

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

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

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



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

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

**PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION**

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2015-16 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### **PART I**

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

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

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

### **PART II**

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, unless otherwise noted.

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

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2015-16 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Arizona Department of Education		
Address: 1535 West Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85007		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Shari Zara		
Telephone: 602-364-2347		
Fax: 602-542-5440		
e-mail: shari.zara@azed.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Shari Zara		
		<u>Thursday, March 30, 2017, 4:13:00 PM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART II**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 09, 2017  
5PM EST**

**2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)**

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

**2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs**

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

**2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)**

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	54,154	S	35.9
4	52,809	S	33.8
5	51,921	S	35.8
6	50,277	S	28.1
7	48,504	S	23.3
8	47,736	S	25.2
High School	22,751	S	12.5
Total	328,152	S	29.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	53,868	S	31.1
4	52,633	S	35.1
5	51,765	S	34.5
6	50,052	S	25.9
7	48,202	S	30.2
8	47,674	S	23.5
High School	29,026	S	20.4
Total	333,220	S	29.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

**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	8,110	S	55.0
4	8,071	S	55.1
5	7,793	S	56.5
6	7,558	S	47.8
7	5,138	S	35.6
8	4,891	S	38.9
High School	3,013	S	19.3
Total	44,574	S	47.6

**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	8,075	S	49.9
4	8,052	S	56.4
5	7,766	S	54.1
6	7,559	S	44.9
7	5,112	S	44.5
8	4,870	S	36.2
High School	4,360	S	29.3
Total	45,794	S	46.9

**Comments:**



**2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation**

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

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

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

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	36,406
Limited English proficient students	32,120
Students who are homeless	8,761
Migratory students	2,371
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	12,294
Asian	4,057
Black or African American	19,647
Hispanic or Latino	177,922
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	851
White	65,634
Two or more races	6,886
Total	287,291
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2	0	54	0	8	62
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1	2,904	27	38	2,970
K	1,237	23,955	437	170	25,799
1	1,435	25,281	525	184	27,425
2	1,392	26,914	486	188	28,980
3	1,482	27,111	480	141	29,214
4	1,220	26,018	438	178	27,854
5	1,126	25,468	401	145	27,140
6	1,037	24,039	353	205	25,634
7	641	23,014	287	239	24,181
8	581	22,530	364	298	23,773
9	260	12,056	187	422	12,925
10	259	12,591	122	538	13,510
11	388	11,529	102	498	12,517
12	276	12,467	80	392	13,215
Ungraded	0	77			77
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>11,335</b>	<b>276,008</b>	<b>4,289</b>	<b>3,644</b>	<b>295,276</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

**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.

<b>TAS Instructional Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Mathematics	5,742
Reading/language arts	9,052
Science	499
Social studies	439
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	736
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>TAS Support Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Health, dental, and eye care	1
Supporting guidance/advocacy	0
Other support services	417
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 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	329.36	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	286.81	17.48
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	10.00	
Clerical support staff	23.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	39.00	
<b>Comments:</b> Teacher shortage areas show a large increase in all geographical areas and across all disciplines. This is what is accounting for the decrease in qualified full time staff and administrators. LEAs have had to rely on part time staff and paraprofessionals to fill their needs. Even though the number of paraprofessionals has increased, the number of qualified paraprofessionals has decreased due to many LEAs starting to follow ESSA guidelines for qualifications.		

#### FAQs on staff information

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

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

<sup>2</sup> 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 <sup>3</sup>	3,179.00	79.90
<b>Comments:</b> Teacher shortage areas show a large increase in all geographical areas and across all disciplines. This is what is accounting for the decrease in qualified full time staff and administrators. LEAs have had to rely on part time staff and paraprofessionals to fill their needs. Even though the number of paraprofessionals has increased, the number of qualified paraprofessionals has decreased due to many LEAs starting to follow ESSA guidelines for qualifications.		

<sup>3</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

**2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A**

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2015 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

<b>Parental Involvement Reservation</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000</b>
Number of LEAs*	375	103
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	344,741	2,683,053
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	42,517,403	268,834,557
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.81	1.00

\*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocation.

**In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2015-16.**

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- | Population data of eligible migrant children
- | Academic data of eligible migrant students
- | Data of migrant children served during the performance period
- | School data
- | Project data
- | Personnel data

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period.

