

**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 2013-14

WASHINGTON



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2014
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2015

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

- 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) 2013-14 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 ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2013-14 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 18, 2014**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 13, 2015**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2013-14, 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 2013-14 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 2013-14 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 7/31/2015
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, 2013-14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2013-14		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:		
Address:		
		Person to contact about this report:
Name:		
Telephone:		
Fax:		
e-mail:		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):		
Signature _____		Date _____

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2013-14



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 13, 2015
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	21,693	11,726	54.05
4	21,241	11,061	52.07
5	20,670	11,436	55.33
6	11,154	6,135	55.00
7	9,402	4,235	45.04
8	8,712	3,814	43.78
High School	5,719	3,652	63.86
Total	98,591	52,059	52.80

Comments: Assessment data is going to be far lower than last year due to the pilot of the SBAC tests. For the students who took the SBAC, we do not have proficiency data.

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	21,692	13,951	64.31
4	21,311	12,903	60.55
5	20,693	12,957	62.62
6	11,147	7,037	63.13
7	9,404	5,032	53.51
8	8,701	5,287	60.76
High School	5,815	4,077	70.11
Total	98,763	61,244	62.01

Comments: Assessment data is going to be far lower than last year due to the pilot of the SBAC tests. For the students who took the SBAC, we do not have proficiency data.

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	6,108	4,087	66.91
4	6,308	4,072	64.55
5	5,892	3,799	64.48
6	2,834	1,943	68.56
7	1,790	930	51.96
8	1,796	886	49.33
High School	1,595	1,196	74.98
Total	26,323	16,913	64.25

Comments: Assessment data is going to be far lower than last year due to the pilot of the SBAC tests. For the students who took the SBAC, we do not have proficiency data.

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	6,105	4,617	75.63
4	6,311	4,597	72.84
5	5,891	4,372	74.21
6	2,838	2,076	73.15
7	1,796	1,115	62.08
8	1,797	1,258	70.01
High School	1,667	1,253	75.16
Total	26,405	19,288	73.05

Comments: Assessment data is going to be far lower than last year due to the pilot of the SBAC tests. For the students who took the SBAC, we do not have proficiency data.

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	24,226
Limited English proficient students	35,353
Students who are homeless	6,409
Migratory students	17,275
Comments: Districts reported and verified this data as part of their annual Title I Part A End of Year report.	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,098
Asian	20,616
Black or African American	24,458
Hispanic or Latino	135,611
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5,599
White	152,886
Two or more races	24,326
Total	371,594
Comments: Districts reported and verified this data as part of their annual Title I Part A End of Year report.	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	14	13,591	0	0	13,605
K	2,250	46,916	144	0	49,310
1	3,229	46,386	190	0	49,805
2	2,737	43,339	188	1	46,265
3	2,472	41,471	158	1	44,102
4	1,949	40,320	154	1	42,424
5	1,465	38,076	116	6	39,663
6	671	22,576	68	10	23,325
7	810	16,650	44	19	17,523
8	716	15,712	42	31	16,501
9	303	8,253	4	36	8,596
10	334	7,450	5	46	7,835
11	211	6,810	9	46	7,076
12	154	7,088	0	36	7,278
Ungraded	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	17,315	354,638	1,122	233	373,308

Comments: No students reported in Age 0-2.

No students reported for grades K-2 for Local neglected.

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

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

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

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

TAS instructional service	# Students Served
Mathematics	5,990
Reading/language arts	14,072
Science	42
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	0
Comments: No students reported for social studies, vocational/career, and other instructional services.	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	73
Supporting guidance/advocacy	214
Other support services	69
Comments: As reported by the district.	

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	181.61	
Paraprofessionals ¹	158.22	99.90
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0.00	
Clerical support staff	3.31	
Administrators (non-clerical)	7.97	
Comments: District did not report any staff in the "Other Paraprofessionals" category.		

FAQs on staff information

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

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	6,536.00	99.90
Comments:		

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2013 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (School Year 2013-14) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2013 (School Year 2013-14) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	201	85
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	49,743	3,248,953
Sum of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations	32,267,569	158,381,428
Percentage of LEA's FY 2013 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.15	2.05

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2013 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 2013–2014.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts reported activities such as;

- Childcare when necessary
- Transportation to parent meetings
- Training around the new assessment and common core
- Math night for parents
- Reading night for parents
- Training on parenting
- Title I meetings included required parent review of parent involvement policies, schoolwide plans, and other Title I requirements

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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. For example, a child who turns 3 during the performance period would only be performance in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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, 2012 - August 31, 2013), youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the 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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,801
K	1,724
1	2,080
2	2,102
3	2,023
4	1,941
5	1,846
6	1,813
7	1,930
8	1,923

9	1,841
10	1,861
11	1,670
12	2,444
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2,344
Total	30,343
Comments: Ungraded should be 0.	

