

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

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

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: North Carolina		
Address: 301 North Wilmington Street Raleigh, NC 267602		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Karl Pond		
Telephone: 919-807-3241		
Fax: 919-807-4000		
e-mail: karl.pond@dpi.nc.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mark Johnson		
		<u>Wednesday, May 10, 2017, 11:16:53 AM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2015-16



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

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	86,586	S	45.6
4	83,227	S	44.5
5	80,082	S	47.1
6	38,520	S	33.0
7	37,216	S	29.7
8	37,398	S	26.5
High School	7,982	S	23.5
Total	371,011	S	40.4
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	86,563	S	40.9
4	83,221	S	38.7
5	80,082	S	36.1
6	38,520	S	38.8
7	37,215	S	35.5
8	37,387	S	31.3
High School	8,114	S	32.5
Total	371,102	S	37.4
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,684	S	64
4	2,555	S	64
5	2,597	S	67
6	1,700	S	56
7	1,602	S	53
8	1,410	S	47
High School	646	S	45
Total	13,194	S	59.7

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	2,683	S	64
4	2,555	S	63
5	2,595	S	61
6	1,701	S	64
7	1,600	S	63
8	1,410	S	57
High School	688	S	63
Total	13,232	S	62.2

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	97,570
Limited English proficient students	70,907
Students who are homeless	15,213
Migratory students	2,294
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	12,839
Asian	13,968
Black or African American	231,659
Hispanic or Latino	149,283
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,014
White	276,199
Two or more races	29,119
Total	714,081
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	88	0	13	101
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	20,092	0	2	20,094
K	214	88,453	40	57	88,764
1	300	91,825	39	60	92,224
2	321	91,611	35	42	92,009
3	271	90,650	44	46	91,011
4	213	87,156	55	35	87,459
5	201	83,587	39	35	83,862
6	121	41,181	28	44	41,374
7	131	39,649	22	63	39,865
8	108	39,933	18	107	40,166
9	42	13,069	5	164	13,280
10	8	9,918	11	105	10,042
11	0	7,818	8	84	7,910
12	0	7,805	10	64	7,879
Ungraded	0	0	0	53	53
TOTALS	1,930	712,835	354	974	716,093
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	884
Reading/language arts	1,436
Science	2
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	172
Comments:	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	1,550
Other support services	1
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	13.42	
Paraprofessionals ¹	8.45	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	1.94	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.00	
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	512.90	100.00
Comments:		

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

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

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	130	104
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	67,210	5,446,438
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	11,766,592	386,470,156
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.57	1.41

*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.

Local education agencies reserve a minimum of 1% of the total Title I allocation and allocate 95% of the reservation to Title I schools to conduct school level parent engagement activities as identified in school-level parent involvement plans. Funds are used to support ongoing communication and parent training and assistance. Sample training sessions include but are not limited to how to help your child with homework, learning about the curriculum, dealing with adolescence behavior, and opportunities to support at home learning through programs parents can access at home.

Funds are also used at the district and school level to hire parent involvement liaisons to promote parent outreach, maintain parent resource centers, and conduct parent academies and conferences during the school year.

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: There are no major concerns. The changes in numbers are in line with expectations.

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	438
K	407
1	401
2	366
3	411
4	321
5	285
6	236
7	246
8	229
9	261

10	195
11	145
12	156
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,353
Total	5,450
Comments:	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Decline in numbers is 5.5%. While it is not ideal, this number is understandable, given bad crop seasons for some crops (e.g., blueberries, peanuts, and sweet potatoes in some regions, and a stated desire of many parents of school age children to not migrate with their children.

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	222
Comments:	