#### 2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

**Note:** In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

#### FAQs on Child Count:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2014 - August 31, 2015), youth who are working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

#### 2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	719
K	495
1	529
2	573
3	614
4	636
5	652
6	620
7	674
8	642
9	874

10	909
11	803
12	1,424
Ungraded	440
Out-of-school	83
Total	10,687

**Comments:** The Arizona Migrant Education Program increased 654 students since the last reporting period.

**2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** The Arizona Migrant Education Program increased 654 students since the last reporting period. During the reporting period we began using the electronic Certificate of Eligibility (COE) adding an extra line of accountability. More attention to recruiter data, student move data, use of MSIX and encouragement in recruiting has added to the increase.

**2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	383

**Comments:**



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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	46
K	54
1	81
2	104
3	129
4	125
5	132
6	106
7	132
8	94
9	61
10	82
11	76
12	101
Ungraded	3
Out-of-school	0
Total	1,326
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

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

- | The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- | Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity).
- | Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- | Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- | Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- | Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEStar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility; all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEStar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source. The calculation of eligibility is relatively simple because the COEStar system contains a copy of the actual COE. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; and the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if the child can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEStar data searches and synchronization effectively eliminate this possibility). By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulation, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted. To maintain an audit track, COEs cannot be physically deleted after they are added to COEStar, but COEs determined to be ineligible may be disqualified. TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, Residency dates, Enrollment dates, Withdrawal dates, Departure dates, LEP, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this state during the period.

Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate the child left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began. Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in category 2. Entry of this data means that the State served the child during the summer/intersession term. Additional services information can be added to indicate the nature of services but the summer/ intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service began. COEStar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state, region, county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level, eligible children are counted only once in each eligible category. Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in Schoolwide and TA programs funded by MEP and in both regular and summer/ intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

1. For this year, the specific check is that the birth date must fall in the range 9/2/1992 and 8/31/2012. The program calculates and displays these dates based on the Performance Period.
2. For this year, the QAD must fall in the range 9/1/2015 and 8/31/2016. The program calculates and displays these dates based on the Performance Period.
3. The software specifically looks for encounter dates on children who turn age three during the performance period and ADE also requires that personnel who collect data specifically to follow up on children who turn three to make sure they are still in the state when they turn three. Any children found to not be eligible are marked ineligible for counting.
4. Graduates and HSE attainees are marked with a termination type to indicate graduation or GED/HSE attainment and the date associated with the attainment/ graduation. That date terminates the students eligibility and the program does not count them after that date.

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

TROMIK extracts the EDEN data directly from the data source files that contain COE's, child identification, enrollments and services. The data is formatted into XML files for transmission for EDEN. Excel reports summarizing the data for the SEA and LEA levels are also produced and inspected for quality. 1. The specifications for each ED Facts file are interpreted and coded into the Performance Reporter software that produces the child counts. Each specified data element is tabulated at the SEA, Region, LEA and school level for each child who participates in that element. As might be expected, this requires hundreds or tabulation steps. 2. Each ED Facts file is produced in duplicate from the data derived in step 1, once as an XML file for submission and once as an XLS spreadsheet for inspection. In addition, the program builds a specific table for each file type and produces a spreadsheet showing ED Facts data as counts and percentages for each district and school in the state. Each spreadsheet is inspected for possible areas where data may not have been entered and compared to expected results. If any exceptions are noted, corrections are made and the files are rerun and re-inspected if necessary.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA and Statewide Services use MSIX to verify data. They receive work list items from MSIX, which include near matches, near match validation, initiate merges to validate split, and potential duplicates. SEA, Statewide Services, and TROMIK also review data completeness and data validity.

**2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

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

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	110
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	50
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	50

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All children were determined eligible in the re-interviewing process. The state of Arizona produced a 0% error rate.

Procedures	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	SY 2014-15
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

**FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sampling method used for the Arizona 2014-15 re-interview was not stratified. Instead, a statewide random sampling procedure was used. The State Education Agency (SEA) provided a list of randomly selected students - 50 as the main sample and 60 as the alternate sample to the external agency conducting the re-interview. All the students in the sample were obtained from the total number of students in the state's database meeting the parameter as of the date the sample was drawn, October 13, 2015.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sample selected for the 2014-2015 Arizona re-interview was randomly selected from the state's migrant database. The state's migrant database provider, also an external agency, selected the sample, using the following process: The sample list was randomly selected by TROMIK, the state's migrant database provider. COEStar is the state's database. The data was randomized 4 times. The first random number used either the SAIS ID or the digits in the last four places of the COEStar Id and Sibling number if no SAIS ID was available. That result was multiplied by the number 77. The data selected were students who appear eligible for the 2015 count at this time and who had a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) during the performance period. The result of the first draw was saved and a new random number was generated using the random id created in the first set as a seed. The second draw was then saved. The result of the second draw was used to create a third level random number using the result of the second draw as a seed to the randomizer. The third draw was saved. The third draw was then used to select the first 50 students used in the sample based on the third draw random number. The third draw was then input to another randomizer run using the third draw random number generated to create a fourth set of random keys. The result of this fourth set was saved. The fourth draw was then used to select the second 60 students used in the sample based on the fourth draw random number. Note that there could have been duplicates in the draws but none appeared. The first 50 and second 60 sets were joined with school data, identification data, and enrollment data to produce the output sets in the above two mentioned files. During the re-interview, the interview teams received sample lists divided by districts throughout the state. The lists included both main and alternate students. Re-

