

**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: New Mexico Public Education Department		
Address: 300 Don Gaspar Avenue Santa Fe, NM 87501		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Lisa Hamilton		
Telephone: 505-827-7931		
Fax: 505-827-1826		
e-mail: lisa.hamilton@state.nm.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lisa Hamilton		
		Thursday, May 11, 2017, 1:58:50 PM
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	20,375	S	26.9
4	19,713	S	19.3
5	19,743	S	21.9
6	17,057	S	16.6
7	16,358	S	14.5
8	13,913	S	11.1
High School	34,915	S	12.6
Total	142,074	S	17.4

**Comments:** Students participate in the Math assessment according to their grade in most cases. However, some 8th grade students take Algebra and therefore will take this assessment. Algebra is reported in the grade "HS" or high school. This evident in the High School grade, were more students have taken the Math than Reading assessment in both SWP and TAS schools.

**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	20,479	S	22.5
4	19,707	S	21.0
5	19,829	S	21.7
6	17,145	S	20.2
7	16,457	S	19.8
8	16,480	S	22.4
High School	33,757	S	28.1
Total	143,854	S	22.9

**Comments:** Students participate in the Math assessment according to their grade in most cases. However, some 8th grade students take Algebra and therefore will take this assessment. Algebra is reported in the grade "HS" or high school. This evident in the High School grade, were more students have taken the Math than Reading assessment in both SWP and TAS schools.

**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	223	S	42
4	256	S	39
5	237	S	46
6	279	S	45
7	211	S	29
8	74	S	22
High School	1,148	S	14
Total	2,428	S	27

**Comments:** Students participate in the Math assessment according to their grade in most cases. However, some 8th grade students take Algebra and therefore will take this assessment. Algebra is reported in the grade "HS" or high school. This evident in the High School grade, were more students have taken the Math than Reading assessment in both SWP and TAS schools.

**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	227	S	45
4	257	S	40
5	240	S	43
6	279	S	44
7	214	S	41
8	247	S	36
High School	1,019	S	32
Total	2,483	S	37

**Comments:** Students participate in the Math assessment according to their grade in most cases. However, some 8th grade students take Algebra and therefore will take this assessment. Algebra is reported in the grade "HS" or high school. This evident in the High School grade, were more students have taken the Math than Reading assessment in both SWP and TAS schools.



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

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

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

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

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	40,337
Limited English proficient students	46,440
Students who are homeless	8,562
Migratory students	354
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	32,186
Asian	1,863
Black or African American	4,457
Hispanic or Latino	164,222
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	253
White	44,945
Two or more races	3,656
Total	251,582
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2	0	7	0	0	7
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		7,051	1	4	7,056
K	77	20,769	52	10	20,908
1	64	22,511	57	9	22,641
2	71	22,600	60	7	22,738
3	56	22,115	57	26	22,254
4	79	21,261	68	19	21,427
5	49	21,290	34	17	21,390
6	78	18,653	40	21	18,792
7	66	18,060	26	38	18,190
8	100	18,210	14	56	18,380
9	216	15,992	3	125	16,336
10	109	13,904	3	69	14,085
11	93	11,919	1	39	12,052
12	92	11,516	0	16	11,624
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,150</b>	<b>245,858</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>247,880</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

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

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

<b>TAS Instructional Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Mathematics	547
Reading/language arts	906
Science	199
Social studies	161
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	114
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>TAS Support Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Health, dental, and eye care	6
Supporting guidance/advocacy	6
Other support services	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	16.30	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	14.01	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	0.69	
Clerical support staff	4.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.38	
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and reflective of Targeted Assistance Title I staff only. In prior years NM submitted School wide Title I staff in N065. The query that produces the file has been revised and will accurately reflect the TAS staff.		

**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>

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

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

**2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs**

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals <sup>3</sup>	2,480.00	100.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

<b>Parental Involvement Reservation</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000</b>
Number of LEAs*	88	35
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	206,921	4,260,315
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	26,593,278	391,300,100
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.78	1.09

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

**2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts**

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

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

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

**FAQs on Child Count:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations.

**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)	56
K	63
1	49
2	49
3	43
4	58
5	44
6	45
7	40
8	48
9	51

10	38
11	35
12	21
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	22
Total	662

**Comments:** There was an increase in the total because of a change from a school based recruiting model to a regional based recruiting model. This meant that there were recruiters working during the summer as well as after normal work hours during the school year. There has been a intentional focus on improving identification and recruitment in every phase and person working in our districts that have migrant programs.