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

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	171
K	156
1	199
2	203
3	193
4	169
5	157
6	137
7	131
8	128
9	126
10	100
11	64
12	46
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	459
Total	2,439
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: There was a decrease of 15.2% since last year for this count. Some of this decline can be explained by the overall A1 decrease of 5.5%. However, there are three other reasons this decline has occurred:
 1) Our largest LEA-based program, in Bladen County and three other "blueberry" counties (Sampson, Pender, and Duplin) lost children this summer due to a highly shortened blueberry season. Cold lasted later in the season than normal, but it was followed by a very hot period during which the blueberries quickly rotted on the bushes. Many families who arrived in April had left our area by June 15, the normal beginning date of our summer term. In Bladen County, this was documented by low attendance at normally crowded summer programs. When summer re-interviews occurred during late June, many families had already departed, providing further proof that the children were not present during summer session.
 2) Several LEAs lost staff during the summer, and recruitment and services declined. Northampton County recruiter/tutor retired. Halifax County recruiter/advocate had to take emergency leave during the summer period. Johnston County's lead recruiter/advocate resigned to go back to school. Pender County's recruiter was replaced in late summer. Haywood County's recruiter/advocate had a substitute who was not as attuned to recruitment and summer services. These staffing changes occurring during peak seasons had a strong bearing on the numbers of summer services. Becoming aware of this problem, we (North Carolina State MEP staff) have designed a webinar for program directors to help them use state resources to cope with summer staffing changes. Sampson County lost a recruiter suddenly, and that person was not replaced for over one month.
 3) In the case of one of the counties above, summer services were not correctly logged into our data system, due to staff changes (Sampson County). This county is being monitored to ensure that staff clearly understands procedures, even when staff leave suddenly.

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

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	46

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	<u>No</u>
MIS 2000	<u>No</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>No</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>Yes</u>
In North Carolina, Migrant student data is entered into the state student database, PowerSchool. Within PowerSchool, we maintain both school enrollments and MEP enrollment data. We also have a "migrant data cluster" within PowerSchool, where MEP-specific data (COEs, MEP services, etc.) is maintained and updated.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

n/a

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 serviced for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children includes children and youth ages 3-21. The student's age must be between 3 and 21 years during the reporting year. Children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three during the program year are also included, along with those students who reach their twenty-second birthday within the program year (09/01/15-08/31/16).

Reports from Power School compute the fields "Student ThirdBDay" is less than the end date of the report period and the "Student TwentySecondBDay" is greater than the start date of the reporting period. In addition, validations have been built into PowerSchool Migrant functions to prevent entering over-age students.

A child will be counted if they turn 3 or 22 during the reporting period and met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 36 months of a last qualifying move and had a qualifying activity). The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the beginning of the reporting period. The Qualifying Arrival Date must be equal to or greater than 09/01/12 and be within 36 months of the Residency date.

The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the QAD (i.e. Enroll Date). The exceptions are Withdraw and Supplemental Program End dates. (Withdraw is defined as ending an enrollment period in a school history line). In PowerSchool, the supplemental program section has a field named "End Date." This date can be the same as the Withdraw date from a history line, but it can stand on its own if the Local Educational Agency ends a supplemental program before the student is withdrawn from a school history enrollment line. End of Eligibility is not the same as Program End Date. End of Eligibility occurs when the student has ended 36 months of eligibility, has reached their 22nd birthday, has graduated, or has died.

A child will be counted in the A1 count if the QAD plus 36 months is equal or greater than the beginning of the reporting period and if any of the following dates falls within the reporting range period 09/01/15 to 08/31/16: Enroll Date, Withdraw Date, Supplemental Program Start Date, or Supplemental Program End Date. Also, the interview date must be before or equal to the last date of the reporting period.

"Enrollment" means the student has a school history line in PowerSchool showing enrollment in a school or in the migrant program (for out-of-school children and youth or children only enrolled in summer/not in regular schools). Supplemental Programs are defined in North Carolina as services above and beyond the basic educational programs provided by the local school district.

Students who were resident in North Carolina for at least one day during the reporting period (09/01/2015-08/31/2016) and who have activity in PowerSchool in any of the fields listed above will be counted in the Category 1 count.

For this purpose, the reporting period for the A1 count and for Intersession in the A2 count goes from 09/01/15 to 08/31/16. The reporting period for summer in the A2 count goes from 06/16/16 to 08/31/16. A child will be counted in the A2 count if, in addition to the criteria for the A1 count, the child's end of eligibility is equal to or after the beginning of the summer program (defined as 6/16/2016) and if the child's summer services were paid in whole or part with MEP funds. For a child to be counted in Category 2 count the "enrollment type" must be summer. Summer participants are defined as children receiving supplemental programs as supportive services or instructional programs provided by the local MEP during 06/16 - 08/31. At least one service must be paid in whole or in part with migrant funds. For a child with a summer enrollment type to be counted, one of the following dates must fall within the specified summer time frame (06/16 to 08/31): Enroll Date or Withdraw Date and Supplemental Program Start or End date. Students must have been residents in North Carolina for at least one day and have been eligible during the summer/intersession reporting period and have received at least one supplemental service for at least one day during the summer/intersession reporting period. PowerSchool must confirm activity in any of the fields named above for children to be counted in Category 2.