interviewers were instructed to ensure that all the students in the main sample were interviewed first. They were asked to make up to three attempts before indicating in the re-interview form that they were unable to find the family. In some instances, the recruiters were able to determine that the family had moved away either because there were new tenants in the residence or it appeared empty. When a main sample was not found, the re-interviewer selected a name from the alternate sample list. Since all the students in the sample were randomly selected and organized by district, the re-interviewer was able to select an alternate from the same area.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 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.

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

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

## 2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

### 2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	27
1	52
2	99
3	69
4	82
5	88
6	65
7	73
8	65
9	91
10	86
11	71
12	99
Ungraded	17
Out-of-school	1
Total	990
<b>Comments:</b> The increase of 259 students is attributed to training and better understanding of who is a PFS Student and an increase in migratory student population.	

#### FAQ on priority for services:

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

**2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2
K	116
1	252
2	257
3	246
4	231
5	235
6	182
7	173
8	135
9	118
10	111
11	88
12	102
Ungraded	13
Out-of-school	4
Total	2,265
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	13
1	24
2	29
3	44
4	42
5	55
6	50
7	42
8	61
9	48
10	32
11	31
12	59
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	
Total	539
<b>Comments:</b>	



**2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2016 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	270
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	327
K	272
1	241
2	257
3	248
4	303
5	316
6	314
7	333
8	342
9	564
10	534
11	432
12	557
Ungraded	125
Out-of-school	68
Total	5,503
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2015-16 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	83
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	145
K	110
1	88
2	106
3	99
4	116
5	136
6	109
7	114
8	121
9	134
10	127
11	95
12	180
Ungraded	55
Out-of-school	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,826</b>

**Comments:** The category lists the number of students who are in the regular school year but also have moved between September 1, 2015 - August 31, 2016. The number of children dropped in this category because the number of students moved before September 1, 2015. A large number of families moved between July and August. Families are moving earlier in the year before the beginning of the school year.

**2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referrals During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	22
K	18
1	27
2	37
3	27
4	38
5	29
6	28
7	31
8	39
9	24
10	21
11	12
12	20
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	
Total	386
<b>Comments:</b> The MEP provided more services to our Migratory students than referred services to other organizations and programs.	

**2.3.2.8 Academic Status**

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

**2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts**

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	12
8	26
9	17
10	21
11	31
12	88
Ungraded	
Total	195

**Comments:** Our LEAs are working diligently in providing access for students to stay in school. The number of students attending these grades has increased and so have the programs available to keep the students in school. The LEAs are working at supporting the students with advocates that work closely with the students and teachers so the students do not become credit deficient and leave school.

**FAQ on Dropouts:**

*How is "drop outs" defined?* The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2015-16 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

**2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)**

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

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	S
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

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

Do not include:

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

#### FAQ on Services:

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

#### 2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	21
1	44
2	72
3	57
4	58
5	70
6	50
7	56
8	55
9	81
10	78
11	62
12	92
Ungraded	13
Out-of-school	1
Total	815

**Comments:** Data has been verified. The increase is due to the increased number of students identified for the Migrant Education Program; intense training conducted by the SEA regarding PFS; and LEA better understanding and identification of PFS.

**2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	1
1	3
2	0
3	1
4	0
5	1
6	0
7	0
8	3
9	4
10	2
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	15

**Comments:** In keeping with the Service Delivery Plan LEAs reached out to PFS students who were not traveling to attend Summer/Intersession.

