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 2012-13

ARKANSAS

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

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:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2012-13 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 conduciv to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high schoo

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 implementati of required EDFacts submission.
3.   The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, 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 2012-13 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 2012-13 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013

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, 2012-13   X Part II, 2012-13

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Arkansas

Address:
423 Main St., Suite 200
Little Rock, AR 72201

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Cody Decker

Telephone: 501-683-1417

Fax: 501-371-5010

e-mail: Cody.Decker@arkansas.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Cody Decker

                                      Friday, April 4, 2014, 11:30:23 AM
_____
      Signature

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2012-13

**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 17, 2012
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	28,627	S	85.2
4	28,397	S	80.9
5	26,649	S	67.4
6	21,095	S	73.1
7	17,955	S	67.3
8	16,834	S	61.3
High School	19,967	S	72.6
Total	159,524	S	73.7
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	28,585	S	78.2
4	28,360	S	83.3
5	26,625	S	82.2
6	21,072	S	71.0
7	17,929	S	73.6
8	16,821	S	74.6
High School	8,955	S	65.0
Total	148,347	S	77.1
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,908	S	91
4	3,003	S	87
5	3,583	S	77
6	4,181	S	80.5
7	3,796	S	74
8	3,220	S	73
High School	5,523	S	76.4
Total	26,214	S	79.2
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,908	S	86
4	3,002	S	87
5	3,581	S	87.2
6	4,177	S	77.1
7	3,793	S	82.2
8	3,217	S	84
High School	2,639	S	72
Total	23,317	S	82.3
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*)	31,488
Limited English proficient students	20,761
Students who are homeless	6,769
Migratory students	2,643
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	1,718
Asian	2,671
Black or African American	69,192
Hispanic or Latino	28,845
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,963
White	169,803
Two or more races	5,060
Total	279,252
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	275	7,429	62	4	7,770
K	1,116	27,091	200	28	28,435
1	1,303	26,683	171	25	28,182
2	1,296	26,228	150	25	27,699
3	1,308	26,001	145	29	27,483
4	1,145	25,909	132	47	27,233
5	1,086	25,095	160	84	26,425
6	848	22,003	104	61	23,016
7	361	18,296	81	95	18,833
8	1,564	16,889	29	106	18,588
9	927	12,538	17	121	13,603
10	1,242	11,000	8	100	12,350
11	1,078	10,074	5	78	11,235
12	876	9,387	7	47	10,317
Ungraded	1	203	0	0	204
TOTALS	14,426	264,826	1,271	850	281,373

Comments:

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

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

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

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

TAS instructional service	# Students Served
Mathematics	2,681
Reading/language arts	2,900
Science	
Social studies	
Vocational/career	20
Other instructional services	
Comments:	

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

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

TAS Suport Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	7,788
Supporting guidance/advocacy	
Other support services	
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	229	
Paraprofessionals[1]	788	94.40
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	181	
Clerical support staff	391	
Administrators (non-clerical)	268	
Comments: According to data collected, there are 529.52 HQ paraprofessionals and 31 non-HQ paraprofessionals; 529.52/560.52 = 94.4% are HQ;		

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:
(a) 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;
(b) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
(c) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
(d) Conducting parental involvement activities;
(e) Providing support in a library or media center;
(f) Acting as a translator; or
(g) 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]	4,585.20	92.40
Comments: From data file, there appeared to be a total of 4,585.19 parapros in the SW programs; of this total 374.02 don't have to be HQ; 318.91 are not HQ; 3,892.26 are HQ; so, 3829.26/4211.17 = % that are HQ; which is 92.4%; 7.6% are not HQ		

[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 2012 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) 2012 (School Year 2012−2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of $500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012−2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than $500,000
Number of LEAs[*]	174	80
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	1,158,933	3,917,163
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	39,923,092	108,818,128
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	2.90	3.60

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2012 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 2012−2013.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children
- Academic data of eligible migrant students
- Participation data of migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year
- School data
- Project data
- Personnel data

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the performance period would only be performance in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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, 2011 v August 31, 2012), youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the underlined 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, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is

calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	881
K	518
1	514
2	501
3	505
4	447
5	453
6	420
7	383
8	357
9	335
10	333
11	241
12	159
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	661
Total	6,708
Comments:	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Factors that have affected migrant counts for the 2012-2013 Program Year:
Less acreage was planted in cotton and tomatoes this year. A number of farmers shifted to less labor intensive crops such as corn and watermelons. Subsequently there was a decrease in enrollment.
Also across the state the need for temporary migrant workers decreased. Many of the companies that normally hire temporary labor were not hiring in the numbers they normally do and three plants closed down completely. Subsequently there was a decrease in the enrollment of temporary migrant workers.

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children from age 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, 2012 through August 31, 2013.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	330
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 **serveed** 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, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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)	68
K	80
1	91
2	74
3	76
4	49
5	76
6	52
7	40
8	31
9	21
10	32
11	8
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	83
Total	783
Comments:	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

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, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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 <u>only</u> referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	D
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	Yes
COEStar	No
MAPS	No
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	No

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

Data Collection and Management Procedures	(Yes/No)
Does the State collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	Ye

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:

- Children who were age 3 through 21
- 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 <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u>
- Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category
- Children two years of age that turned three years old during the performance period.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following provides a brief summary of the procedures and processes used to ensure all eligible children are accounted for in the performance period. It not only describes said processes and procedures for the State level as requested but includes processes and procedures implemented at the LEA and regional level as directed by the SEA.

The Migrant Child counts are based first on eligibility data and individual student data from the COE, which is collected and entered throughout the year. These data are collected by means of face to face interviews with the migrant families or youth by trained MEP recruiters. The pertinent eligibility data and further documentation are noted on the Arkansas COE and the Supplementary Documentation Form either hardcopy or by electronic COE. Before entering data from a new COE on any child a name and birthdate based search is run on the state database to verify for previous information. If there is any doubt parent and other data are reviewed to ensure that the child is not already on the database. If a child is already on the database the new information is input with the existing Student Identification Number. If the child is not found on the database a distinct Student Identification Number is created by the SIS and the data is input with the new number. Also during the year lists of possible duplicate students are run to consider if the students are duplicated on the database. If, after review by the Recruitment Eligibility Data Specialists (REDS) and the SEA, it is determined that the children have duplicate numbers the identifiers are merged. Also the MSIX Data Administrator receives a work list of possible duplicate students from MSIX, reviews the possible duplicate students and makes a decision about merging.