Children are counted once per age/grade level for each child count category. Each student is counted only one time for the state regardless of the number of school history lines on the student's record for the state or the number of LEAs in which that student has resided in North Carolina. Migrant children in the state are assigned a unique ID, which remains the same as the student moves within this state. Throughout the year, duplicate records are merged to in the state database. Student's duplicate records are merged if the student's last name, student's first name, student's middle initial, student's DOB, mother's last name and mother's first name match more than one record. If the student has been in more than one LEA during the same reporting period, the student is counted in the last LEA where he/she resided during that time.

Student data is uploaded from LEAs and Regional Recruiters to a secure server maintained at DPI. It is the highly secure accountability server. The Migrant Data Specialists then retrieve the data forms (COEs, Service Reports, or Enrollment Verification Reports) and enter data into PowerSchool. There is a maximum of 10 calendar days that may occur between MEP enrollment and entry into the PowerSchool system. The PowerSchool record can then be reviewed by the Data Specialist or State staff after it has been created or modified. Data Specialists and State staff will be using the same system of periodic review of data quality by checking several reports (Migrant Services, A1, COE Up-to-Date) that are either generated within PowerSchool or extracted from PowerSchool.

Student Counts and Rosters are periodically uploaded to the secure server so that sub-grantees may review their counts and student information periodically. Monthly webinars and meetings are held with State Staff and Data Specialists to troubleshoot potential sources of error. Because our state student database, PowerSchool, is the same system for all students in the state, including OSY and pre-K students who are not in school, the same process is used to generate all tables for EDFacts; hence there is no need for matching between a migrant database and the state database. We address the accuracy of the following elements in the following ways:

2.3.1 Child Counts: Twice per year (during September and June), we conduct an enrollment verification process, in which each child's home is visited by a local, regional, or state-level MEP staff member to verify residence in the state. The state's enrollment methodology also ensures that only students with a residency date between September 1, 2015 and August 31, 2016 are included in the Category 1 child count. The enrollment process also avoids duplicate students by having as its first step the investigation of the Unique PowerSchool ID to ensure that there is only one PS ID per child. During our initial PowerSchool use, we found that historically imported data (from old MIS2000 files) generated numerous duplicates, but we have removed those, and the newly entered data has resulted in few to no duplicates.

For the C-122 count, we again enter data on student services received during the summer into the PowerSchool system, which is the same database as for all students (including OSY and Pre-K children) throughout the state.

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)?

Because our state student database, PowerSchool, is the same system for all students in the state, including OSY and pre-K students who are not in school, the same process is used to generate all tables for ED*Facts*; hence there is no need for matching between a migrant database and the state database. We address the accuracy of the following elements in the following ways:

2.3.1 Child Counts: Twice per year (during September and June), we conduct an enrollment verification process, in which each child's home is visited by a local, regional, or state-level MEP staff member, in order to verify residence in the state. The state's enrollment methodology also ensures that only students with a residency date between September 1, 2015 and August 31, 2016 are included in the Category 1 child count. The enrollment process also avoids duplicate students by having as its first step the investigation of the Unique PowerSchool ID to ensure that there is only one PS ID per child. During our initial PS use, we found that historically imported data (from old MIS2000 files) generated numerous duplicates, but we have removed those, and the newly entered data has resulted in few to no duplicates.

For the C-122 count, we again enter data on student services received during the summer into the PowerSchool system, which is the same database as for all students (including OSY and Pre-K children) throughout the state.

