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:

ɭ   **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.

ɭ   **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.

ɭ   **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

ɭ   **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

	OMB Number: 1810-0724
	Expiration Date: 5/31/2018

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
    ___Part I, 2015-16   __X__Part II, 2015-16

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Idaho State Board of Education

Address:
650 W. State Street, Room 307
Boise, ID 83702

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Alison Henken

Telephone: 208-332-1579

Fax: 208-334-2632

e-mail: alison.henken@osbe.idaho.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Idaho State Board of Education

	Tuesday, May 9, 2017, 10:03:15 AM
Signature	Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16

☒

PART II DUE FEBRUARY 09, 2017
5PM EST

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	15,178	S	48.6
4	14,728	S	42.2
5	14,478	S	35.4
6	10,116	S	33.0
7	6,994	S	33.6
8	7,009	S	31.5
High School	3,059	S	21.2
Total	71,562	S	38.1
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	15,164	S	45.6
4	14,717	S	45.3
5	14,476	S	49.4
6	10,115	S	42.7
7	6,996	S	45.9
8	7,013	S	48.7
High School	3,056	S	54.5
Total	71,537	S	46.6
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	3,181	S	51.0
4	3,125	S	48.1
5	3,422	S	38.1
6	3,016	S	42.9
7	2,736	S	44
8	2,708	S	38
High School	1,174	S	28
Total	19,362	S	42.7
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	3,172	S	50.9
4	3,128	S	51.5
5	3,417	S	54.4
6	3,019	S	53.7
7	2,739	S	55
8	2,707	S	54
High School	1,182	S	64
Total	19,364	S	53.8
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	19,735
Limited English proficient students	10,849
Students who are homeless	5,165
Migratory students	3,166
Comments: Based on LEA needs assessments, some LEAs chose to add targeted assistance schools in 2015-2016. Eligible targeted assistance schools are encouraged to consider transitioning to schoolwide programs. Based on LEA needs assessments, some targeted assistance schools moved to schoolwide programs in 2015-2016. More migrant students were identified in the state as migrant students. Therefore, more migrant students were identified as being served in Title I-A programs.	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,344
Asian	1,272
Black or African American	1,587
Hispanic or Latino	36,177
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	452
White	107,319
Two or more races	3,456
Total	152,607
Comments: Based on LEA needs assessments, some LEAs chose to add targeted assistance schools in 2015-2016. Eligible targeted assistance schools are encouraged to consider transitioning to schoolwide programs. Based on LEA needs assessments, some targeted assistance schools moved to schoolwide programs in 2015-2016, resulting in more Black or African American students and more students of two or more races being served in Title I-A programs.	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	94	0	0	94
K	901	15,784	46	0	16,731
1	977	16,546	48	1	17,572
2	1,004	16,806	39	1	17,850
3	965	16,768	30	2	17,765
4	854	16,253	21	4	17,132
5	929	15,998	20	5	16,952
6	747	11,304	4	6	12,061
7	517	8,064	0	8	8,589
8	457	8,104	0	11	8,572
9	344	4,331	0	29	4,704
10	274	3,736	0	12	4,022
11	257	3,696	0	12	3,965
12	311	3,776	0	0	4,087
Ungraded	0	0	0	25	25
TOTALS	8,537	141,260	208	116	150,121

Comments:

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

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

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

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

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	4,071
Reading/language arts	7,311
Science	349
Social studies	267
Vocational/career	281
Other instructional services	431
Comments: The increased numbers in mathematics, vocational, and other instruction areas represent more students in Targeted Assistance programs, with more focus on those subject areas. The decreased numbers in science and social studies represent less direct focus on those subject areas in Targeted Assistance programs.	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	360
Supporting guidance/advocacy	335
Other support services	539
Comments: Data indicates that Targeted Assistance are receiving more health services, but less advocacy and other support services, in addition to their academic support services, than during the previous year.	

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	60.10	
Paraprofessionals[1]	124.76	97.70
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	16.16	
Clerical support staff	3.24	
Administrators (non-clerical)	12.55	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

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

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

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

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	1,159.07	99.32
Comments: Data indicates that since there are more students and schools being served by Schoolwide Programs, there are more paraprofessionals in Schoolwide Programs.		