Educational and other service data is also used in the calculation of child counts. When direct educational and other services are provided, they are documented electronically; on data collection forms, and/or indicated on student records, and lists which are sent to the data specialist for review and entry in the SIS throughout the year as services are provided and at the end of each school term.

All students who are physically enrolled in the district after 09/01/12, who were migrant students the previous year and whose eligibility has not ended by 09/01/12 will receive a new school history line. Any preschooler or Out of School Youth who was a migrant in the previous year and not physically enrolled in the school must have their residency verified for the present year before they can be entered in the system. The residency is verified by a visit to the home, an interview with the family or an interview with the youth or other family member after 09/01/12. Also children who were enrolled as migrants before they were three years of age and who have not completed their third birthday before 09/01/12 must have their residency verified after they turn three by a visit to the home, an interview with the family. Once the residency for the children turning three is verified a new school history line placed on the database and to be counted in the query process. All new migrants have a school history/residency line added when the COE is approved.

The Summer/Intercession count requires further data to be collected and recorded from migrant intercession staff demonstrating a Summer Enrollment, indicated by an 'S' in the enrollment type and receipt of a migrant funded service during the Summer Enrollment period. The migrant service is indicated by a supplemental service code number with a start date that must fall within the Summer/Intersession timeframe. The Summer/Intercession count requires that the supplemental service be migrant funded. This information is documented throughout the summer term and sent to the data specialist for review and entry in the database upon completion of the term.

Three times a year, usually in September, April and August, lists of all eligible migrant students are provided to the projects for a review of accuracy and completeness. The projects are also requested to verify that students who have turned three prior to receipt of the list are still in the district, and add a residency line added if they are still present.

All projects have secure internet access to the database and are encouraged to check the database for individual students and complete lists of all of the migrant children in their district throughout the year. Any time during the year that parents are contacted, the data may be reviewed for accuracy and changes may be made if errors are found or revisions are needed. Lists and special reports are provided any time during the year upon request. When updates are made a record is made available electronically to the school/district for verification of accuracy of information and that all eligible migrant students are included. To further ensure that all eligible children are being accounted for throughout the year regional and LEA sites are monitored by the SEA to verify that all processes and procedures are being followed. Each program site is monitored yearly by either the SEA or the regional site.

The actual child counts are retrieved from the state database through a set of queries that count only distinct student numbers statewide. The queries are set up to count the children who were at least three years of age and under 22 years of age between 09/01/12 and 08/31/2013 and have resided in the state at least one day as indicated by activity on a residency or school history line during the time frame. Eligible children who turn three during the reporting period of 09/01/12 and 08/31/13 must have a residency line created after their third birthday. The queries are also designed to eliminate from the count any child, whose

three-year eligibility has run out before 09/01/2012 or has a termination date before 09/01/2012, whether for graduation, completing a GED or death. The Summer/Intercession queries count all children who show a Summer Enrollment, have a migrant supplemental service code attached to that enrollment and are eligible for funding purposes by age and residency anytime during the Summer Enrollment period. This would eliminate students who have not completed three years of age, be over 22 years of age and have a termination code dated prior to the Summer Enrollment date.

After the Category I and Category 2 queries are run, a complete list of all eligible Migrant Children sorted by region and district is made from the state database using the Category I and 2 criteria. These lists with counts are provided to the REDS in each region who in turn share the reports with the LEAs to check for discrepancies in the lists. If there are discrepancies they are researched by student number and if deletions or further data entry is required the data is provided by the LEA and entered by the REDS. When all review has been completed and discrepancies addressed the CSPR will be run again for final review by the SEA.

Finally all data items are compared to the data provided for the prior year's CSPR. If there are any dramatic changes they are investigated to ensure that they are correct and to find out what factors may have caused the changes. If any comments are required the state director will provide them and must verify and approve the data before it is considered finished and sent to the CSPR Coordinator for final verification.

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?

The following processes and procedures are in place to ensure that data on migrant children in the State database corresponds with the Migrant specific database:
The State Information System (SIS) instructional manual specifies that entry for Migrant Status must only be entered when the status if provided by a representative of the Arkansas Migrant Education Program. The state director of Migrant Education is specifically identified as the contact for any Migrant Status questions.
In data entry training for the State Information System (SIS), a Migrant Education staff member delivers a description of Migrant Status and specifically identifies the Migrant Cooperatives and state director as the only providers of the Migrant Student Lists. Included in the training is a reminder that only those students specifically identified in the lists provided by the cooperatives or the state director should be indicated as Migrant in the SIS. They are informed that if any other students are coded as Migrant they should contact their regional migrant cooperative or the state migrant director for verification of the status.
The LEAs are provided with a list of currently eligible migrant students by the Migrant Cooperatives at the beginning of the school year, and information on newly recruited students is sent throughout the year for entry in the State SIS.
At any time during the year lists of currently eligible migrant students or information on individual migrant students may be provided by the Migrant Education Cooperatives to the LEAs upon request.
Prior to all State required assessments the Migrant Cooperatives provide a current list of eligible migrant students to the LEA superintendent, SIS data entry person and to the LEA Assessment Coordinator for coding as Migrant on the assessments.
When State required assessment data is compiled a copy of the data is provided to the MEP for review, comparison, and inclusion in the Migrant database. The migrant state director reviews the assessment data before submission to EDEN to ensure that assessment information does not conflict with the Migrant database provided data.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MSIX is only used to assist in checking for duplication of students.
The Arkansas MSIX Data Administrator receives a work list of possible duplicate students from MSIX, reviews the possible duplicate students and makes a decision about merging. This assists the ARMEP in ensuring that their are no duplicate students in the Arkansas Migrant data system and there are no duplicates with other states in the MSIX.