**2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	160
K	234
1	301
2	338
3	385
4	401
5	426
6	376
7	418
8	413
9	453
10	721
11	629
12	1,203
Ungraded	99
Out-of-school	6
Total	6,563
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	22
1	44
2	74
3	59
4	62
5	73
6	51
7	59
8	59
9	83
10	79
11	64
12	92
Ungraded	13
Out-of-school	1
Total	840

**Comments:** Data has been verified. The increase is due to the increased number of students identified for the Migrant Education Program; intense training conducted by the SEA regarding PFS; and LEA better understanding and identification of PFS.



**2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period**

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

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

**Comments:** The difference in the reporting from last year to this year is one student. Continuation of services was provided since there was no other program providing the needed services to these students.

**2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41
K	68
1	117
2	185
3	219
4	210
5	217
6	209
7	243
8	189
9	164
10	50
11	77
12	210
Ungraded	35
Out-of-school	2
Total	2,236
<b>Comments:</b> Data has been verified and is correct.	

**2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2			////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	41	41	////////////////////////////////////
K	66	59	////////////////////////////////////
1	115	88	////////////////////////////////////
2	174	117	////////////////////////////////////
3	213	157	////////////////////////////////////
4	202	145	////////////////////////////////////
5	208	157	////////////////////////////////////
6	202	154	////////////////////////////////////
7	231	184	////////////////////////////////////
8	170	162	////////////////////////////////////
9	114	116	27
10	11	15	33
11	5	12	71
12	4	37	201
Ungraded	1	3	34
Out-of-school	1	2	1
Total	1,758	1,449	367

**Comments:** The high school that serves our largest Migratory student population uses the Cambridge Program and the students are only able to take certain classes through credit accrual.

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2		0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	155	0
K	217	0
1	270	0
2	290	1
3	324	0
4	346	0
5	361	1
6	311	0
7	349	0
8	350	0
9	401	0
10	715	0
11	617	0
12	1,188	0
Ungraded	85	0
Out-of-school	5	0
Total	5,984	2
<b>Comments:</b> While the data field shows blank, Age Birth through 2 column should be zero. Data for grade 10 has been verified and is correct.		

#### FAQs on Support Services:

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

**2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year**

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

**2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year**

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

<b>Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	211
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	8,210
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>Schools</b>	<b>#</b>
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
<b>Comments:</b> The Arizona MEP does not consolidate funds in Schoolwide Programs.	

### 2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

Also, provide the number of migrant children **served** in the projects. Since children may receive services in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	5	861
Regular school year - school day/extended day	3	291
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	19	7,823
<b>Comments:</b> The number of MEP projects has not changed. The increase in students is noted in the number of Migratory students served by our projects.		

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

**2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data**

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

**2.3.8.1 MEP State Director**

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

<b>State Director FTE</b>	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQs on the MEP State director**

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

**2.3.8.2 MEP Staff**

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	39	23.10	108	89.06	147
Counselors	1	1.00	0	0.00	1
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
Qualified paraprofessionals	38	20.62	48	30.90	86
Recruiters	20	13.97	11	8.09	31
Records transfer staff	47	36.68	17	11.08	64
Administrators	16	10.74	14	7.89	30
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

**FAQs on MEP staff:**

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



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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

**2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	13	15
Juvenile corrections	1	262
Adult corrections	9	365
Other	0	0
Total	23	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

**FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:**

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

**2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1**

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	13
Juvenile corrections	1
Adult corrections	9
Other	0
Total	23
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1**

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served		3,005	378	1,012	
Total Long Term Students Served		1,808	316	1,012	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )		507	106	267	
LEP Students		0	12	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		248	20	43	
Asian		18	1	16	
Black or African American		398	37	207	
Hispanic or Latino		1,299	158	378	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	
White		1,038	109	355	
Two or more races		4	53	13	
Total		3,005	378	1,012	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		1,517	340	899	
Female		1,488	38	113	
Total		3,005	378	1,012	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		0	0	0	
6		0	0	0	
7		0	0	0	
8		0	0	0	
9		0	0	0	
10		5	0	0	
11		11	0	0	
12		46	0	0	
13		119	0	0	
14		328	10	0	
15		560	45	3	
16		794	130	8	
17		1,142	193	45	
18		0	0	97	
19		0	0	236	
20		0	0	295	
21		0	0	328	
Total		3,005	378	1,012	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1**

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.		3,005	234	0	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

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

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

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

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

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

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit			683		S					
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED			114	S	69	S				
Obtained high school diploma			S	27	62	S				
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits			1,187	S	161	S				
Enrolled in a GED program			114	S	S	S				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			S	13	S	S				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			S	4	86	S				
Obtained employment										