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

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

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of $500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than $500,000
Number of LEAs[*]	129	25
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	68,761	421,033
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	15,310,892	38,302,783
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvment	0.45	1.10

*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.

Examples of parent involvement activities include: math activities to assist parents with grade-specific math standards and strategies; activities to encourage parents to read with their children to support their children in developing reading fluency and comprehension; and STEM activities to demonstrate science, technology, and math connections using grade-specific academic standards.

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 underlined statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 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)	405
K	277
1	299
2	324
3	310
4	340
5	288
6	311
7	256
8	246
9	267

10	234
11	204
12	266
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	258
Total	4,285

Comments: Increasing the accuracy of Idaho data has been a high priority. In extensive data analysis, it was determined that migrant preschool children and Out-of-School Youth (OSY) had previously been added without an ethnicity tag. This process was corrected a few months ago, but students entered before that time did not show in our total count. Over 600 children were updated with ethnicity information from the COE and now are included in Idaho data. This has an impact on preschool and OSY, but also other grade levels, as some of these children are now in school. Furthermore, meetings between the Migrant Coordinator and information technology staff have clarified the definition of Out-of-School Youth (OSY) so that all children that should be included are included. Finally, training with an emphasis on recruiting in the last year has resulted in more students being identified for migrant programs. The problem with more students having a valid assessment score in CSPR Part I than there are migrant students in grades 6-8 will be corrected during the CSPR Part re-open period. One district had data entry problems which have since been corrected.

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: Increasing the accuracy of Idaho data has been a high priority. In extensive data analysis, it was determined that migrant preschool children and Out-of-School Youth (OSY) had previously been added without an ethnicity tag. This process was corrected a few months ago, but students entered before that time did not show in our total count. Over 600 children were updated with ethnicity information from the COE and now are included in Idaho data. This has an impact on preschool and OSY, but also other grade levels, as some of these children are now in school. Furthermore, meetings between the Migrant Coordinator and information technology staff have clarified the definition of Out-of-School Youth (OSY) so that all children that should be included are included. Finally, training with an emphasis on recruiting in the last year has resulted in more students being identified for migrant programs. The problem with more students having a valid assessment score in CSPR Part I than there are migrant students in grades 6-8 will be corrected during the CSPR Part re-open period. One district had data entry problems which have since been corrected.

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	319

Comments: The corrected problem with missing ethnicity tags mentioned above affected preschool and OSY more than other grade levels, resulting in the significant increase in birth through 2 years old.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **<u>served</u>** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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 <u>only</u> 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)	125
K	96
1	140
2	140
3	133
4	147
5	132
6	121
7	87
8	39
9	37
10	18
11	7
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
Total	1,240
Comments:	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: SEA efforts to increase LEA participation in summer school were successful in 2016 (as in 2015). Two additional school districts offered summer school in summer 2016. Other districts expanded the grades levels being served, especially preschool and secondary grades. Increased recruiting for summer school was a result of ongoing efforts to improve student participation.

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 <u>not</u> include:

- Children who received <u>only</u> referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	6
Comments:	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	No
MIS 2000	No
COEStar	No
MAPS	No
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	Yes
The Idaho Migrant Student Information system (MSIS)is a computerized database system that stores, maintains and transfers educational and health information for migrant students, for the Migrant Education Program (MEP). Authorized users have access to migrant student demographics, movement and enrollment details, secondary grades and credits, current provided services, assessment scores, and health information, including immunizations. MSIS data sets are maintained in a format to allow uploads to MSIX (Migrant Student Information Exchange).	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.3 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 <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u>.
- Children 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.

Idaho has a three-step verification process for initial eligibility determination. First, migrant family liaisons or recruiters at an LOA identify a qualifying family on a certificate of eligibility. Then, one of six regional ID&R coordinators reviews and enters the family's eligibility and movement information into a statewide migrant tracking system, Migrant Student Information System (MSIS). The state program specialist further reviews the information entered into MSIS for final eligibility determination.