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
Do 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 at summer/inter-session projects?	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.	93
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	70
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	70

Describe any reasons children were determined ineligible in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes
Was the sampling statewide?	Yes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The determination results indicated in the reporting above were from a rolling sample report which was not stratified by group or area. The Arkansas Migrant Education Program completed a second rolling sample report that was stratified by workers who were determined to be employed temporarily as required in the Program Determination of Audit ED-OIG A06F0016. The universe of the second random sample consisted all of COEs on the ADE migrant database that have been validated as eligible for the MEP in the program year AND that the Qualifying Work was determined to be Temporary, as indicated by an 'T' in the Seasonal/Temporary Flag Field of the database. The COEs were queried by a unique COE ID in a list ordered by log approval date-time and only included COES with Temporary work as indicated by a 'T' in the Seasonal/Temp Flag. Every tenth COE was selected and the first child on the designated COE was to be validated by a re-interview. The following is an example of the rolling COE List for Temporary Workers: List # COE ID Log Approval Date Seasonal/Temp Flag 150 AR1013-87564 09/27/12 11:12:58 AM T 151 AR1365-354462 09/27/12 11:13:22 AM T 152 AR1271-905573 09/27/12 11:15:37 AM T

The following are the certified results of the Rolling COE List stratified by Temporary Qualifying Work:
The number of eligibility determinations sampled. 55
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed. 52
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and have been certified that the determinations of eligibility and the information on which the determinations were based were true and correct and the child was found eligible. 52

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Arkansas Migrant Education Program has developed and implemented a re-interview process in accordance of the provisions in 34 CFR 200.89(d)and as required in the Program Determination of Audit ED-OIG A06F0016. The ADE uses rolling sample reports. The universe of the first random sample consists of all COEs on the ADE migrant database that have been validated as eligible for the MEP in the program year. The COEs are queried by a unique COE ID in a list ordered by log approval date-time. Every fifteenth COE is highlighted and selected for re-interview. The first child on the selected COE is to be validated by a re-interview. The first and second replacement students are from the following two COEs on the same random list. If the student from the first COE cannot be re-interviewed after three attempts, the first student on the next COE on the list will be attempted. If that student cannot be validated by a re-interview after three attempts it will pass to the first student on the following COE from the list. If in turn after three attempts no interview can be done on the third consecutive COE it is considered a non-response and the re-interviewer must move down the list fifteen COEs for the next highlighted COE/student for re-interviewing. This process ensures that the sampling replacement is systematic and included sampling from the entire list.
The following is an example of the rolling COE List:
150 AR1013-87564 09/27/12 11:12:58 AM
151 AR1365-354462 09/27/12 11:13:22 AM
152 AR1271-905573 09/27/12 11:15:37 AM

The Arkansas Migrant Education Program completed a second rolling sample report that was stratified by workers who were determined to be employed temporarily. The universe of the second random sample consisted all of COEs on the ADE migrant database that have been validated as eligible for the MEP in the program year AND that the Qualifying Work was determined to be Temporary, as indicated by an 'T' in the Seasonal/Temporary Flag Field of the database. The COEs were queried by a unique COE ID in a list ordered by log approval date-time and only included COES with Temporary work as indicated by a 'T' in the Seasonal/Temp Flag. Every tenth COE was highlighted and selected for re-interview. The first child on the designated COE was to be validated by a re-interview. The first and second replacement students are from the following two COEs on the same random list. If the student from the first COE cannot be re-interviewed after three attempts, the first student on the next COE will be attempted. If that student cannot be validated by a re-interview after three attempts it will pass to the first student on the following COE from the list. If in turn after three attempts no interview can be done on the third COE it is considered a non-response and the re-interviewer must move ten down the list for the next highlighted COE/student for re-interviewing. This ensures that the sampling replacement is systematic and included sampling from the entire list.

The following is an example of the rolling COE List for Temporary Workers:
List # COE ID Log Approval Date Seasonal/Temp Flag
150 AR1013-87564 09/27/12 11:12:58 AM T
151 AR1365-354462 09/27/12 11:13:22 AM T
152 AR1271-905573 09/27/12 11:15:37 AM T

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	
Phone Interviews	
Both	Face-to-face re-interviews
Obtaining Data From Families	**Yes/No**
Was there a standard instrument used?	Yes
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers trained and provided instruments?	Yes
Did the recruitment personnel who made the initial eligibility determinations also conduct the re-interviews with the same families?	No
When were the most recent independent re-interviews completed (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LOA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	(MM/YY) 12/13

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The ARMEP completed two sets of prospective re-interviews, one statewide random of all children identified as migrant and one statewide sample stratified by workers determined to be employed temporarily as described previously in this section (2.3.1.3.4.) The re-interview process was implemented by an independent team, which was neither SEA nor LOA staff, nor had worked on the initial eligibility determinations being reviewed. The team included a re-interviewer who completed each of the face to face interviews and an a reporter who provided the lists, reports, interview documents and forms to the re-interviewer and collected all re-interview information provided by the re-interviewer and later compiled and reported all results to the SEA. The re-interviewer and the reporter were trained by the SEA and by regional Recruitment Eligibility Data Specialists on MEP eligibility, general information on migrant families, contacts on locating migrant families and were allowed to work with recruitment staff before beginning the re-interview process. The reporter worked with the SEA to develop new and revise existing lists and forms for interviewing and reporting. This was done through a series of trainings, phone conferences, and meetings through the summer of 2012, prior to the beginning of the 2012-2013 Program Year.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The ARMEP found no ineligible migrant children in the two interview processes used. We attribute this to the extensive changes the ARMEP has effected in its COE process over the past several years. Further review and strengthening of all areas of documentation; including the implementation of a rigorous system of quality controls were crucial in reducing our error rate and also addressed the weaknesses identified by OME and the OIG in its review of eligibility documentation in the final determination of Audit: ED-OIG A06FOO16. We firmly believe this further demonstrates that the ARMEP is executing the provisions in 34 CFR 200.89(d).