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: Ungraded should be 0.

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	1,473
Comments: During the 2013-14 performance period, there was a 20.34% drop in the number of migrant students identified as migrant eligible for children birth through age 2 as compared to 2012-13 (1,849).	

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, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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)	128
K	217
1	239
2	248
3	210
4	234
5	135
6	115
7	79
8	140
9	122
10	172
11	157
12	33
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	2,229

Comments: Ungraded and out-of-school should be 0.

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

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

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014. 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	

Comments: There were 0 migrant students reported as being served during summer 2013-14.

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	<u>No</u>
MIS 2000	<u>No</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>No</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>Yes</u>
Washington State has developed its own migrant student database system called the Migrant Student Information System.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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:

- 1 The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- 1 Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- 1 Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- 1 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
- 1 Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A. The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Include two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.

An MSIS programmed algorithm accounts for the child's date of birth such that the child was at least three years of age and less than 22 years of age for at least one day of the performance period 9/1/2013 to 8/31/2014.

MEP staff made contact with migrant families either through a home visit, school contact or a phone call after September 1, 2013 and before August 31, 2014 for every child who was not enrolled in school to verify a child's residency. For every child who enrolled in school, MEP staff verified the child's residence via school attendance records. An enrollment date (residency date) is then recorded in the State's MSIS data system. The State's child count algorithm ensures that only children with an enrollment date (residency date) between September 1, 2013 and August 31, 2014 are included.

MEP staff run a report of every two-year old turning three. Once a two-year old turns three, a MEP recruiter makes contact with the family (either through a phone call or a home visit) to verify that the child was a resident in the state during the performance period and after she/he turned three. An out-of-school enrollment date (residency date) is then recorded in the State's MSIS data system. The State's child count algorithm ensure only children with an enrollment data (residency date) between September 1, 2013 and August 31, 2014 are included.

To ensure only unduplicated counts of eligible children are included in the state report, the State's MSIS database checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated wild card prompt. Potential duplicates are checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date, and parent's name. Any matches generate further review by MSIS data staff.

If a student record does not already exist for a student, the database creates a unique student identifier (USID) for him/her.

Once the student has a record in state MEP database, LOAs verify their unique child counts by using other MEP database reports, certificates of Eligibility (COEs), and local databases to eliminate any duplicates.

As part of the cleanup process and before the state takes a snapshot of its database for purposes of child count reporting, state MEP staff work with LOAs to review their student reports to ensure that all potential duplicates have been checked and any duplicates have been merged into a single student record.

B. Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of qualifying move, have a qualifying activity).

The MSIS programmed algorithm ensures only those migrant students who have met eligibility criteria are enrolled into the migrant student database system and are included in the state report for the reporting period September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014.

C. Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)

In addition to the ongoing face-to-face family interviews conducted by program recruiters to determine eligibility and complete Certificates of Eligibility, MEP staff made contact with migrant families either through a home visit, school contact or a phone call after September 1, 2013 and before August 31, 2014 for every child who was not enrolled in school to verify a child's residency. For every child who enrolled in school, MEP staff verified the child's residence via school attendance records. An enrollment date (residency date) is then recorded in the State's MSIS data system. The State's child count algorithm ensures that only children with an enrollment date (residency date) between September 1, 2013 and August 31, 2014 are included in the performance period.

D. Children who - in 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.

For each new or updated enrollment for a qualified child in the Category 1 Count, a history line with an associated enrollment into an identified summer school building is processed.

In order for a child to be counted in Category 2, he or she must meet the above criteria and migrant funded service flag associated with his/her history line during the corresponding child count reporting period. Additionally, in order to count a child for a summer service, the child must have turned three before receiving the service.

E. Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

To ensure only unduplicated counts of eligible children by age/grade level are included in the state report, the State's MSIS database checks for duplication based on the student's last name or similar last name by using a system-generated wild card prompt. Potential duplicates are checked against additional fields such as first name, birth date, and parent's name. Any matches generate further review by MSIS data staff.

If a student record does not already exist for a student, the database creates a unique student identifier (USID) for him/her.