Once the state program specialist approves the certificate of eligibility, LOA staff collects and enters other information into MSIS, including services, PFS status, continuation of services information, health information, summer school participation, residency verification dates and graduation/GED dates. LOA staff continues to monitor and update the information throughout the year with assistance from the regional ID&R coordinators. The state MEP coordinator also monitors MSIS throughout the year using built-in reports.

The state MEP coordinator works closely with IT personnel to ensure that the information housed in MSIS is appropriately transmitted into EDFacts files. The state MEP coordinator verifies every EDFacts file for accuracy before submission, including unduplicated count of eligible migrant children that are from 3 to 21 for at least one day during the performance period, have not received a diploma or GED and have a valid residency verification date. Specifically, Idaho uses the following procedures and processes at the State level to ensure all eligible children are accurately counted in the performance period.

The unduplicated count of migrant students 3-21 is taken from MSIS. The query is based on the following information: the Idaho unique identification number is only included once; eligible migrant child is from 3 to 21 for at least one day during the performance period; the child has not received a diploma or GED; and the child has a valid residency verification date between the first and last day of the performance period.

The count only includes children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three. The query ensures that any three-year-old child was already three at the time of the residency verification check by comparing the child's birthdate field to the residency verification date field. For three-year-olds, only children whose residency verification date is on or after the date of birth are included in the 3-21 count. Per OME direction for 2014-2015 data, any child whose residency verification was before the 3rd birthday is included in the 0-2 count, even if the child turned three during the performance period.

The count only includes children who met the program eligibility criteria (within 3 years of QAD). The query is designed to compare the Qualifying Arrival Date field to three years prior to the year begin date for the current performance period. If a child's qualifying arrival date recorded in MSIS is before the date that is three years prior to the beginning of the reporting performance period, the child is excluded from the count.

The count only includes children who were resident in Idaho for at least 1 day during the performance period. The residency verification date is collected annually for each child and is entered into MSIS by LOA staff. Migrant family liaisons in each LOA visit each migrant family every year either in person or by telephone to verify the family's address for each child. This visit is also used as an opportunity to check for child and family referral needs and possible summer moves.

The count only includes 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. All LOAs offering a MEP-funded summer school program are required to identify the children who were served for one or more days in MSIS. LOAs are also required to track and maintain detailed information on attendance onsite.

The count only includes children once per age/grade level for each child count category. The query is designed to count each Idaho unique student identification number only once. For children not enrolled in school, age is calculated using the child's date of birth. For children enrolled in school, the highest grade level attained during the performance period is taken from the state's longitudinal database. Because all Idaho migrant districts begin their school year before September 1st the grade will be the new entered grade in the fall. .

The count only includes children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education. Once a student obtains a high school diploma or equivalent, LOA staff is required to enter the date on which the student completed public education into MSIS. If the date of completion is prior to the beginning of the performance period, the student is excluded from the count.

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)?

Idaho uses a purchased software that other states also use to create EdFacts files to ensure the accuracy of the counts. In addition, IT management and the Idaho MEP Coordinator verified the accuracy of each query used to generate reports for SY 2015-16. Finally, every table is carefully reviewed by the state MEP Coordinator for accuracy before being submitted.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

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

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	103
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	90
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	90

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Some families selected randomly for re-interviewing were not able to be contacted. Some had moved, while others did not respond to request for re-interviewing.

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 2013-14

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

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.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Independent re-interviews will be conducted during 2016-2017.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As part of the MEPs Quality Control Process, LEAs conduct rolling re-interviews throughout the year with due dates of November, February and April. Each district creates a randomized list of migrant children whose COE was approved during the current performance period. Nearby LEAs coordinate efforts and re-interview each other's children. Using this process, LEAs selected 103 children to re-interview. Of those, 90 re-interviews were completed. 100% were found to be eligible. The remaining 13 re-interviews were not able to be completed as the family had moved or was otherwise unavailable.