As requested in final determination of Audit: ED-OIG A06FOO16 a description and the results of the re-interviewing process are as follows:
The Arkansas Migrant Education Program has developed and implemented a re-interview process in accordance of the provisions in 34 CFR 200.89(d)and as required in the Program Determination of Audit ED-OIG A06F0016. The ADE uses rolling sample reports. The universe of the first random sample consists of all COEs on the ADE migrant database that have been validated as eligible for the MEP in the program year. The COEs are queried by a unique COE ID in a list ordered by log approval date-time. Every fifteenth COE is highlighted and selected for re-interview. The first child on the selected COE is to be validated by a re-interview. The first and second replacement students are from the following two COEs on the same random list. If the student from the first COE cannot be re-interviewed after three attempts, the first student on the next COE will be attempted. If that student cannot be validated by a re-interview after three attempts it will pass to the first student on the following COE from the list. If in turn after three attempts no interview can be done on the third COE it is considered a non- response and the re-interviewer must move down the list fifteen COEs for the next highlighted COE/student for re-interviewing. This process ensures that the sampling replacement is systematic and included sampling from the entire list.
The following are the certified results of the Rolling COE List for ALL eligible migrants in the Program Year:
The number of eligibility determinations sampled. 90
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed. 70
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and have been certified that the determinations of eligibility and the information on which the determinations were based were true and correct and the child was found eligible. 70

The Arkansas Migrant Education Program completed a second rolling sample report that was stratified by workers who were determined to be employed temporarily. The universe of the second random sample consisted all of COEs on the ADE migrant database that have been validated as eligible for the MEP in the program year AND that the Qualifying Work was determined to be Temporary, as indicated by an 'T' in the Seasonal/Temporary Flag Field of the database. The COEs were queried by a unique COE ID in a list ordered by log approval date-time and only included COES with Temporary work as indicated by a 'T' in the Seasonal/Temp Flag. Every tenth COE was highlighted and selected for re-interview. The first child on the designated COE was to be validated by a re-interview. The first and second replacement students are from the following two COEs on the same random list. If the student from the first COE cannot be re-interviewed after three attempts, the first student on the next COE will be attempted. If that student cannot be validated by a re-interview after three attempts it will pass to the first student on the following COE from the list. If in turn after three attempts no interview can be done on the third COE it is considered a non-response and the re-interviewer must move ten down the list for the next highlighted COE/student for re-interviewing. This ensures that the sampling replacement is systematic and included sampling from the entire list.

The following are the certified results of the Rolling COE List stratified by Temporary Qualifying Work:
The number of eligibility determinations sampled. 55
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed. 52
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and have been certified that the determinations of eligibility and the information on which the determinations were based were true and correct and the child was found eligible. 52

The re-interviewing process revealed several documentation errors that did not affect the eligibility determination. They are

listed as follows:

23 Addresses were incorrect and/or misspelled.

3 Names of students were misspelled.

1 Date of birth was incorrect.

With the significant number of findings of poor documentation of the correct address, future trainings will emphasize the importance of verifying a valid physical address and ensuring that addresses are updated when moves are made. VVith our highly mobile population this is an area of data that we must focus on.

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	16
K	86
1	99
2	110
3	120
4	79
5	92
6	68
7	53
8	59
9	67
10	45
11	35
12	18
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
Total	955
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, <u>and</u> whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	1
K	115
1	146
2	140
3	135
4	126
5	119
6	127
7	93
8	92
9	79
10	87
11	59
12	38
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	10
Total	1,367
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	0
K	8
1	27
2	30
3	22
4	39
5	45
6	28
7	31
8	24
9	22
10	26
11	18
12	12
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	15
Total	347

Comments: Factors that have affected IDEA migrant counts for the 2012-2013 Program Year:
A number of migrant children with disabilities (IDEA) had run out of eligibility prior to the start of the program year.
A number of migrant children with disabilities (IDEA) had moved and are no longer residing in the state.

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the underlined number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2013 (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	147
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	154
K	94
1	79
2	71
3	79
4	86
5	85
6	63
7	64
8	60
9	67
10	63
11	48
12	23
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	412
Total	1,595

Comments: Factors that have affected migrant QAD for the 2012-2013 Program Year:
Less acreage was planted in cotton and tomatoes this year. A number of farmers shifted to less labor intensive crops such as corn and watermelons. Subsequently there was a decrease in migrant workers moving to/within the state during the program year.
Also across the state the need for temporary migrant workers decreased. Many of the companies that normally hire temporary labor were not hiring in the numbers they normally do and three plants closed down completely. Subsequently there was a decrease in the enrollment of temporary migrant workers that moved to/within the state during the program year.

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children whose most recent qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2012-13 regular school year) The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	153
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	429
K	254
1	215
2	211
3	199
4	172
5	167
6	163
7	146
8	131
9	143
10	115
11	83
12	46
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	299
Total	2,926

Comments: The Arkansas Migrant Education Program collected data on children with a qualifying arrival date during the regul a year of the last three performance periods (SY 2010-11, SY 2011-12, and 2012-13).

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the regular school year, 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. <u>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.</u> The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	4
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	60
1	95
2	90
3	90
4	76
5	88
6	62
7	62
8	58
9	80
10	90
11	71
12	48
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	1,004

Comments: In order to meet the educational needs of our students, where other services are available or we are unable to provide services, the ARMEP has made a concerted effort to see that migrant students are directed to programs where those educational needs can be met. Through training and communication we have been able to make our staff aware of other types of educational services that may be available in their schools and communities and assist the students and families in participating. As a result we have seen an increase in the number of students we are referring to services such as ESL classes, after school tutoring opportunities, ACT/other test preparation classes, GED programs, quality preschool programs and other programs provided by the schools and other organizations in the community.

2.3.2.7 Referrals — During the Summer/ Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another 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. <u>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.</u> The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	2
10	9
11	7
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	20
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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	S
8	S
9	10
10	8
11	8
12	12
Ungraded	0
Total	44
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:
How is "drop outs of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the performance 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 2011-12 performance period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your State.

Obtained GED	**#**
Obtained a GED in your State During the Performance Period	S
Comments:	

2.3.3   MEP Participation Data–Regular School Year

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant children in MEP-funded services during the regular school year.

Participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Eligible migrant children and children who continued to receive MEP-funded services: (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) 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) (1–3)].

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 only served during the summer/intersession term.