Once the student has a record in state MEP database, LOAs verify their unique child counts by using other MEP database reports, certificates of Eligibility (COEs), and local databases to eliminate any duplicates.

As part of the cleanup process and before the state takes a snapshot of its database for purposes of child count reporting, state MEP staff work with LOAs to review their student reports to ensure that all potential duplicates have been checked and any duplicates have been merged into a single student record.

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)?

The migrant student database system provides data to the state database system at regular intervals to ensure all students that have been verified as eligible under Title I, Part C are cross-referenced with the state database for other state reporting purposes. This data is then used to generate information

and reports for other EdFacts submissions and data files.

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

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	<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/inter-session projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	<u>Yes</u>

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	120
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	116
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	112

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Non-response encountered during the re-interview process was due to family moving out of the area prior to their scheduled re-interview.

Procedures	Yes/No
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)?	<u>SY2013-14</u>
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.

Washington State Prospectus Re-Interview Process

SY 2013 - 2014

Objective:

- *Test 2013-14 eligibility determinations (NRG; B.6)
- *Re-interview 75 Migrant Education Program qualified families (NRG; B.8)
- *Random statewide sample or random sample within categories associated with identified risk factors (NRG; B.9)

*All migrant students 3-21 years of age who had a COE completed during the 2013-14 school-year to be eligible for re-interview (NRG; B.10)

Process:

Independent reviewer from Oregon State MEP was utilized to carry out Washington MEP re-interviews

Eligibility Re-Interview Questionnaire was utilized for all re-interviews

Washington families to be re-interviewed were selected based on:

Regular/Summer completion time-frame

Regular school-year term completed COEs were clustered into ESD regions

Summer school-year term COEs were clustered according to east/west side of state due to distance between migrant summer camps and large influx of migrant families within a short time frame.

Percentages of COEs to be reviewed within each ESD region reflect the approximate COE completion rate of previous (2012-13) school-year

School Size

Large/medium/small schools were selected
 Staff Experience
 New/Veteran staff were reviewed
 Activities identified
 Agriculture and fishing activities were reviewed
 Temporary and seasonal activities were reviewed
 COE Selection Process

A total of 7,650 COEs were completed during the 2012-13 school-year. The approximate percentage of COEs complete within reach designated region and regular/summer school time frame was used to identify the number of COEs to be reviewed.

Using the "cluster approach" MSIS database was utilized to select families using the following criteria:

Families were randomly selected;

Only families who have had a COE completed within the 2013-14 school-year were selected;

For every family selected to be reviewed, two additional families within the same locale were selected to be used as replacements if necessary; and

Only families who show a current enrollment were selected.

Regular school-year term re-Interviews were broken down in the following sequence according to approximate percentage of COEs completed in the 2012-13 regular school-year term.

ESD 105 (Yakima Region) 40%
 24 COEs Reviewed
 ESD 123 (Pasco Region) 21%
 12 COEs Reviewed
 ESD 171 (Wenatchee Region) 22%
 13 COEs Reviewed
 ESD 189 (Anacortes Region) 17%
 10 COEs Reviewed

Summer school-year term re-Interviews will broken down in the following sequence according to the approximate percentage of COEs completed in the 2012-13 summer school-year term.

West side of the state 21%
 3 COEs Reviewed

East side of the state 79%
 13 COEs Reviewed

Regular School Year Re-Interview Schedule

- ESD 105—October and February
- ESD 123—November
- ESD 171—March
- ESD 189—April/June

Summer Re-Interview Schedule

- West side—June
- East side—July

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For every family selected to be reviewed, two additional families within the same locale were selected to be used as replacements if necessary.

Sample Size
 75 COEs Reviewed
 150 Replacement COEs Selected
 Total Sample Size 225

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Washington State Migrant Education Program has established a re-interview reciprocity process between Washington and Oregon's Migrant Education Program. Oregon's Migrant Education Program provides a veteran and well-trained Identification and Recruitment staff member complete Washington's independent re-interviews.

Using the MSIS student database, migrant students were randomly selected across the state and the independent interviewer scheduled face-to-face visits to interview the families to verify whether the original Certificate of Eligibility completed for the students was valid.

75 migrant families were selected to be re-interviewed during the 2013-14 performance period (see next section for reinterview process and results).

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.

