Comments: Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year. There was an increase of 64 migrant students from SY 2014-2015 to SY 2015-2016. This resulted as an increase of the number of families identified.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	15
1	12
2	15
3	13
4	11
5	7
6	7
7	5
8	5
9	5
10	2
11	3
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	111
Comments:	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	
8	
9	
10	S
11	S
12	S
Ungraded	
Total	S
Comments: Missouri did not have any eligible migrant students who dropped out of school in grades 7, 8, 9, or ungraded. Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year. There was an increase of three migrant students from SY 2014-2015 to SY 2015-2016.	

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)	0
K	2
1	0
2	1
3	1
4	3
5	2
6	2
7	1
8	2
9	3
10	2
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	20
Comments: The number of migrant students identified as priority for services during the regular school year decreased by six migrant students in school year 2015-2016 from school year 2014-2015. Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year.	

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

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

Comments: The number of migrant students identified as priority for services during the summer intersession decreased by two migrant students in school year 2015-2016 from school year 2014-2015. Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year.

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	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	29
K	29
1	32
2	40
3	26
4	24
5	32
6	31
7	22
8	26
9	23
10	20
11	16
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	358

Comments: Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year. In addition, migrant funds were reduced which provided for less money to serve students.

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)	
K	2
1	0
2	1
3	1
4	3
5	2
6	2
7	1
8	2
9	3
10	2
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	20

Comments: The number of migrant students identified as priority for services during the performance period decreased by six migrant students in school year 2015-2016 from school year 2014-2015. Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year.

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

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

Comments: The number of migrant students identified as continuation for services during the regular school year decreased by four migrant students in school year 2015-2016 from school year 2014-2015. Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year.

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	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12
K	26
1	30
2	33
3	24
4	22
5	27
6	25
7	20
8	24
9	21
10	18
11	12
12	4
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	299
Comments:	

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	1	1	//
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6	7	//
K	26	19	//
1	23	15	//
2	23	17	//
3	19	16	//
4	17	15	//
5	15	11	//
6	18	12	//
7	9	5	//
8	13	6	//
9	13	10	17
10	7	7	9
11	4	5	5
12	2	1	3
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	196	147	34

Comments: The number of migrant students receiving high school credit accrual during the performance period increased by 23 migrant students in school year 2015-2016 from school year 2014-2015. Missouri does not have any migrant students reported as receiving MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period for ungraded or out-of-school. Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year.

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	3	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17	1
K	13	2
1	10	4
2	12	2
3	10	5
4	11	6
5	13	6
6	9	3
7	10	6
8	7	3
9	9	1
10	7	4
11	5	4
12	4	3
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	1	
Total	141	51
Comments: Missouri has a small number of number of migrant students which will cause fluctuations from year to year. MEP Funds were utilized for other activities such as parent involvement and supplemental instruction.		

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	138
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	521
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: MEP funds were not consolidated in Schoolwide Programs.	

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	10	152
Regular school year - school day/extended day	3	54
Summer/intersession only	1	70
Year round	2	52
Comments: The number of migrant children served in regular school year - school day only programs increased due to the increase in the number of regular school year - school day only MEP projects, which subsequently resulted in a decrease in the number of regular school year - school day/extended day projects which resulted in a decrease in the number of migrant children served in the regular school year - school day/extended day project. There was also a decrease in the year round projects which resulted in a decrease in the number of migrant children served in the year round project.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	0.50
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	44	3.84	16	16.00	60
Counselors	1	0.03	0	0.00	1
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	1	0.02	1	1.00	2
Qualified paraprofessionals	13	11.81	0	0.00	13
Recruiters	5	5.00	0	0.00	5
Records transfer staff	2	1.00	0	0.00	2
Administrators	0	0.00	3	2.00	3
Comments:					

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
   1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
   2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.

c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.

d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.

e. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).

f. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.

g. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.

h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

2.4 Prevention and Intervention Programs For Children And Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, Or At Risk (Title I, Part D, Subparts 1 and 2)

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 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	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	38	180
Adult corrections	4	309
Other	0	0
Total	42	//////////////////////////////
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	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	38
Adult corrections	4
Other	0
Total	42
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			1,443	246	
Total Long Term Students Served			1,443	113	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (*IDEA*)			256	99	
LEP Students			0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			1	0	
Asian			5	1	
Black or African American			622	142	
Hispanic or Latino			30	0	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			0	0	
White			785	103	
Two or more races			0	0	
Total			1,443	246	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			1,152	179	
Female			291	67	
Total			1,443	246	

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			8	0	
13			46	0	
14			148	0	
15			317	0	
16			475	1	
17			409	1	
18			40	11	
19			0	36	
20			0	57	
21			0	140	
Total			1,443	246	

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.			182	246	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