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Children Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the underlined number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. 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 Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	131
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	334
K	405
1	399
2	390
3	380
4	343
5	359
6	324
7	304
8	261
9	269
10	259
11	192
12	123
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	233
Total	4,706

Comments:

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services-During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** 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	4
K	86
1	98
2	107
3	115
4	79
5	88
6	67
7	51
8	58
9	67
10	45
11	35
12	18
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	919
Comments:	

2.3.3.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year 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 Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	7
1	9
2	12
3	9
4	17
5	9
6	12
7	5
8	8
9	7
10	8
11	4
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	113
Comments:	

2.3.3.4 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by <u>either a teacher or a paraprofessional</u>. 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 Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	12
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten	101
K	259
1	286
2	280
3	254
4	255
5	238
6	212
7	204
8	176
9	167
10	176
11	136
12	97
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	3
Total	2,856
Comments:	

2.3.3.4.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. 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 Regular School Year	Mathematics Instruction During the Regular School Year	High School Credit Accrual During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	1	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14	3	
K	245	125	
1	270	138	
2	263	133	
3	241	152	
4	236	130	
5	220	134	
6	170	95	
7	167	64	
8	148	58	
9	121	60	79
10	140	45	120
11	106	27	85
12	76	21	66
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	2	0	0
Total	2,420	1,185	350
Comments:			

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

2.3.3.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received <u>any</u> MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. 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 Regular School Year	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	125	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	278	0
K	359	9
1	392	18
2	378	11
3	359	20
4	346	15
5	350	14
6	311	5
7	311	8
8	259	10
9	259	92
10	269	134
11	201	86
12	146	63
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	225	1
Total	4,568	486
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.4   MEP Participation Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the **summer/intersession term** instead of the regular school year.

2.3.4.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the underlined number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. 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 Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	68
K	80
1	91
2	74
3	76
4	49
5	76
6	52
7	40
8	31
9	21
10	32
11	8
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	83
Total	783
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the underduplicated number of **participating** 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	13
K	17
1	29
2	35
3	37
4	18
5	29
6	20
7	15
8	15
9	13
10	17
11	2
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	262

Comments: The ARMEP makes every attempt to provide services to PFS students first whether in Regular SY or Summer/Intercession. Many times PFS students are not able to participate in the services provided in the summer for numerous reasons such as work, transportation, moving, etc. This year more PFS students were present and able to participate in the summer services offered by the ARMEP.

2.3.4.4 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received <u>any</u> type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by <u>either a teacher or a paraprofessional</u>. 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 Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten	67
K	79
1	91
2	74
3	76
4	49
5	76
6	52
7	40
8	31
9	21
10	32
11	8
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	83
Total	781
Comments:	

2.3.4.4.1 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of **participating** migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. 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 Summer/ Intersession Term	Mathematics Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term	High School Credit Accrual During the Summer/ Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	55	18	
K	38	78	
1	53	88	
2	42	73	
3	41	75	
4	24	48	
5	37	76	
6	33	52	
7	20	38	
8	16	28	
9	11	17	12
10	12	22	12
11	1	1	5
12	0	1	1
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	64	1	0
Total	447	616	30
Comments:			

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

2.3.4.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the underlined number of **participating** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled **Counseling Service**, provide the underlined number of **participating** migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. 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 Summer/Intersession Term	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27	0
K	42	0
1	49	0
2	32	0
3	37	0
4	33	0
5	39	0
6	29	0
7	26	0
8	18	0
9	12	2
10	22	10
11	7	7
12	2	1
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	83	0
Total	458	20
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.5 MEP Participation – Performance Period

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of **participating** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do <u>not</u> 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	131
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	372
K	407
1	405
2	392
3	385
4	343
5	362
6	326
7	306
8	262
9	272
10	261
11	193
12	123
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	236
Total	4,776
Comments:	

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	644
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	5,199
Comments:	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in School Wide 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: N/A Arkansas does not consolidate MEP funds in School Wide 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 **participating** in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	36	2,015
Regular school year - school day/extended day	4	108
Summer/intersession only	1	20
Year round	18	2,335
Comments:		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.8   MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the performance 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 <u>funded by the MEP</u>. 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	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	9	8	38	38
Counselors	0	0	0	0
All paraprofessionals	123	107	63	63
Recruiters	14	14	10	10
Records transfer staff	5	5	4	4
Administrators	7	6	6	5
Comments: Several summer projects significantly increased the number of paraprofessionals used to provide services outsid of the school setting.				

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest <u>whole number</u> 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 recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.

f. *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.

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

2.3.8.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	123	106.90	63	63.00
Comments: Several summer projects significantly increased the number of qualified paraprofessionals used to provide services outside of the school setting.				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
   1. To calculate the FTE, 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 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 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 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) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of *ESEA*).

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
    - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
    - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
    - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
    - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
    - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
    - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	7	267
Adult corrections	3	116
Other		
Total	10	

Comments: In Arkansas, there are no neglected programs or juvenile detention programs receiving Subpart 1 funding at this time; there are actually 2 State Agencies that received Title I, Part D Subpart 1 funds: DYS and DOC; DYS has 7 facilities under it that serve students and DOC has 3 adult facilities under its umbrella that house students;

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	
Juvenile Detention	
Juvenile Corrections	7
Adult Corrections	3
Other	
Total	10
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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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			428	206	
Total Long Term Students Served			405	124	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			117	27	
LEP Students			0	2	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			0	0	
Asian			1	0	
Black or African American			235	120	
Hispanic or Latino			15	10	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			1	0	
White			169	76	
Two or more races			7	0	
Total			428	206	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			390	167	
Female			38	39	
Total			428	206	

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			1	0	
13			9	0	
14			27	0	
15			59	0	
16			134	11	
17			147	27	
18			43	54	
19			7	71	
20			1	43	
21			0	0	
Total			428	206	

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

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 able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?			No	No	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			428	102	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: There is a Arkansas law and there is DHS policy and/or procedures that prohibit contract with students after they leave the facilities. If the student has a personal relationship with the facility worker, they will usually provide updates on how they are progressing. Otherwise, there is no way to keep track.

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

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the underlined number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next provide the underlined number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in their local district school					428		S			
Earned high school course credits					323		5			
Enrolled in a GED program					86		S			
Earned a GED					70		S			
Obtained high school diploma					11		S			
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					8		13			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					S		45			
Obtained employment					6		31			

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: DYS has an agreement with Arkansas Department of Education and DYS is actually considered an educational system "district"; they must meet the same or similar requirements; therefore their kids are considered enrolled in their local district;

2.4.1.6   Academic Performance Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent 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 tables below, provide the underlined number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, 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 tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			254	70	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			389	103	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			61	S	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			114	26	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			95	69	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			119	6	
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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

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 testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			235	77	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)			388	86	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			67	8	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			115	40	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			85	36	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			121	S	
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	18	136
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total	18	
Comments: In Arkansas, only at-risk or delinquent programs receive Title I, Part D-Subpart 2 funding; so there is no data to report for neglected facilities;		