### 2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** There was an increase in the total because of a change from a school based recruiting model to a regional based recruiting model. This meant that there were recruiters working during the summer as well as after normal work hours during the school year. There has been a intentional focus on improving identification and recruitment in every phase and person working in our districts that have migrant programs.

### 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	0

**Comments:** the data are correct



**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)	9
K	12
1	12
2	12
3	9
4	7
5	7
6	15
7	6
8	5
9	9
10	4
11	8
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	117
<b>Comments:</b> none	

**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 were additional summer programs conducted in our state.

**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	
<b>Comments:</b> none	

**2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System**

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

<b>Student Information System</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
NGS	<u>No</u>
MIS 2000	<u>No</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>Yes</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system: none	<u>No Response</u>

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

•Only children ages 3-21; During SY 2015-16 performance period, the State's database only included children born after September 01, 1995 and before September 01, 2013

•Only children who were within 36 months of a QAD

The State's recruiters, local directors, and state director ensures that each child's end of eligibility date does not occur before September 01, 2015.

•Only children who resided in our State for at least one day during the child count period; for 2-year olds who turned three during the child count period, include a description of the State's process for ensuring that these two year olds resided in our State for at least one day after they turned three years old; Local project staff make a list from the State migrant database after September 01, 2015 of all children turning 3 during the performance period. They then inform the state director as these children turn 3 to check the eligible box in the state database which indicates this child is now between the ages of 3-21.

•Only children who had not graduated from high school equivalency diploma. Upon local verification visits to the homes after September 01, recruiters inquire if children have graduated from high school, earned a high school equivalency, or died. These students are included in the Category 1 and 2 counts for the reporting period, but are not include in subsequent count.

•Only unique children in Category 1, and eliminates duplicate students with its State MEP database. Each student that is entered into the state database is required to have a unique state ID. The local MEP staff also check that this same student is not in the system under a different name. e.g. in one school the student used their first name and in another school the student used their middle name. The local MEP checks for unique data elements such as parent's name and child's birthday.

•For category 2 count, only a subset of the Category 1 children who received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term. A history line with an "S" (summer school enrollment)flag is created for each summer enrollment for the Category 2 Count. The local sites enlist the assistance of recruiters to include the children who were age 3 through 21, who met program eligibility criteria, residents in our state for at least one day during performance period, served by summer term program, counted once per grade level, and those who were two years of age that turned three years old during the performance period. This was done at the local level by using the ERTC MAPS system to enter COE data as well as data that is required to answer CSPR questions. In addition, migrant students are reported by districts in the state's longitudinal data system during five state required reporting periods; which occur in October, December, February, June, and July or August depending on when the district's school year begins.

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)?

All migrant children who participate in statewide assessments are identified as eligible migrant children within the State's migrant specific database. All eligible migrant children within the State's migrant specific database are appropriately coded and reported as part of the migrant subgroup for State assessments. This process is accomplished through a process using multiple fields that are contained in both the migrant specific database and the State's database.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	133
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	50
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	50

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The overall response rate for the New Mexico re-interview was 37.6%. A total of 133 interviews were attempted; 50 interviews were completed. Of the 83 unsuccessful attempts, 55 children or youth had moved according to neighbors or other third party sources, 21 were not found after multiple attempts, and seven were not available. None declined to be interviewed.