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	34
K	37
1	110
2	93
3	91
4	118
5	90
6	88
7	73
8	78
9	88
10	74
11	58
12	59
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	14
Total	1,105
Comments: Extensive training has been provided to LEAs over the last year to ensure that migrant staff know how to properly determine Priority for Services (PFS). In addition, new reports that track migrant students and assessments have made the process easier. Finally, Idaho has implemented WIDA's ACCESS 2.0 language assessment for English Learners and Idaho has seen lower test scores than with the previous assessment (IELA). All three reason have contributed to a higher number of PFS students being identified and reported. The number of ungraded students is 0. PFS is none. This is due to EdFacts file specifications. The two should both be 0.	

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	196
1	225
2	195
3	179
4	174
5	138
6	138
7	99
8	105
9	109
10	87
11	72
12	48
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1,765
Comments: As mentioned in 2.3.2.1, Idaho has implemented WIDA's ACCESS 2.0 assessment for English Learners. The number of students reaching proficiency was dramatically reduced in 2015-2016. Therefore, the number of English Learners exiting the program was also significantly reduced.	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities *(IDEA)*

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities *(IDEA)* During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27
K	24
1	25
2	25
3	32
4	37
5	38
6	40
7	26
8	18
9	25
10	24
11	21
12	20
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	385
Comments:	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

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

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	167
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	173
K	92
1	119
2	120
3	103
4	124
5	90
6	116
7	91
8	77
9	97
10	73
11	66
12	60
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	109
Total	1,677

Comments: Two factors contributed to the increase. The number of students previously unreported due to missing ethnicity tags means that the 2014-2015 numbers were too low. In addition, during 2015-2016 the emphasis of training was on Identification and Recruitment. This effort was directed at Family Liaisons who were encouraged do more community based recruiting, in addition to school based recruiting and to LEA migrant directors to ensure that liaisons received adequate support to do this recruiting.

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	131
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	139
K	77
1	88
2	91
3	89
4	100
5	76
6	97
7	72
8	64
9	84
10	59
11	48
12	57
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	67
Total	1,339

Comments: Two factors contributed to the increase. The number of students previously unreported due to missing ethnicity tags means that the 2014-2015 numbers were too low. In addition, during 2015-2016 the emphasis of training was on Identification and Recruitment. This effort was directed at Family Liaisons who were encouraged do more community based recruiting in addition to school based recruiting and to LEA migrant directors to ensure that liaisons received adequate support to do this recruiting.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	77
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	175
K	144
1	147
2	165
3	156
4	173
5	150
6	148
7	121
8	124
9	110
10	107
11	93
12	121
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	52
Total	2,063

Comments: 2015-2016 was the second year that districts reported services and referrals directly into MSIS without sending it to a central site for data entry. It was due to the concern that not all services and referrals were being submitted or entered that prompted the change. During 2014-2015, districts did not have long to learn the system before the data was due. This is the second year and the data is more accurate than it was in the past. We believe that ongoing training has contributed to higher accuracy as well.

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	S
8	S
9	9
10	12
11	8
12	6
Ungraded	
Total	44
Comments:	

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

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total <u>unduplicated</u> 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	
Comments: The Idaho MEP does not collect this information.	

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 <u>not</u> include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds <u>were</u> 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 <u>not</u> considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would <u>not</u> 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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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)	20
K	24
1	87
2	72
3	65
4	78
5	76
6	61
7	57
8	63
9	67
10	62
11	50
12	44
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	10
Total	836

Comments: Extensive training has been provided to LEAs over the last year to ensure that migrant staff know how to properly determine PFS. In addition, new reports that track migrant students and assessments have made the process easier. Finally, Idaho has implemented WIDA's ACCESS 2.0 language assessment for English Learners and Idaho has seen lower test scores than with the previous assessment (IELA). All three of these situations have contributed to a higher number of PFS students being identified and reported.

The number of ungraded students in the Idaho MEP is 0. Any tables that refer separate totals based on Age/grade should show this field to be 0. Unfortunately some EdFacts file specifications leave it blank, which appears to confuse the computer.