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?	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- 1) The State Data Administrator reviews all near matches that are placed on the MSIX worklist and makes a determination to split or merge the records. (There has been an ongoing issue this year with the worklist creating an error, but this has been communicated since 4/16 to DeLoitte, and they are attempting to resolve the issue.) It appears that the worklist error only occurred during the earliest submissions after we began submitting data to MSIX again. Sometimes when near matches are being resolved in MSIX, it appears that the near match has originated within our PowerSchool system, and the regional data specialists are sent an e-mail to correct the error within PowerSchool.
- 2) In some cases, during the worklist process, spelling discrepancies are noted between NC and other states. Normally, our State Data Administrator communicates the discrepancy to the other state to decide how it will be resolved.
- 3) The NC State Data Administrator runs the following MSIX reports: Data Quality, Data Completeness, and Potential Duplicates. We also compare NC data to National Data in an attempt to understand if a particular MDE is problematic just for NC or for other states.
- 4) We make frequent (at least once per week) use of the "alert" feature on the Consolidated Record to inform our sister states when a student has arrived or is leaving. This has been an extremely useful feature of MSIX.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	Yes
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.	83
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	75
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	73

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We found that families had moved from the area before we could conduct the re-interview. This was especially common in Bladen County (our largest program). We normally conduct reinterviews there in late June, but when we arrived for re-interviews, several of the families had already left for Ohio or Michigan.

The State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator met personally with recruitment staff in each LEA where there was an error and re-trained them. In addition, all NCMEP staff were given a training at our Fall Regional Meetings in November 2016. The training consisted of a review of errors found in recent years, errors found during summer 2016, and methods to reduce errors in recruitment. The two errors discovered involved Out of School Youth, one of whom had graduated from high school (preparatoria) in his country of origin, but who was not eligible to attend high school in the district in which he was enrolled (due to district policy). This policy differs in different districts, and the recruiter was given a new training regarding the alignment of district practices with MEP practices. As mentioned before, our State ID and R Coordinator conducted both a statewide training and an individualized session with the recruiter. The issue of the over-22 year old student was resolved by meeting with both the recruiter and through training all staff at the fall 2016 regional meetings (and through webinars) on MSIX new regulations that require us to formally withdraw students from PowerSchool when they leave the area or otherwise end eligibility.

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.

Three stratified random samples were created in Excel in order to ensure proportional representation of all sizes of programs. Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Students in the first sampling were assigned a number in Excel, and when that student was not available, a replacement was found in the first or second back-up samples, respectively, each with an matching, assigned number.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

n/a--The last independent re-interview process was conducted in 2013-2014. we will conduct the next one during 2016-2017 (this year).

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As indicated above, there was a 2.66% error rate, based on the number of COEs selected for the re-interviews. The two students represented in this error rate were immediately withdrawn from the program. The two areas that created eligibility problems were age (one student had turned 22 before the re-interview, but was not yet withdrawn), and graduation (one student had already graduated from high school in his country of origin and lived in a school district that would not allow students who had graduated in other countries to enroll in their schools).

The State Identification and Recruitment Coordinator met personally with recruitment staff in each LEA where there was an error and re-trained them. In addition, all NCMEP staff were given a training at our Fall Regional Meetings in November 2016. The training consisted of a review of errors found in recent years, errors found during summer 2016, and methods to reduce errors in recruitment. The two errors discovered involved Out of School Youth, one of whom had graduated from high school (preparatoria) in his country of origin, but who was not eligible to attend high school in the district in which he was enrolled (due to district policy). This policy differs in different districts, and the recruiter was given a new training regarding the alignment of district practices with MEP practices. As mentioned before, our State ID and R Coordinator conducted both a statewide training and an individualized session with the recruiter. The issue of the over-22 year old student was resolved by meeting with both meeting individually with the recruiter and through training all staff at the fall 2016 regional meetings (and through webinars) on MSIX new regulations that require us to formally withdraw students from PowerSchool when they leave the area or otherwise end eligibility.

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	25
1	59
2	60
3	51
4	54
5	34
6	32
7	28
8	34
9	38
10	24
11	13
12	9
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	40
Total	507

Comments: Our numbers of Priority for Services students dropped from 9.97% (597 students) of our total count to 8.94% (507) of our total count. This can be explained primarily by a change in the mobility of our students, one of the criteria for PFS. Our 9 month QAD percentage changed from 31.2% in 2014-2015 to 23.5% in 2015-2016. Even for the 12 month QAD, the percent of total students declined from 43.4% in 14-15 to 42% in 15-16. (I choose to look at percentages, since this takes into account the A1 drop of 5.5%.)