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	18
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	18
Comments: All programs reported some data; however, due to the length of stay of some, they were not able to provide performance data;	

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 underlined 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	1,704				
Total Long Term Students Served	1,029				

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	232				
LEP Students	0				

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	4				
Asian	6				
Black or African American	504				
Hispanic or Latino	69				
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0				
White	1,039				
Two or more races	82				
Total	1,704				

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,146				
Female	558				
Total	1,704				

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	9				
6	9				
7	15				
8	20				
9	25				
10	35				
11	72				
12	116				
13	147				
14	276				
15	303				
16	354				
17	309				
18	11				
19	3				
20	0				
21	0				

Total	1,704				

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

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 able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?	No				
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	1,254				

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Arkansas law and/or DHS policy and procedures do not allow facilities and their personnel to track students/client upon their departure; if students have a personal relationship with the workers, they will follow-up with the worker;

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

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the underlined number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next provide the underlined number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in their local district school	1,704									
Earned high school course credits	698									
Enrolled in a GED program	95									
Earned a GED	68									
Obtained high school diploma	34									
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	11									
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	5									
Obtained employment	21									

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: We are unable to provide an accurate # of students who were enrolled in the local district as Arkansas does not have a consistent way of entering these students into our current system; many provide educational services on the facility's campus; some have the district to send a teacher to the facility; need more clarity on this question. Arkansas law and/or DHS policy and procedures do not allow facilities and their personnel to track students/clients upon their departure; if students have a personal relationship with the workers, they will follow-up with the worker;

2.4.2.6   Academic Performance Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent 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 tables below, provide the unduplicated number of <u>long-term</u> students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories in the second table below. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the tables below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, 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 tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	465				
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	520				

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	50				
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	102				
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	268				
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	100				
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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

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

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	472				
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	513				

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	43				
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	109				
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	270				
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	91				
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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

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.

2.7   Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)

This section collects data on student behaviors under the *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.*

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease in the percentage of schools designated as persistently dangerous.	SEA-Statewide information System (SIS)	Annually	2013	2010-11: 2010-11: 0 2011-12: 2011-12: 0 2012-13: 2012-13: 0 2013-14: 2013-14: 0 2014-15: 2014-15: 0	2010-11: 2010-11: 0 2011-12: 2011-12: 0 2012-13: 2012-13: 0	0	2002
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
A two percent increase in the age of first use of cigarettes, alcohol and marijuana	Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment 2011-12 survey grades 6,8, 10,& 12	Annually	2013	2010-11: 2010-11: alcohol: 12.75, 2010-11: cigarettes: 11.48, alcohol: 12.50 marijuana:13.52 2011-12: 2011-12: cigarettes:11.7alcohol: 12.75, marijuana: 13.79 2012-13: 2012-13: 0 2013-14: 2013-14: 0 2014-15: 2014-15: 0	2010-11: 2010-11: 2010-11: cigarettes: 12.2; alcohol: 12.7; 2011-12: 2011-12: cigaretes: 12.3, alchol: 12.7 marijuana: 13.7 2012-13: 2012-13: 0	cigarettes 11.89, alchol-12.60, marijuana:13.52	2002
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
A two percent decrease in favorable attitudes toward antisocial behavior (drug use)	Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment Survey - grades 6, 8, 9, 10 & 12	Annually	2013	2010-11: 2010-11: 2010-11: Grade 6:38.3; Grade 8: 32.0; grade 10: 41.9: grade 12: 38.1 2011-12: 2011-12: grade 6: 6.2, grade 8:31.26, grade 10:40.66 grade 12: 37.34 2012-13: 2012-13: 0 2013-14: 2013-14: 0 2014-15: 2014-15: 0	2010-11: 2010-11: 2010-11: Grades 6: 38.3, Grade 8:32.7, Grade 10: 41.9, Grade 12: 38.0 2011-12: 2011-12: grade 6: 36.7, grade 8: 32.2. Grade 10: 40.5, grade 12: 37.7 2012-13: 2012-13: 0	Grades6: 40.4, Grades 8:35.0, Grade 10: 43.6, Grade 12: 39.9	2002

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
a two percent decrease in students carrying weapons on school property	Statewide Information System (SIS)	Annually	2013	2010-11: 2010-11: 2010-11: K-5:109; 6-8:127 9-12:156 2011-12: 2011-12: K-5: 107.91, 6-8: 124.4, 9-12: 153.83 2012-13: 2012-13: 0 2013-14: 2013-14: 0 2014-15: 2014-15: 0	2010-11: 2010-11: 2010-11: k-5: 111; 6-8; 133; 9-12:179 2011-12: 2011-12: K-5: 152, 6-8: 174, 9-12: 162 2012-13: 2012-13: 0	2009-10: 2009-10 K-5: 2 6-8: 4 9-12: 23	2010

Comments:

2.7.2   Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	(liquor law violations-possession, use, sale): violations of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture,sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or consumption of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol. suspicion or being under the influence of alcohol may be included if it results in disciplinary action.
Illicit drug related	excluding alcohol and tobacco, (illegal drug possession, sale, use/under the influence): Unlawful use,cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, solicitation, purchase, possession, transportation or importationof any controlled drug (e.g. Demerol, morphine, marijuana, LSD,) narcotic substance, or inhalant.
Violent incident without physical injury	(physical altercation, minor pushing, shoving; fighting (mutual altercation); school threat (threat of destruction or harm); threat/intimidation (causing fear or harm); harasment,nonsexual (physical verbal, or psychological) and sexual (unwelcomed sexual conduct).Bullying -unwanted and repeated written verbal, or physical behavior including threatening, insulting or dehumanizing gestures, by a student that is severe or pervasive enough to create an intimidating, hostile or offensive educational environment, cause discomfort or humiliation, or unreasonably interfere with the individual's school performance or participation.
Violent incident with physical injury	Student Assault - Battery (physical attack/harm): Examples include striking that causes bleeding, broken nose, kicking while a student is down. Consider age and developmentally appropriate behavior before using this category. This category should be used when the attack is serious enough to warrant calling the police or security or when serious bodily harm occurs. Include an attack with a weapon in this category. (This offense may be referred to by law enforcement as aggravated assault). Staff Assault- Am attempt to cause purposely, knowingly, or recklessly bodily injury to staff; or negligently causing bodily injury to staff with a deadly weapon.
Weapons possession	Handguns, rifles, shotguns-Possession of an instrument or object defined as a firearm and used to inflict harm or other persons. Any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of any explosive; the frame or receiver of any weapon described above, and any firearm muffler or firarm silencer. Handgun - A firearm (revolver or pistol)designed to be held and fired with one hand. Rifle - A shoulder weapon. Shotgun- a smoothbore shoulder weapon used for firing shots at short range. Club-(chain, nunchakus, billy club, electrical weapon or device (stun gun), or substance used as a weapon (e.g., mace, tear gas) Explosives-incendiary, or poison gas; any weapon which will or which may be readily converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive or other propellant, and whcih has any barrel with a bore of more than one-half inch in diameter, i.e., Bomb, Grenade, Rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces,. Missiles having an explosive or incendiary charge or more than one-quarter ounce, Mine or similar device.
Comments:	