Re-Interview Results

Regular School-Year Results

- o 59 Re-Interviewed
- o 56 Eligible
- o 3 Not Eligible
- o 2 COEs completed were found ineligible as the move was for housing purposes
- o 1 COE completed was found to be ineligible as the kids traveled for vacation purposes

Summer School-Year Results

- o 16 Re-Interviewed
- o 16 Eligible
- o 0 Not Eligible

Re-interview results were used as a framework for your August and Spring recruiter academies. At these academies sessions, extra emphasis was placed on moving for housing and vacation purposes and not qualifying such families. In addition, WA MEP recruitment training staff sent weekly emails and quarterly newsletter. In this communication, interviewing tips and eligibility scenarios are communicated to address concerns brought to light through the re-interviews. In addition, any recruiter who was found to have inaccurately completed a COE will have additional COEs reviewed in the 2014-15 school-year.

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	6
1	158
2	241
3	228
4	209
5	203
6	225
7	238
8	240
9	233
10	282
11	270
12	272
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	2
Total	2,807
Comments:	

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	768
1	1,596
2	1,588
3	1,395
4	1,242
5	1,024
6	860
7	778
8	709
9	611
10	524
11	444
12	553
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	3
Total	12,095
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	9
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61
K	89
1	115
2	145
3	143
4	130
5	151
6	146
7	145
8	138
9	152
10	133
11	93
12	145
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1,795
Comments:	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2014 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	932
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,100
K	569
1	604
2	562
3	583
4	549
5	533
6	484
7	510
8	557
9	494
10	483
11	369
12	353
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1,847
Total	10,529
Comments:	

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2013-14 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	442
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	555
K	347
1	358
2	322
3	328
4	286
5	278
6	255
7	272
8	299
9	256
10	253
11	185
12	180
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	387
Total	5,003

Comments: In accordance with File Specification C121, the total reflects "mobility status - 12 months."

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	4
1	5
2	7
3	5
4	4
5	9
6	2
7	4
8	10
9	21
10	18
11	11
12	33
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	140

Comments: Migrant Education Program staff continue to emphasize the need to report referrals resulting in migrant children receiving educational and educationally related services funded by non-MEP programs/organizations. This has resulted in an increase from 2012-13 reporting.

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	39
8	46
9	77
10	83
11	116
12	154
Ungraded	
Total	515
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2012-13 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	5
Comments: The number of migrant students reported as receiving a High School Equivalency Diploma dropped from 19 in 12-13 to 5 in 13-14. This decrease will be reviewed as part of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process the state will be conducting during the 2015-16 program period.	

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)).

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2 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	
K	6
1	55
2	95
3	92
4	80
5	83
6	93
7	146
8	157
9	158
10	178
11	161
12	181
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1,485

Comments: Upon further review of data submitted in February, the query conducted under File Specification C192 used incorrect definitions. After updating the definitions and re-running the data, the updated figures more closely match the data submitted in previous performance periods.

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	
K	0
1	14
2	43
3	41
4	38
5	36
6	21
7	40
8	46
9	47
10	38
11	51
12	21
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	436

Comments: Upon review of the data submitted in February, it was discovered the data query was incorrect. The total number of PFS students served in Summer was actually 436. An increase of 15 students from previous school year.

Upon further review of data submitted in February, the query conducted under File Specification C192 identified more migrant students reported as receiving MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term than what was under 2.3.2.1 (File Specification C121). The updated query has adjusted the number of students reported as receiving MEP-Funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term and is more in alignment with student reported during the 2012-13 performance period.

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	153
K	553
1	659
2	702
3	615
4	602
5	528
6	627
7	740
8	740
9	804
10	796
11	802
12	1,172
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	6
Total	9,499
Comments:	

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5	0
K	6
1	61
2	119
3	115
4	99
5	100
6	118
7	163
8	175
9	177
10	186
11	176
12	188
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	1,683

Comments: Upon further review of data submitted in February, the query conducted under File Specification C054 identified 13 K PFS students reported as receiving MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period which was larger than the count (6) reported as PFS During the Performance Period under 2.3.2.1 (File Specification C121). The updated query indicates 6 K-migrant students received MEP-Funded instructional or support services during the performance period.