A small decline in PFS numbers might have occurred due to major staffing changes during the summer of 2016, which resulted in PFS determinations being made AFTER 8/31/2016 for students who enrolled prior to 8/31/2016. This has been addressed through Professional Development on PFS during our biannual regional meetings.

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	177
1	248
2	242
3	272
4	122
5	106
6	83
7	87
8	84
9	108
10	67
11	53
12	33
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	9
Total	1,695
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	13
1	12
2	14
3	28
4	18
5	20
6	17
7	14
8	3
9	15
10	7
11	10
12	1
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	176
Comments:	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

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

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	148
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	192
K	182
1	154
2	144
3	145
4	111
5	112
6	87
7	92
8	89
9	103
10	56
11	50
12	24
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	710
Total	2,399
Comments:	

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	92
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	116
K	122
1	100
2	85
3	85
4	72
5	63
6	42
7	55
8	41
9	56
10	31
11	25
12	12
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	335
Total	1,332

Comments: We have seen a decline in QAD during regular school year occurring during 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2015-16. We believe that this is a trend, as many families are hesitant to travel due to driver's license issues. Anecdotally, many of our families have told us that they prefer to not travel with their children once the children are in second or third grade. This is borne out by analyzing the proportion of children in each grade who make up this mobile group. For example, the number of children in K who have a school year QAD are 122/407 or 29.98%, while the number of children in grade 9 who have a school year QAD are 56/261 or 21.46% and by grade 12 are 12/156 or 7.7%. This is a positive trend, in that children are not faced with the disruptive aspects of school year moves, but it does change the mobility dynamic within our program.

We have also found several counties (Columbus, Brunswick, Bladen, and Hoke) in which families are making those counties their homebase, due to high housing costs in other states.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	39
K	25
1	22
2	21
3	20
4	16
5	10
6	5
7	10
8	7
9	11
10	11
11	15
12	9
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	64
Total	301

Comments: We feel that the number of referral services has declined, especially for our out of school youth, for at least two reasons.

- 1) We have a large number of OSY who are H-2A workers, and their employers do not permit them to follow up on referrals we might make. (NC has the highest number of H-2A workers in the US.)
- 2) In addition, our number of OSY students has declined from 1420 to 1353, which reduced the number of students who might be referred.
- 3) Staffing changes occurring during the summer resulted in new staff (if hired before 8/31/2016) not having been trained to refer and follow up on referral services. This will be remedied by conducting a referral services training during our March MEP Regional meetings.

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	
8	
9	10
10	S
11	S
12	
Ungraded	
Total	18

Comments: NC graduation rate reached its highest level (80%) last year, and NCMEP has worked diligently with high school students to keep them in school. We have had a greater recovery rate of OSY than in the past also.

FAQ on Dropouts:

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

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

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

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	8

Comments: We have continued to work closely with the HEP program at Wake Tech Community College to increase the number of students receiving a diploma through an HSED program. Our state accepts all three tests for HSED.

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

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

Do not include:

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5
K	22
1	49
2	42
3	44
4	41
5	28
6	27
7	22
8	26
9	32
10	19
11	6
12	7
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	26
Total	396
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	3
1	10
2	18
3	7
4	13
5	6
6	5
7	6
8	8
9	6
10	5
11	7
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	14
Total	111

Comments: Three reasons predominate for a decline in the number of PFS students in summer.

- 1) We have had a decline in overall mobility of our students.
- 2) We have had fewer students in the summer, primarily due to crop issues in blueberries, and to a small extent, strawberries. The families are leaving before 6/16, which is the start date for our summer term.
- 3) Staffing changes during summer (retirements, resignations, and removals) resulted in new staff not getting PFS determinations made until after 8/31/2016.

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	92
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	274
K	324
1	349
2	312
3	349
4	279
5	249
6	207
7	213
8	189
9	219
10	165
11	123
12	135
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	889
Total	4,368
Comments:	

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	25
1	59
2	60
3	51
4	54
5	34
6	32
7	28
8	34
9	38
10	24
11	13
12	9
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	40
Total	507

Comments: This number has most likely declined a bit due to the overall decline in number of students in the program and to the decline in mobility among students. In 2014-15, the percentage of first graders who were PFS was 19.5%, and third graders was 17%. The 2015-2016 percentage of PFS first graders was 14.7% and 3rd graders was 12.4%. Among third graders, we believe the decline may be due to the general decrease in mobility among families as their children reach grades 3 and higher. At any rate, we have designed some Professional Development opportunities for our staff to remind them of the importance of early and careful PFS designations at all grade levels, including OSY, who have declined significantly (as have total numbers of OSY identified).