Procedures	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	SY 2015-16
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

**FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESCORT reviewed the state's migrant-specific database in coordination with the SEA to ascertain the estimated numbers of migrant children residing in New Mexico. Due to low numbers of migrant children in the NM MEP, it was determined that the sample for this study would include the entire universe of 133 migrant children, ages 3 to 21, for whom a COE had been completed between September 1, 2014 and August 31, 2015. The interviews were conducted January 6-13, 2016, after the 2014/2015 school year reporting period had ended. On December 21, 2015, the SEA provided information to ESCORT on the universe of children whose eligibility was newly determined during the current year (September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2015) including demographic data (child's first and last name, qualifying arrival date (QAD), date of birth, grade, and district name). The SEA transmitted the information on an Excel spreadsheet to ESCORT via email communication using secured password protection. On this same day, ESCORT added a new column to the spreadsheet in order to assign re-interview numbers 1 to 133 to each sample, which was transmitted to the SEA via email communication using the same security protection.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since the entire universe of migrant children in the NM MEP were included, a random sampling replacement method was not used for the purposes of this study. The re-interview team was charged with attempting to contact each child in the universe.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The NM MEP 2014-2015 re-interview was conducted by an independent, external agency. Two out-of-state interviewers with experience in identification and recruitment (ID&R) were used to conduct the re-interviews of the randomly selected sample. None of the re-interviewers had any relationship with the NM MEP staff or the state's migrant families.

The interviews were conducted using a protocol and form that has been used by the external agency in other states for the same purpose. The forms were reviewed and accepted by the NM MEP.

Re-interviewers were instructed to complete the forms as if they were census takers - in other words, they would only enter the information provided by the family without making any eligibility determinations. After interviewing the families, they were to review the COE forms (kept in a re-interview binder) and ask clarifying questions to the families if necessary. After completing the interview, the re-interviewers were to place the re-interview form, COE, and any other additional notes in the binder without making an eligibility determination. This allowed re-interviewers to just collect the needed information without the pressure of making a determination at the time.

Local staff from the NM MEP was used during the re-interview to assist the out-of-state individuals in locating and introducing them to the families. Local staff was asked to avoid interfering with the re-interview process by not participating in the actual interview. If possible, they were asked to excuse themselves from where the interview was taking place. Local programs were informed on December 22, 2015 that entire universe (133) would be included in the sample.

Of the total re-interviews, 45 were conducted face-to-face, five were conducted over the phone.

Copies of all the completed forms, COEs and re-interviewer notes were sent to a review panel comprised of three ID&R experts. To ensure additional independence, none of the members of the review panel had any relationships with the re-interviewers or the staff from the NM MEP.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The 2014-15 external re-interview was conducted January 6-12, 2016. The external re-interview team conducted 50 interviews.

Depending on the final determinations, corrective actions may include:

- Removing not eligible children from the state's database
- Reviewing state policies and guidance that may be currently misinterpreted, causing a misidentification of children into the program
- Providing training to recruiters and COE reviewers to ensure the ID&R process result in migrant children being recruited in a proper and timely basis
- The IN MEP should examine practices for reviewing COEs before they are signed by the designated state COE reviewer. Forms should have all sections completed accurately. A review of incidences when comments are needed in the comments box would be beneficial (e.g., early moves, temporary work, previous history, etc.).
- The IN MEP should maintain the practice of conducting internal re-interviews in a continuous manner to ensure the accuracy of eligibility determinations.

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

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

### 2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

#### 2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	17
1	13
2	7
3	8
4	17
5	13
6	10
7	5
8	17
9	17
10	15
11	11
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	7
Total	163
<b>Comments:</b> The increase is due to the increase in enrollment and ongoing work with the sub grantees about the priority for services criteria.	

#### FAQ on priority for services:

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

**2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	32
1	24
2	21
3	26
4	31
5	21
6	24
7	19
8	29
9	25
10	11
11	10
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	7
Total	283
<b>Comments:</b> none	

**2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	1
1	3
2	2
3	4
4	2
5	3
6	6
7	1
8	1
9	3
10	2
11	2
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	38
<b>Comments:</b> none	



**2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	15
K	17
1	12
2	9
3	7
4	15
5	11
6	16
7	13
8	9
9	15
10	14
11	14
12	4
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	6
Total	177
<b>Comments:</b> none	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9
K	9
1	5
2	6
3	3
4	9
5	6
6	7
7	1
8	6
9	6
10	7
11	6
12	3
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>

**Comments:** The decrease is due to more families being identified during the summer that used to be identified during the school year. We have more recruiters working during the summer months than in the past.