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12
K	15
1	50
2	39
3	31
4	56
5	30
6	33
7	28
8	15
9	20
10	8
11	4
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	343

Comments: The number of students identified as Priority for Services (PFS) during the summer term increased because the number of students participating in summer school increased. The increase in summer PFS (36%) is higher than the increase in overall summer participation (24%) because PFS students were specifically recruited to participate in summer school in an attempt to serve PFS students "first" and to help them fill in learning gaps.

The number of ungraded students in the Idaho MEP is 0. Any tables that refer separate totals based on Age/grade should show this field to be 0. Unfortunately some EdFacts file specifications leave it blank, which appears to confuse the computer.

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	91
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	198
K	150
1	211
2	221
3	207
4	229
5	200
6	190
7	174
8	164
9	174
10	167
11	134
12	187
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	72
Total	2,769
Comments:	

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	30
K	30
1	94
2	74
3	70
4	88
5	79
6	64
7	62
8	63
9	68
10	62
11	51
12	44
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	10
Total	889

Comments: Based on Idaho's increased emphasis on both accurate reporting and the importance of offering summer school, we saw an increase in services provided (and reported) in general and an increase of services provided through summer school that explain why the number of PFS students receiving services has also increased. 1st and 4th grades may have proportionately higher services, but nearly all grades saw significant increases.

The number of ungraded students in the Idaho MEP is 0. Any tables that refer separate totals based on Age/grade should show this field to be 0. Unfortunately, some EdFacts file specifications leave it blank, which appears to confuse the computer.

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	7
1	6
2	13
3	11
4	11
5	11
6	13
7	9
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	5
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	136

Comments: In the past districts reported which level of continuation was being given to the student (1, 2, or 3), but the information in MSIS was tied to that school year and did not carry over into the upcoming year. This resulted in under-reporting for students whose eligibility should have extended into a following performance period(s). This has been corrected in MSIS so that districts put in the level and the end-date for continuation of services. This allows us to track continuation for more than one year.

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	13
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	127
K	103
1	152
2	157
3	143
4	162
5	133
6	129
7	103
8	87
9	89
10	68
11	56
12	71
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	9
Total	1,602

Comments: The increase in instructional services reported has come about for several reasons. 2015-2016 was the second year that districts reported services and referrals directly into MSIS without sending it to a central site for data entry. It was due to the concern that not all services and referrals were being submitted or entered that prompted the change. During 2014-2015, districts did not have long to learn the system before the data was due. This is the second year and the data is more accurate than it was in the past. Ongoing training using Non-regulatory guidance and OME Q&A materials has clarified which services qualify for reporting. Participating in the Preschool Initiative Consortium and additional summer school programs have both contributed to increasing services for preschool and other students. Finally, in 2014-2015 the LEA migrant staff marked summer school attendance for each student who attended summer school, but did not mark instructional services or support services provided during the summer. This year LEAs were instructed to report these services if they were provided during the regular year or summer session.

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	5	5	///
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	112	112	///
K	90	90	///
1	125	124	///
2	133	127	///
3	112	109	///
4	136	133	///
5	106	105	///
6	106	102	///
7	76	72	///
8	58	57	///
9	51	48	2
10	21	23	12
11	23	18	8
12	18	17	8
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	5	5	
Total	1,177	1,147	30

Comments: The increase in services during the performance period reflects that LEAs accurately reported instructional services from the regular year AND summer school. The numbers this year include instructional services provided to a migrant child at any point during the year. Finally, in 2014-2015 the LEA migrant staff marked summer school attendance for each student who attended summer school, but did not mark instructional services or support services provided during the summer. This year LEAs were instructed to report these services if they were provided during the regular year or summer session.