However, we also believe that the staff turnover during the summer months resulted in a significant decline in PFS designations during the summer months. We believe that increasing the professional development regarding PFS will put these numbers into alignment with total numbers.

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	1
1	1
2	1
3	3
4	3
5	1
6	2
7	2
8	2
9	2
10	9
11	5
12	10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	43
Comments:	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	122
K	176
1	268
2	230
3	242
4	199
5	169
6	156
7	137
8	128
9	143
10	110
11	84
12	108
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	413
Total	2,699

Comments: We believe there are several reasons for the change in instructional services.

1) There was an overall decline in the number of students.

2) Many students in the blueberry counties who would have received summer instructional services left early due to crop issues. The weather was cold, and then became very hot, and the blueberries were lost.

3) We had large staff turnover in our subgrants during the summer, which resulted in a loss of services, since staff had to be trained before providing services.

4) It is notable that services to our high school students have remained more stable. This is due to our stress on providing more for our high students, who were not making the academic progress of earlier grades. For example, four of our sub-grantees have created positions for high school advocates to work as mentor/tutors for high school students. We look to the number of instructional services for high school students to continue to increase, while we believe that we need to ensure the strengthening of our summer programs for grades k-8.

5) We returned to a focus on reading and math during our regular school year, so that we could be more focused on the goals of our CNA/SDP. In fact, the focus was primarily on reading, because that was where the gaps were widest. That may also explain why some instructional services were not given as much as in the past.

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	6	1	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	32	12	////////////////////////////////////
K	65	36	////////////////////////////////////
1	131	106	////////////////////////////////////
2	123	99	////////////////////////////////////
3	140	103	////////////////////////////////////
4	112	95	////////////////////////////////////
5	91	69	////////////////////////////////////
6	79	70	////////////////////////////////////
7	81	71	////////////////////////////////////
8	69	63	////////////////////////////////////
9	64	51	
10	48	41	
11	37	23	1
12	45	29	2
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	34	10	
Total	1,157	879	3

Comments: We see an increase in instructional services in reading of 3% since 2014-2015. This is due to an increased focus on working on reading with our students. We especially see an increase at the high school level, which was one of our goals for 2015-16. We saw a 13% increase in math instructional services, again due to a focus on this core subject. Our staff obtained more training for math instruction, and we encouraged the use of instructional technology tools to move our students forward in math. Interestingly, even at grades 3 and 4, which coincide with state-mandated summer reading programs (not MEP funded), we see an increase in MEP instructional services.

Our numbers declined for OSY. We believe this occurred for a couple of reasons. Our OSY numbers declined, so there were fewer students who asked for any instruction. In addition, 96% of our OSY ask for ESOL classes, which we currently record as ESOL, not reading, so our numbers would be much higher if we included ESOL as "reading." We will develop training for our ESOL staff in literacy instruction to make sure that they are also teaching reading, so we can begin to count ESOL instruction to OSY as reading instruction also.

Finally, our numbers for credit accrual have gone down. It is interesting that last year, we served children with credit accrual in 9th and 10th grades, and this year, we served 11th and 12th graders. I believe that we are making a stronger effort to keep students on track to graduate (PowerSchool has great ways to keep this information up to date), so that the students in 9th and 10th grades are not falling behind as easily.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	75	21
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	239	58
K	265	70
1	259	93
2	245	77
3	264	93
4	206	76
5	198	66
6	160	49
7	158	53
8	145	52
9	172	69
10	114	60
11	89	54
12	74	47
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	772	194
Total	3,435	1,132

Comments: The decline in supportive services has several possible explanations. First, there was major staff turnover in several large counties, requiring the recruiting, hiring, and training of staff during peak season months, which meant that fewer hours were available for providing services; second, there were fewer students this year than last; third, a decline in counseling services occurred because of the unavailability of trained summer counseling staff to work with OSY. We are in the process of designing and implementing a mentoring program for OSY that will have trained staff to serve them. I fully expect these OSY numbers to increase in 16-17.