**2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referrals During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	16
K	33
1	27
2	23
3	25
4	29
5	25
6	25
7	23
8	27
9	25
10	20
11	19
12	15
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	8
Total	340
<b>Comments:</b> none	

**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	S
9	S
10	S
11	4
12	7
Ungraded	
Total	18
<b>Comments:</b> none	

**FAQ on Dropouts:**

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

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

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

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	S
<b>Comments:</b> none	

### 2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

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

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

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

Do not include:

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

#### FAQ on Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	16
1	12
2	7
3	7
4	16
5	12
6	9
7	5
8	16
9	14
10	15
11	11
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	6
Total	151

**Comments:** The increase is due to the increase in enrollment and ongoing work with the sub grantees about the priority for services criteria.

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

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	1
1	1
2	0
3	0
4	1
5	1
6	2
7	1
8	1
9	2
10	1
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	13
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	20
K	41
1	35
2	30
3	31
4	38
5	32
6	31
7	26
8	34
9	32
10	24
11	20
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	410

**Comments:** We will identify the source of the difference between the two table for Out of School Youth and re-submit if necessary during the re-open phase.

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	17
1	13
2	7
3	8
4	17
5	13
6	10
7	5
8	17
9	17
10	15
11	11
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	7
Total	163

**Comments:** The increase is due to the increase in enrollment and ongoing work with the sub grantees about the priority for services criteria.



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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Continuation of Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	2
1	4
2	5
3	4
4	2
5	2
6	3
7	0
8	3
9	1
10	1
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	30
<b>Comments:</b> none	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	13
K	29
1	25
2	21
3	23
4	26
5	26
6	20
7	20
8	29
9	20
10	20
11	13
12	12
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	298
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2			////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4	4	////////////////////////////////////
K	5	4	////////////////////////////////////
1	8	7	////////////////////////////////////
2	6	6	////////////////////////////////////
3	5	4	////////////////////////////////////
4	5	3	////////////////////////////////////
5	5	3	////////////////////////////////////
6	6	6	////////////////////////////////////
7	2	2	////////////////////////////////////
8	4	4	////////////////////////////////////
9	4	3	
10	1	3	
11	1	1	
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	56	50	

**Comments:** The decrease in students receiving reading services is due to our state no longer being a member of the reading consortium. The increase in students receiving math services is due reviewing our state evaluation and noting that there are many more reading services in the districts available to migrant students through non migrant funds than math.

**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		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	20	
K	40	
1	34	
2	30	
3	30	
4	36	
5	30	
6	31	
7	26	
8	32	
9	31	
10	24	1
11	20	
12	15	
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	1	
Total	400	1
<b>Comments:</b> none		

#### 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	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> New Mexico is using a district service model. This explains why we do not have a number for schools that enrolled eligible migrant children.	

#### 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	
<b>Comments:</b> New Mexico does not consolidate MEP funds in SWP.	

**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		
Regular school year - school day/extended day		
Summer/intersession only		
Year round		
<b>Comments:</b> none		

**FAQs on type of MEP project:**

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

**2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data**

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

**2.3.8.1 MEP State Director**

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

<b>State Director FTE</b>	0.30
<b>Comments:</b> The MEP state director is fully funded from Title I-A funds.	

**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	3	3.00			3
Counselors					
Non-qualified paraprofessionals					
Qualified paraprofessionals	1	0.65			1
Recruiters	5	3.75			5
Records transfer staff	4	0.70			4
Administrators					
<b>Comments:</b> none					

**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		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	2	262
Adult corrections	1	365
Other	1	365
Total	4	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	2
Adult corrections	1
Other	1
Total	4
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1**

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	464	95	29
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	455	42	0

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	153	9	11
LEP Students	0	0	15	2	0

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	16	2	5
Asian	0	0	1	0	0
Black or African American	0	0	28	4	2
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	325	69	11
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	1	0	0
White	0	0	88	20	11
Two or more races	0	0	5	0	0
Total	0	0	464	95	29

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	409	88	13
Female	0	0	55	7	16
Total	0	0	464	95	29

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	2
7	0	0	0	0	2
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	1
10	0	0	0	0	1
11	0	0	0	0	2
12	0	0	0	0	1
13	0	0	9	0	3
14	0	0	22	0	2
15	0	0	36	0	7
16	0	0	74	0	5
17	0	0	147	0	3
18	0	0	110	3	0
19	0	0	41	22	0
20	0	0	25	70	0
21	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	464	95	29

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** The data are accurate.