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

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

**2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1**

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		21	98	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		40	96	5	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		137	34	50	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		177	78	18	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1**

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		38	100	10	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		27	60	9	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		120	29	36	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		106	92	18	
<b>Comments:</b>					

**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	15	117
Neglected programs	2	95
Juvenile detention	4	57
Juvenile corrections	2	61
Other	0	0
Total	23	////////////////////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

**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	15
Neglected programs	2
Juvenile detention	4
Juvenile corrections	2
Other	0
Total	23
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2**

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,428	67	96	84	
Total Long Term Students Served	1,063	0	26	84	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	430	8	25	19	
LEP Students	80	0	0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	222	57	34	8	
Asian	7	0	0	1	
Black or African American	111	2	1	19	
Hispanic or Latino	570	3	9	11	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	7	0	0	0	
White	409	2	8	32	
Two or more races	89	3	10	13	
Total	1,415	67	62	84	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	736	31	46	0	
Female	689	36	16	84	
Total	1,425	67	62	84	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	4	0	0	0	
6	27	0	0	0	
7	26	0	4	0	
8	36	0	2	0	
9	27	0	2	0	
10	42	0	5	0	
11	68	0	4	0	
12	100	0	1	0	
13	134	0	4	2	
14	164	13	9	7	
15	184	18	12	21	
16	192	16	11	30	
17	211	10	8	22	
18	133	10	0	2	
19	50	0	0	0	
20	16	0	0	0	
21	6	0	0	0	
Total	1,420	67	62	84	

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

The reason of this increase is a change in how youth are counted in response to federal monitoring. The numbers are self-reported by the districts and they are unverifiable. As some districts reported the length of stay in the facility, it will affect the testing numbers yet we cannot verify the length of stay. Also, due to confidentiality the facilities will report numbers but not breakdowns of gender, age, etc. to the districts.

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.



**2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2**

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

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	366	3	39	17	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Arizona is unable to verify the data that has been self reported as on the completion reports. Due to confidentiality the facilities will report numbers but not breakdowns of gender, age, etc. to the districts. Lastly, the staff responsible for collection and analysis of data has retired and officially no one has replaced his role.

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

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

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

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

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

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

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student), only after exit	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit	562		16		55		43			
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned a GED	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Obtained high school diploma	12	S	S	S	S	S	6	S		
Obtained employment	67	50	S	S	S	S	7	4		
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned high school course credits	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in a GED program	391	265	11	S	30	S	S	36		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	23	13	S	S	S	S	14	6		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	14	20	S	S	S	S	S	5		
Obtained employment	9	26	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Obtained employment	15	40	S	S	S	7	S	19		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

**2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2**

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

**2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2**

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	57	9	0	17	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	171	6	10	23	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	289	4	S	19	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	118	0	0	25	
<b>Comments:</b> The numbers are self-reported by the districts but they are unverifiable. As some districts reported, the length of stay in the facility will affect the testing numbers however we cannot verify the length of stay. Also, due to confidentiality the facilities will report numbers but not breakdowns of gender, age, etc. to the districts.					

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

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

**2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2**

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	85	24	18	13	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	175	7	6	21	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	264	5	7	40	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	66	S	S	10	
<b>Comments:</b> The numbers are self-reported by the districts but they are unverifiable. As some districts reported, the length of stay in the facility will affect the testing numbers however we cannot verify the length of stay. Also, due to confidentiality the facilities will report numbers but not breakdowns of gender, age, etc. to the districts.					

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Purpose</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	6
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	13
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	14
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	12
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	4
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

The following list includes the name of each LEA participating in the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) program for the 2015-2016 school year, and their results on the AzMERIT English Language Arts (ELA) and Math (percentage of LEA students scoring at "Proficient" or above).