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 <u>unduplicated</u> number of **eligible** migrant children who received <u>any</u> MEP-funded support service during the performace period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> 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	85	37
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	172	66
K	137	51
1	197	74
2	198	67
3	181	57
4	201	69
5	169	48
6	166	54
7	171	66
8	161	71
9	171	70
10	158	83
11	128	68
12	178	93
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	71	24
Total	2,544	998

Comments: In Idaho, more LEAs now have Graduation Specialists who provide mentoring and advocacy and college and career readiness counseling at the high school level. Some LEAs also have mentors at younger grades. As in other cases, training using Non-Regulatory Guidance and OME Q&A information has resulting in more accurate reporting. Finally, as in other cases, LEAs are much more comfortable entering their services directly into MSIS for the second year.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

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

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

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

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	325
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,896
Comments:	

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

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: MEP funds are not combined into schoolwide programs (SWPs) in Idaho.	

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	20	551
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	23	2,651
Comments: Last year was the coordinator's first year with CSPR and it appears that the count reported for 2014-15 was the number ELIGIBLE by program type, NOT the number SERVED, despite the bolding that should have made it clear. This number reflects the total number of students served in each project.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	0.50
Comments: In 2014-2015 there was a migrant coordinator who also acted as director. Now there is a director 1/2 time and a full FTE migrant coordinator at the SEA. So the amount of time spent on migrant has increased significantly. The SEA migrant coordinator and records transfer clerk are added to the staff reported below.	

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 <u>funded by the MEP</u>. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	11	3.40	100	88.70	111
Counselors	0	0.00	1	1.00	1
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	2	0.67	1	0.50	3
Qualified paraprofessionals	42	23.57	53	50.45	95
Recruiters	51	34.76	19	11.44	70
Records transfer staff	4	1.80	9	8.00	13
Administrators	13	3.72	11	10.50	24
Comments:					

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

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

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

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

e. *Who is a 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 <u>not</u> be included.

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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	1	365
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	0	0
Total	2	///////////////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:
How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	1
Adult corrections	1
Other	0
Total	2
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			338	619	
Total Long Term Students Served			274	413	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (*IDEA*)			149	85	
LEP Students			0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			10	7	
Asian			2	2	
Black or African American			11	6	
Hispanic or Latino			84	40	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			2	0	
White			225	462	
Two or more races			4	102	
Total			338	619	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			283	535	
Female			55	84	
Total			338	619	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0	0	
6			0	0	
7			0	0	
8			0	0	
9			0	0	
10			0	0	
11			0	0	
12			2	0	
13			14	0	
14			31	0	
15			45	0	
16			81	1	
17			88	2	
18			58	30	
19			14	112	
20			5	192	
21			0	282	
Total			338	619	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Data represents accurate numbers reported by the State Institution.

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

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

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

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

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			338	401	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Subpart 1- The Idaho Department of Corrections (IDOC) is not able to report outcomes on all offenders after their release. If the students release to
probation and parole, their employment, etc is documented in notes made in the department database.

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 underlined 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 underlined 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 underlined 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 underlined number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be 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			26	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					69	S	51	S		
Obtained high school diploma					40	S	S	S		

Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits					323	S	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program					102	S	289	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					18	6	S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					136	S	108	S		
Obtained employment					S	11	S	S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: For Juvenile Corrections, the difference in the number of students enrolled in job training was due to two primary reasons: 1) decreased numbers of students in the program through judicial placement; and 2) an Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections policy change from placing all eligible students in job training (in SY 14-15 and prior) to placing students in either job training or academic courses, dependent on the individual needs of students.

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 <u>long-term</u> students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			39	15	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			20	14	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			29	10	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			80	32	
Comments:					

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

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			17	12	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			33	22	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			31	17	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			68	20	
Comments:					

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	3	260
Neglected programs	0	
Juvenile detention	11	180
Juvenile corrections	0	
Other	0	
Total	14	/////////////////////////////
Comments: This is the first year for reporting one new Juvenile detention facility, one At-risk program closure, and one non-funded due to student count below state set minimum required count to be funded.		