2.7.2.2   Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on <u>violent incident without physical injury</u>.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for <u>violent incident without physical injury</u> by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>violent incident without physical injury</u>, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	5,344	200
6 through 8	7,762	216
9 through 12	6,723	224
Comments:		

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for <u>violent incident without physical injury</u> by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>violent incident without physical injury</u>, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	11	8
6 through 8	46	21
9 through 12	89	32
Comments:		

2.7.2.3   Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on <u>violent incident with physical injury</u>.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for <u>violent incident with physical injury</u> by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>violent incident with physical injury</u>, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	23	12
6 through 8	17	10
9 through 12	16	8
Comments:		

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for <u>violent incident with physical injury</u> by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>violent incident with physical injury</u>, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	0	0
9 through 12	S	1
Comments:		

2.7.2.4   Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	186	67
6 through 8	167	73
9 through 12	144	71
Comments:		

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	9	8
6 through 8	24	15
9 through 12	31	19
Comments:		

2.7.2.5   Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	4	4
6 through 8	77	37
9 through 12	222	66
Comments:		

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	S	2
9 through 12	10	5
Comments:		

2.7.2.6   Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	10	8
6 through 8	342	86
9 through 12	1,015	151
Comments:		

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	S	1
6 through 8	48	22
9 through 12	122	36
Comments:		

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five <u>most common</u> efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Y	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
Yes	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
No	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
Yes	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
Yes	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
No	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No	Other Specify 1
No	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	1
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	62
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	13
Parental involvement activities	14
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	17
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	22
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEA District Name Math Proficiency Target Math Percent Proficient/Advanced Literacy Proficiency Target Literacy Percent Proficient/Advanced
0104000 STUTTGART SCHOOL DISTRICT 77.83 69.92 73.23 70.97
0201000 CROSSETT SCHOOL DISTRICT 73.18 62.53 75.12 70.96
0203000 HAMBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT 79.53 74.24 77.42 79.31
0302000 COTTER SCHOOL DISTRICT 91.42 87.29 84.8 84.42
0303000 MOUNTAIN HOME SCHOOL DISTRICT 87.6 83.95 86.38 85.25
0502000 BERGMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT 90.34 90.12 88.14 90.09
0505000 VALLEY SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT 92.58 83.05 90.09 91.04
0602000 WARREN SCHOOL DISTRICT 77.26 68.01 68.38 70.68
0801000 BERRYVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 88.44 80.97 84.64 81.92
0802000 EUREKA SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.99 79.45 83.76 83.05
0901000 DERMOTT SCHOOL DISTRICT 63.3 49.53 59.5 57.95
0903000 LAKESIDE SCHOOL DIST(CHICOT) 69.72 64.75 67.28 71.65
1002000 ARKADELPHIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 81.62 77.36 79.83 76.22
1003000 GURDON SCHOOL DISTRICT 75.48 66.24 77.88 79.73
1101000 CORNING SCHOOL DISTRICT 82.48 81.12 75.58 81.71
1104000 PIGGOTT SCHOOL DISTRICT 82.36 79.81 76.14 79.78
1202000 HEBER SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT 87.26 77.64 82.13 80.38
1305000 CLEVELAND COUNTY SCHOOL DIST. 82.59 79.28 76.24 76.07
1402000 MAGNOLIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 74.02 70.57 69.95 70.16
1507000 SO. CONWAY CO. SCHOOL DISTRICT 86.36 73.25 83.98 79.76
1605000 BUFFALO IS. CENTRAL SCH. DIST. 85.69 82.64 82.35 84.41
1613000 RIVERSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICT 80.24 68.54 80.22 77.44
1702000 CEDARVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 77.04 73.6 73.09 79.1
1703000 MOUNTAINBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT 79.53 73.85 76.61 73.3
1905000 WYNNE SCHOOL DISTRICT 87.48 82.97 77.69 81.12
2002000 FORDYCE SCHOOL DISTRICT 65.64 56.22 65.63 68.9
2104000 DUMAS SCHOOL DISTRICT 72.98 60 68.28 62.4
2105000 MCGEHEE SCHOOL DISTRICT 75.8 66.93 68.48 72.66
2202000 DREW CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 80.94 72.39 77.24 77.15
2203000 MONTICELLO SCHOOL DISTRICT 85.66 77.5 80.6 80.29
2502000 SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT 90.83 86.75 85.73 86.17
2602000 FOUNTAIN LAKE SCHOOL DISTRICT 82.05 84.36 81.48 82.84
2803000 MARMADUKE SCHOOL DISTRICT 76.92 72.49 76.23 78.53
2808000 PARAGOULD SCHOOL DISTRICT 80.71 71.81 77.13 73.56
2903000 HOPE SCHOOL DISTRICT 65.59 57.25 62.33 62.75
3001000 BISMARCK SCHOOL DISTRICT 85.88 82.97 81.47 84.75
3004000 MALVERN SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.87 74.35 76.39 77.65
3105000 NASHVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 82.09 80.24 79.21 80.84
3201000 BATESVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.88 84.92 79.09 82.54
3209000 SOUTHSIDE SCH DIST(INDEPENDENC 87.58 78.71 81.38 80.88
3212000 CEDAR RIDGE SCHOOL DISTRICT 76.98 64.07 78.73 76.19
3302000 MELBOURNE SCHOOL DISTRICT 87.26 85.11 86.21 84.93
3403000 NEWPORT SCHOOL DISTRICT 79.01 80.06 74.72 75.45
3405000 JACKSON CO. SCHOOL DISTRICT 92.78 82.52 82.53 78.12
3601000 CLARKSVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 88.02 79.06 86.08 81.31
3704000 LAFAYETTE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRI 71.28 66.83 59.41 68.71
3804000 HOXIE SCHOOL DISTRICT 85.65 74.13 79.63 82.68
3904000 LEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 56.87 49.17 53.67 51.35
4003000 STAR CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 85.02 71.18 76.23 72.53
4101000 ASHDOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT 76.78 70.59 71.93 69.99
4201000 BOONEVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.69 82.59 81.01 81.69
4203000 PARIS SCHOOL DISTRICT 88.03 79.88 82.89 81.09
4303000 CARLISLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 76.57 70.67 81.04 77.84
4401000 HUNTSVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.13 83.28 80.71 83.65