1. Academy of Mathematics and Science South, Inc.: ELA increased from 24% to 29%. Math increased from 26% to 22%.
2. Altar Valley Elementary District: ELA increased from 19% to 27%. Math increased from 21% to 31%.
3. Baboquivari Unified School District #40: ELA increased from 7% to 12%. Math increased from 8% to 17%.
4. Blue Ridge Unified School District No. 32: ELA showed no growth from 36% to 36%. Math decreased from 40% to 39%.
5. Camp Verde Unified District: ELA increased from 19% to 27%. Math showed no growth from 22% to 22%.
6. Career Development, Inc.: ELA decreased from 10% to 9%. Math increased from 7% to 22%.
7. Destiny School, Inc.: ELA increased from 43% to 46%. Math decreased from 57% to 56%.
8. Douglas Unified District: ELA increased from 23% to 24%. Math increased from 21% to 23%.
9. Edkey, Inc. - Sequoia Village School: ELA increased from 17% to 25%. Math increased from 20% to 24%.
10. Founding Fathers Academies, Inc: ELA increased from 6% to 19%. Math decreased from 13% to 9%.
11. Gila County Regional School District: ELA increased from 5% to 50%. Math increased from 0% to 50%.
12. Globe Unified District: ELA increased from 12% to 20%. Math increased from 16% to 22%.
13. Holbrook Unified District: ELA increased from 20% to 23%. Math increased from 16% to 22%.
14. Imagine Coolidge Elementary, Inc.: ELA increased from 25% to 33%. Math increased from 33% to 41%.
15. Kayenta Unified School District #27: ELA increased from 11% to 12%. Math increased from 12% to 13%.
16. Mammoth-San Manuel Unified District: ELA increased from 24% to 25%. Math increased from 19% to 21%.
17. Mexicayotl Academy, Inc.: ELA increased from 24% to 36%. Math increased from 50% to 53%.
18. Miami Unified District: ELA increased from 12% to 7%. Math increased from 17% to 8%.
19. Nadaburg Unified School District: ELA increased from 7% to 21%. Math decreased from 26% to 23%.
20. Nogales Unified District: ELA increased from 24% to 29%. Math increased from 27% to 28%.
21. Palominas Elementary District: ELA increased from 40% to 51%. Math increased from 45% to 51%.
22. Parker Unified School District: ELA increased from 16% to 19%. Math increased from 21% to 24%.
23. Payson Unified District: ELA increased from 29% to 31%. Math increased from 29% to 30%.
24. Pinon Unified District: ELA increased from 10% to 12%. Math increased from 17% to 18%.
25. Quartzsite Elementary District: ELA increased from 27% to 32%. Math increased from 16% to 25%.
26. Saddle Mountain Unified School District: ELA increased from 20% to 29%. Math increased from 32% to 38%.
27. San Carlos Unified District: ELA increased from 2% to 5%. Math increased from 6% to 8%.
28. Santa Cruz Valley Unified District: ELA increased from 26% to 28%. Math decreased from 30% to 29%.
29. Snowflake Unified District: ELA increased from 46% to 47%. Math showed no growth from 52% to 52%.
30. Tombstone Unified District: ELA increased from 27% to 28%. Math increased from 25% to 28%.
31. Triumphant Learning Center: ELA decreased from 35% to 33%. Math increased from 25% to 29%.
32. Whiteriver Unified District: ELA increased from 7% to 10%. Math increased from 10% to 12%.
33. Wickenburg Unified District: ELA decreased from 30% to 28%. Math decreased from 36% to 30%.
34. Window Rock Unified District: ELA increased from 11% to 15%. Math increased from 9% to 10%.
35. Winslow Unified District: ELA showed no growth from 19% to 19%. Math increased from 22% to 24%.

**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.

<b>State Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2015-16?	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds**

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

<b>LEA Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	22
<b>Comments:</b>	

**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.

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	22	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		22

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2015 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	128,600.60	128,600.60
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		0.00
Total	128,600.60	128,600.60
<b>Comments:</b>		

*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**<sup>4</sup>

This section collects graduation rates.

**2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2015-16). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	81,084	S	79.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,012	S	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,563	S	89
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	4,632	S	75.5
Hispanic or Latino	34,486	S	76.4
White	33,638	S	84.0
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,878	S	69.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,188	S	32
Economically disadvantaged students	31,340	S	76.7

**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 500 characters.

The majority of English Language Learners in Arizona are concentrated in the lower grades (K-8). A graduation cohort of 1.5% for ELs is reflective of lower number of ELs enrolled in high school.

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

## 2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

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

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

### 2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

#### 2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools<sup>5</sup> under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

**Comments:** 16 schools exited, so those don't get reported as priority or focus. 9 schools closed, plus Career Development Charter in Winslow closed at the beginning of this school year. Sanders Elementary was inadvertently omitted from the list.

<sup>5</sup> The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>



## 2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

### 2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>6</sup>
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

**Comments:** P/F are the only schools "in improvement".

<sup>6</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States****2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses**

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District name
- | District NCES ID code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- | State-specific status for SY 2016-17 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct . The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:** No longer exists

## 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<sup>7</sup> under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Improvement status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

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

**Comments:** No longer exists

<sup>7</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.