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	3
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	11
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	0
Total	14
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	584		1,840		
Total Long Term Students Served	90		311		

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (*IDEA*)	124		331		
LEP Students	2		45		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	10		70		
Asian	4		5		
Black or African American	14		59		
Hispanic or Latino	18		360		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3		8		
White	506		1,213		
Two or more races	29		125		
Total	584		1,840		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	266		1,346		
Female	318		494		
Total	584		1,840		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6	5				
7	10				
8	15				
9	22		4		
10	24		4		
11	24		16		
12	47		41		
13	66		100		
14	98		219		
15	87		359		
16	109		476		
17	68		523		
18	9		68		
19			28		
20			2		
21					
Total	584		1,840		

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

The decrease in unduplicated students served in At-Risk is due to the closure of two programs.

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

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

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

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

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	523		1,363		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Not all At-risk or Juvenile Detention site are permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit. We have are reporting those who can.

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	20				352					

Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED	S	S			15	11				
Obtained high school diploma	9	31			24	14				

Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	43	S			501	254				
Enrolled in a GED program	S	S			39	55				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	S	4			50	5				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	S	S			107	287				
Obtained employment	S	S			56	98				

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The At-Risk facility Alpha One closed. In SY 14-15, Alpha One served 532 students. While some facilities accepted additional students in SY 15-16, there were fewer spaces at at-risk facilities in SY 15-16. As a result, there was a significant decrease in those enrolled in their local district after placement.

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0		53		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7		30		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	59		74		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	11		77		
Comments:					

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

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

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	S		21		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	8		31		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	63		69		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	6		51		
Comments: All students were tested. This data is for subcategories that not all would be reported in. Data was verified accurate and reviewed in a side by side comparison. There was only one site with a noticeable difference. Reading 27Â Math 107.					

FAQ on long-term:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	4
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	11
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	0
Parental involvement activities	6
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	15
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	8
Comments: Idaho had a total of 21 RLIS grantee districts. Each district set one to four goals (five was the maximum) in their consolidated application.	

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.

Idaho school districts receiving awards under the Subpart 2 Rural and Low-Income Schools program are using their funds to supplement and support activities planned for in the district's Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application CFSGA. All efforts provided for in the CFSGA are intended to increase student achievement for all students. The authorized uses of the Rural, Low Income funds have a direct correlation to our state goals. The Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) will ensure, through the consolidated application approval process, that the Rural, Low Income districts apply their funds to those authorized uses. As this data is analyzed over time, technical assistance will be provided to districts in need of additional support to assist them in meeting their own goals. Strategies outlined in the plans include but are not limited to: retention of teachers, training to move instruction of students with disabilities towards best practices, expansion of Title I services to students not meeting grade level in reading and math, professional development for teachers and aides in reading and math interventions, teacher recruitment and retention including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives, and teacher professional development.
Uses Funds For Teacher Recruitment And Retention = 50% achieved goals (2 of 4)
Uses Funds For Teacher Professional Development = 64% achieved goals (7 of 11)
Uses Funds For Parental Involvement Activities = 33% achieved goals (2 of 6)
Uses Funds For Improving Basic Programs = 47% achieved goals (7 of 15)
Uses Funds For Language Instruction = 25% achieved goals (2 of 8)
Uses Funds For Learning Centers= 0 goals achieved (0 of 2)

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	11
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	11	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		11

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

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	254,151.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		254,151.00
Total	254,151.00	254,151.00
Comments:		

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

2.11   GRADUATION RATES [4]

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1   Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

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

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

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	21,883	S	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	S	58
Asian or Pacific Islander	371	S	80
Asian	272	S	83
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	99	S	70
Black or African American	279	S	78
Hispanic or Latino	3,592	S	73.7
White	16,949	S	81.4
Two or more races	427	S	77
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,940	S	60
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,632	S	73
Economically disadvantaged students	11,990	S	71.9

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.

Idaho has completed a graduation rate appeals process with school districts and has reviewed the data we are submitting for accuracy.

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

2.12   LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

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

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

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

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

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

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

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

Comments:

---

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

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

Comments: No list of schools identified for improvement is available under the approved ESEA flexibility waiver.

---

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

2.12.3 List of Districts for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

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

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

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

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

Comments: No list of districts identified with state specific statuses is available under the approved ESEA flexibility waiver.

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action[7] under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

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

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

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

Comments: No list of districts identified for improvement is available under the approved ESEA flexibility waiver.

---

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