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	446
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,257
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: We do not consolidate funds into schoolwide programs.	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	0	0
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	1	6
Year round	34	4,362

Comments: This number declined slightly, in keeping with our overall slight decline (<6%) of our total student count. In addition, some of the children in the summer only project could not return this summer due to family illness; they returned at the end of the season when the summer project had already finished.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	0.20
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.8.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	10	5.82	2	1.69	12
Counselors	1	0.50	1	0.50	2
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	31	28.45	95	56.92	126
Qualified paraprofessionals	20	15.20	28	24.21	48
Recruiters	38	30.37	44	34.04	82
Records transfer staff	4	2.65	3	2.50	7
Administrators	8	3.15	5	2.34	13
Comments:					

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

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

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	6	14
Juvenile corrections	4	200
Adult corrections	4	90
Other	0	0
Total	14	////////////////////
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	6
Juvenile corrections	4
Adult corrections	4
Other	0
Total	14
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		124	281	982	
Total Long Term Students Served		47	281	664	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)		0	112	0	
LEP Students		0	3	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		0	0	19	
Asian		0	0	0	
Black or African American		92	215	701	
Hispanic or Latino		13	13	62	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	
White		9	35	186	
Two or more races		10	18	14	
Total		124	281	982	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		119	250	888	
Female		5	31	94	
Total		124	281	982	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		0	0	0	
6		0	0	0	
7		0	0	0	
8		0	0	0	
9		0	0	0	
10		0	0	0	
11		0	0	0	
12		0	0	0	
13		12	11	0	
14		29	36	0	
15		56	73	0	
16		27	103	24	
17		0	55	155	
18		0	2	121	
19		0	1	202	
20		0	0	260	
21		0	0	220	
Total		124	281	982	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

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

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

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

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	No	No	No	No	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.		124	281	982	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit			S		S		S			
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED			S	S	17	S	140	S		
Obtained high school diploma			S	S	S	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			23	S	231	S	S	S		
Enrolled in a GED program			S	S	50	S	982	S		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			S	S	S	S	S	S		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			S	S	50	S	982	S		
Obtained employment			S	S	S	S	42	S		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		S	22	5	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		47	116	5	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		S	36	332	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		S	20	322	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term students:

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

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		0	34	S	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		29	56	10	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		14	78	356	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		4	26	296	
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		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total		////////////////////
Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2		

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	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	
Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served					
Total Long Term Students Served					

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)					
LEP Students					

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American					
Hispanic or Latino					
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White					
Two or more races					
Total					

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male					
Female					
Total					

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
Total					

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

NC does not participate in Subpart 2

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)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.					

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2

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										
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned a GED	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Obtained high school diploma										
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned high school course credits	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in a GED program										
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education										
Enrolled in job training courses/programs										
Obtained employment										

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2					

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					
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2					

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	19
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	31
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	35
Parental involvement activities	18
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	4
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	36
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	10
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. Increase the number of LEAs using RLIS funding. During 2015-2016 academic year, the number of eligible schools that used RLIS funds was 55. The number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds in 2014-2015 was also 55; there was no increase.

2. Percent of students performing at or above proficiency increased by 5%: There was a total of LEAS 15 reporting increase by 5 %, LEAs reported an increase ranging from and Leas reported proficiency increase from 10-15 %.

3. Student access to technology: There were 20 LEAS using RLIS funding for technology with 18 reporting teacher training in technology.

4. Students graduating from high school of those LEAs using RLIS funds to support that initiative: 4 LEAS reported increased graduation rates from 5-10% increase.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

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

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	0
Comments: none	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

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

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

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

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

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

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	113,726	S	85.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,660	S	82
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,068	S	93.4
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	30,240	S	82.9
Hispanic or Latino	13,808	S	80.1
White	60,649	S	88.6
Two or more races	4,159	S	83.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	11,665	S	68.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,574	S	57
Economically disadvantaged students	45,392	S	80.6

FAQs on graduation rates:

What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate? For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 500 characters.

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

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

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

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

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

Comments:

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

2.12.3 List of Districts for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

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

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

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

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

Comments:

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action⁷ under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

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

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

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

Comments:

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>.