4501000 FLIPPIN SCHOOL DISTRICT 80.35 76.19 81.56 76.03
4502000 YELLVILLE-SUMMIT SCHOOL DIST. 80.33 75.43 84.25 79.35
4702000 BLYTHEVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 64.83 49 57.22 53.28
4706000 SO. MISS. COUNTY SCHOOL DIST. 74.79 62.23 68.96 73.9
4708000 GOSNELL SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.93 82.07 79.87 80
4713000 OSCEOLA SCHOOL DISTRICT 57.74 52.51 66.64 68.87
4801000 BRINKLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT 73.45 71.78 73.74 73.08
5006000 PRESCOTT SCHOOL DISTRICT 75.57 70.28 78.05 78.62
5102000 JASPER SCHOOL DISTRICT 81.53 80.08 81.79 78.73
5204000 CAMDEN FAIRVIEW SCHOOL DIST. 69.62 60.23 67.86 69.21
5205000 HARMONY GROVE SCH DIST(OUACHIT 79.17 72.68 76.13 74.53
5303000 PERRYVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 82.88 78.37 82.44 80.67
5401000 BARTON-LEXA SCHOOL DISTRICT 74.49 67.25 75.67 72.85
5403000 HELENA/ W.HELENA SCHOOL DIST. 62.38 46.16 64.44 56.05
5502000 CENTERPOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT 86.33 83.48 77.42 79.33
5602000 HARRISBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT 78.11 71.18 76.19 73.19
5608000 EAST POINSETT CO. SCHOOL DIST. 77.47 67.23 71.25 74.12
5703000 MENA SCHOOL DISTRICT 88.58 82.66 84.03 79.44
5706000 OUACHITA RIVER SCHOOL DISTRICT 82.93 78.55 79.11 79.83
5707000 COSSATOT RIVER SCHOOL DIST 80.37 77.33 80.08 80.11
5801000 ATKINS SCHOOL DISTRICT 86.73 77.4 84.18 82.39
5804000 POTTSVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 87.63 84.95 89.93 90.31
6103000 POCAHONTAS SCHOOL DISTRICT 88.36 85.91 82.87 80.86
6201000 FORREST CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 60.26 50.52 55.72 49.23
6401000 WALDRON SCHOOL DISTRICT 74.43 72.6 71.85 72.87
6502000 SEARCY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 91.71 85.79 85.54 84.84
6505000 OZARK MOUNTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICT 80.91 76.84 74.19 76.33
6606000 MANSFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 81.7 72.57 78.01 78.74
6701000 DEQUEEN SCHOOL DISTRICT 86.32 86.79 84 86.62
6703000 HORATIO SCHOOL DISTRICT 80.4 78.85 75.78 82.09
6802000 CAVE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 85.06 79.65 81.53 80.52
6804000 HIGHLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 84.05 73.93 83.78 80.3
6901000 MOUNTAIN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT 84.38 83.02 85.33 83.35
7001000 EL DORADO SCHOOL DISTRICT 79.29 72.12 79.27 77.91
7102000 CLINTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.29 81.19 78.28 81.92
7204000 GREENLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT 77.43 65.97 74.12 74.62
7205000 LINCOLN SCHOOL DISTRICT 78.07 71.88 75.84 75.78
7301000 BALD KNOB SCHOOL DISTRICT 82.28 77.42 78.43 78.21
7302000 BEEBE SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.82 75.44 83.25 81.05
7304000 WHITE CO. CENTRAL SCHOOL DIST. 82.78 74.93 77.98 77.4
7307000 RIVERVIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT 81.23 65.64 81.64 78.65
7309000 PANGBURN SCHOOL DISTRICT 84.43 80.22 86.26 86.93
7310000 ROSE BUD SCHOOL DISTRICT 86.05 74.84 81.68 82.11
7403000 MCCRORY SCHOOL DISTRICT 84.13 83.06 76.43 80.44
7503000 DANVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 83.33 80.4 83.22 78.62
7504000 DARDANELLE SCHOOL DISTRICT 86.43 79.31 82.73 81.72
7510000 TWO RIVERS SCHOOL DISTRICT 78.2 69.92 73.86 65.6

RLIS Statewide BenchMark Results SY 2012-2013
Academic Subject Grade Level Percent Proficient/Advanced
Math 03 85.4%
Math 04 80.7%
Math 05 68.0%
Math 06 73.4%
Math 07 68.4%
Math 08 63.6%
Academic Subject Grade Level Percent Proficient/Advanced
Literacy 03 78.6%
Literacy 04 83.9%
Literacy 05 82.4%
Literacy 06 71.8%
Literacy 07 74.6%
Literacy 08 75.6%
Feb 12, 2014 1 11:27:09 AM

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 2012-13?	Yes
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	19
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)	45	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	2
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		43

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2012 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)	2,059,630.30	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	112,030.60
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		1,947,599.70
Total	2,059,630.30	2,059,630.30
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 2012-13). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	78
Asian or Pacific Islander	81
Asian	88
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	58
Black or African American	78.1
Hispanic or Latino	82
White	87.8
Two or more races	88
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	80.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	81
Economically disadvantaged students	80.3

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/hsrguidance.pdf.

The response is limited to 8,000 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 Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

2.12   ists of Schools and Districts

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

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools[6] under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

---

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

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools [8] under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

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

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools [9] with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

---

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

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessmentWhether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Status for SY 2013-14 (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)[10]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

---

[10] 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 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN034 "List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuse's report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

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

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[11] under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

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

[11] 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.