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

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

In the 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			369	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					291	S	18	S		
Obtained high school diploma					110	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					394	S	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					114	S	228	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					119	S	S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					24	S	S	S		
Obtained employment					12	S	S	6		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 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			0	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			12	11	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			128	12	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			1,303	90	
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			0	0	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			15	21	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			156	19	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			1,272	73	
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	1	100
Neglected programs	4	183
Juvenile detention	15	30
Juvenile corrections	7	78
Other	0	0
Total	27	//////////////////////////////
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	1
Neglected programs	4
Juvenile detention	15
Juvenile corrections	7
Other	0
Total	27
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	28	442	2,043	228	
Total Long Term Students Served	16	279	135	63	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3	172	221	57	
LEP Students	0	2	14	3	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	5	3	0	
Asian	0	0	6	2	
Black or African American	5	60	1,131	96	
Hispanic or Latino	1	13	73	10	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	2	37	1	
White	18	355	787	108	
Two or more races	4	7	6	11	
Total	28	442	2,043	228	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	19	250	1,558	166	
Female	9	192	485	62	
Total	28	442	2,043	228	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	
6	0	0	0	0	
7	0	1	0	0	
8	0	2	0	0	
9	0	7	0	0	
10	0	10	2	0	
11	0	9	13	0	
12	0	21	71	4	
13	0	23	161	25	
14	1	64	320	35	
15	3	75	496	65	
16	8	92	740	64	
17	11	65	223	31	
18	3	57	15	3	
19	2	16	1	1	
20	0	0	0	0	
21	0	0	1	0	
Total	28	442	2,043	228	

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

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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	No	Yes	Yes	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	7	0	799	1	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Neglect Programs were not able to collect data on student outcomes after exit due to various reasons: do not have access to hospital records indicating where students transfer, location of student is not known due to placement by court system, students leave the state, or they are no longer in custody due to reaching maximum age for state 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	14	S	360	42	

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	S	S	17	S	5	S	S	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	22	S	238	S	533	480	74	S		
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S	S	S	6	11	S	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	S	S	S	S	7	S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S	S	S	S	27	S	S		
Obtained employment	S	S	S	S	S	18	S	S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 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	S	27	S	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	101	27	16	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	89	14	16	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	39	29	4	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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	28	S	1	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	91	31	4	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	75	13	21	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	55	25	5	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 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	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	41
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	41
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	8
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	66
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	66
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.

Missouri adopted goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 for the RLIS program. Missouri did not collect data on its RLIS LEAs' progress towards their goals.

Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, 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 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

Below reflects the schools and districts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) data:

2003-2004 - 82 LEAs received RLIS grant, 15 LEAs met AYP, 67 LEAs did not meet AYP, 243 buildings, 93 buildings met AYP, and 150 building did not meet AYP.

2004-2005 - 51 LEAs received RLIS grant, 29 LEAs met AYP, 22 LEAs did not meet AYP, 157 buildings, 103 buildings met AYP, and 54 buildings did not meet AYP.

2005-2006 - 57 LEAs received RLIS grant, 22 LEAs met AYP, 35 LEAs did not meet AYP, 177 buildings, 88 buildings met AYP, and 89 buildings did not meet AYP.

2006-2007 - 60 LEAs received RLIS grant, 23 LEAs met AYP, 37 LEAs did not meet AYP, 186 buildings, 140 buildings met AYP, and 46 buildings did not meet AYP.

2007-2008 - 74 LEAs received RLIS grant, 6 LEAs met AYP, 68 LEAs did not meet AYP, 247 buildings, 109 buildings met AYP, and 138 buildings did not meet AYP.

2008-2009 - 93 LEAs received RLIS grant, 7 LEAs met AYP, 86 LEAs did not meet AYP, 322 buildings, 102 buildings met AYP, and 220 buildings did not meet AYP.

2009-2010 - 85 LEAs received RLIS grant, 2 LEAs met AYP, 83 LEAs did not meet AYP, 290 total buildings, 84 buildings met AYP, and 206 buildings did not meet AYP.

2010-2011 - 92 LEAs received RLIS grant, 6 LEAs met AYP, 86 LEAs did not meet AYP, 335 total buildings, 199 buildings met AYP, and 136 buildings did not meet AYP.

2011-2012 - 105 LEAs received RLIS grant. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY2011-12.

2012-2013 - 100 LEAs received RLIS grant. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY2012-13.

2013-2014 - 108 LEAs received RLIS grant. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY2013-14.

2014-2015 - 114 LEAs received RLIS grant. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY2014-15.

2015-2016 - 112 LEAs received RLIS grant. According to our state's ESEA Flexibility waiver request, our state did not make AYP determinations for SY2015-2016.

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?	No
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).	113
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)	113	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		113

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)	2,996,126.01	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		2,996,126.01
Total	2,996,126.01	2,996,126.01
Comments:		

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

2.11 Graduation Rates [4]

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 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	66,994	S	89.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	291	S	86
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,366	S	92
Asian			
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander			
Black or African American	11,221	S	79.0
Hispanic or Latino	3,166	S	83.1
White	49,571	S	91.6
Two or more races	1,379	S	89
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	7,437	S	77.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	852	S	68
Economically disadvantaged students	28,542	S	82.1

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.

[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, ED*Facts* 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 ED*Facts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

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

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the 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:

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

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the 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: Missouri is not required to submit schools identified for improvement.

[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 ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN034 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses. The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the 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:

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action[7] 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 ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS). The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the 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: Missouri is not required to list districts identified for improvement.

[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.