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

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

**2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1**

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

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	0	0	220	15	29

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Subpart 1 sub-grantees are permitted to track student outcomes.

**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	0		0		98		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	0	0	0	0	64	9	12	S	S	S
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	0	0	22	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	0	0	0	0	463	85	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	0	0	S	13	73	S	S	S
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	0	0	0	0	36	5	S	S	S	S
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	0	0	0	0	115	10	9	S	S	S
Obtained employment	0	0	0	0	S	18	S	S	S	S

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The data are accurate.

**2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

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

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

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	9	11	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	40	S	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	33	S	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	47	14	S
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate.					

**FAQ on long-term students:**

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

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		0	8	S	0
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	45	6	0
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	54	0	0
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	22	18	0
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate.					

**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	14	110
Juvenile corrections	3	54
Other		
Total	17	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b>		

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

**2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2**

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	14
Juvenile corrections	3
Other	
Total	17
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2**

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	1,245	519	0
Total Long Term Students Served	0	0	65	87	0

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	175	46	0
LEP Students	0	0	109	0	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	117	86	0
Asian	0	0	3	2	0
Black or African American	0	0	69	15	0
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	771	233	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	285	182	0
Two or more races	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	0	1,245	519	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	912	239	0
Female	0	0	333	280	0
Total	0	0	1,245	519	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	1	1	0
9	0	0	1	1	0
10	0	0	3	0	0
11	0	0	2	3	0
12	0	0	16	38	0
13	0	0	52	67	0
14	0	0	121	86	0
15	0	0	209	130	0
16	0	0	299	103	0
17	0	0	380	73	0
18	0	0	103	13	0
19	0	0	53	2	0
20	0	0	5	2	0
21	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	1,245	519	0

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

--

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

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



**2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2**

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

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	0	0	100	32	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:**

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

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

**2.4.2.3.2 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					166		39			
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED	0	0	0	0	S	S	8	S	0	0
Obtained high school diploma	0	0	0	0	S	S	S	S	0	0
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	0	0	0	0	59	31	89	S	0	0
Enrolled in a GED program	0	0	0	0	S	S	S	S	0	0
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	0	0	0	0	S	S	S	S	0	0
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	0	0	0	0	9	S	S	S	0	0
Obtained employment	0	0	0	0	S	S	S	11	0	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** The data are accurate.

**2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2**

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

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

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	5	10	0
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	8	5	0
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	16	8	0
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	6	40	0
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term:**

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

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

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	S	8	S
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	9	7	S
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	15	7	S
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	0	0	7	30	S
<b>Comments:</b>					

**FAQ on long-term:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Purpose</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	
Parental involvement activities	
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	5
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has monitored the RLIS requirements through the application and reimbursement process. The improvement goals for RLIS districts are common to all districts and schools relative to meeting the goals and objectives of our ESEA Waiver. Within our web based improvement plan system we can filter plans for these goals based on the RLIS funding tag.

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

**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

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

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

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

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

<b>LEA Transferability of Funds</b>	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	29
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

<b>Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b># LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	29	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		29

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

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program</b>	<b>Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	1,192,486.00	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		1,192,486.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,192,486.00</b>	<b>1,192,486.00</b>
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

**2.11 GRADUATION RATES**<sup>4</sup>

This section collects graduation rates.

**2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates**

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

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

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	25,926	S	71.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,893	S	63
Asian or Pacific Islander	419	S	81
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	633	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	15,265	S	70.7
White	6,716	S	75.7
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	3,245	S	61.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,931	S	67.4
Economically disadvantaged students	15,700	S	66.9

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

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

The response is limited to 500 characters.

Graduation cohort uses the concept "Ever ELL" as well as "Ever SPED" over the four years of the cohort. For that reason the percentages exceed those of a single year. This figure is in keeping with prior cohort EL profiles of 26.5% (2015) and 28.1% (2014).

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

## 2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

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

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

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

#### 2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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



## 2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

### 2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

## 2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

### 2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

**Comments:**

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