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the performance period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2
K	0
1	0
2	3
3	1
4	3
5	1
6	0
7	0
8	3
9	1
10	2
11	5
12	9
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	30
Comments:	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	150
K	512
1	584
2	628
3	530
4	528
5	427
6	330
7	362
8	259
9	188
10	309
11	394
12	602
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	5,803
Comments:	

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)			////////////////////////////////////
K	14	32	////////////////////////////////////
1	16	33	////////////////////////////////////
2	29	32	////////////////////////////////////
3	56	35	////////////////////////////////////
4	49	33	////////////////////////////////////
5	33	23	////////////////////////////////////
6	13	28	////////////////////////////////////
7	23	37	////////////////////////////////////
8	8	30	////////////////////////////////////
9	25	13	10
10	30	10	34
11	30	9	57
12	39	6	49
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	365	321	150
Comments:			

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

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

2.3.5.3.2 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)	32	23
K	59	37
1	110	67
2	104	59
3	122	67
4	113	56
5	134	87
6	359	244
7	466	339
8	549	450
9	701	665
10	668	645
11	615	581
12	884	854
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	10	
Total	4,926	4,174

Comments: The program funded positions of Graduation Specialist and Student Advocates work with school counselors, teachers, and other staff to provide counseling services that better identify and enhance the migrant students education, personal, or occupational potential. These positions facilitate activities between students and counselors, student-to-student engagement, and between students and other staff members. A primary goal of these positions is to help guide the student to become a self-advocate but also assist in navigating the school system, especially highly-mobile migrant students who may not be familiar with graduation requirements and planning beyond high school. During the performance period, there were 28 (17.4338 FTE) graduation specialists and 22 (7.483 FTE) student advocates paid with program funds.

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	390
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	26,066
Comments:	

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

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: There were no migrant program funds consolidated into a Title I, Part A Schoolwide Program.	

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 participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	9	686
Regular school year - school day/extended day	13	4,866
Summer/intersession only	5	601
Year round	47	26,468
Comments: More schools moved to a year-round model providing services during both the regular and summer/intersession term.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	0.50
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.8.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	43	7.52	159	12.62	
Counselors	0	0.00	2	0.07	
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	36	7.50	54	2.20	90
Qualified paraprofessionals	146	36.00	52	2.60	198
Recruiters	78	26.39	6	0.25	
Records transfer staff	60	18.48	8	0.31	
Administrators	35	6.09	28	1.55	
Comments: Regular year qualified parapro should be 36.5314 FTE					

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	12	124
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	4	98
Total	16	////////////////////
Comments: No programs for Neglected, Juvenile detention or Adult Corrections receive funding in WA in subpart 1		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	12
Adult Corrections	0
Other	4
Total	16
Comments: No programs for Neglected, Juvenile detention or Adult Corrections receive funding in WA in subpart 1	

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			989		1,445
Total Long Term Students Served			297		585

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)			215		349
LEP Students			31		115

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native			57		64
Asian			16		77
Black or African American			212		485
Hispanic or Latino			213		372
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			25		25
White			429		361
Two or more races			37		61
Total			989		1,445

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			903		938
Female			86		507
Total			989		1,445

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		0
6			0		0
7			0		0
8			0		0
9			0		0
10			0		0
11			1		1
12			4		3
13			11		7
14			52		51
15			114		169
16			228		294
17			272		370
18			233		254
19			56		162
20			18		80
21			0		54
Total			989		1,445

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: No programs for Neglected, Juvenile detention or Adult Corrections receive funding in WA in subpart 1
--

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

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

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)			yes		yes
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			599		1,061

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: No programs for Neglected, Juvenile detention or Adult Corrections receive funding in WA subpart 1

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 table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next 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 counted once in each column separately as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	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
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school	//////////		//////////		//////////	247	//////////		//////////	362
Earned high school course credits					898	2			1,039	36
Enrolled in a GED program					192	5			205	6
Earned a GED					61	1			46	2
Obtained high school diploma					18	1			89	4
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					30	8			16	1
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					338	21			405	38
Obtained employment					143	25			212	1

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: No programs for Neglected, Juvenile detention or Adult Corrections receive funding in WA subpart 1

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, 2013, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			46		62
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			26		45
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			47		42
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			101		101
Comments: No programs for Neglected, Juvenile detention or Adult Corrections receive funding in WA in subpart 1					

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, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			49		51
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			21		44
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			50		54
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			106		86
Comments: No programs for Neglected, Juvenile detention or Adult Corrections receive funding in WA in subpart 1					

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	25	69
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	22	9
Juvenile corrections	4	64
Other	0	0
Total	51	////////////////////
Comments: No Neglected or Other programs served in WA in subpart 2		

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	25
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	22
Juvenile corrections	4
Other	0
Total	51
Comments: No Neglected or Other programs served in WA in subpart 2	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,230		4,926	519	
Total Long Term Students Served	400		142	98	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	219		1,164	126	
LEP Students	46		209	2	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	55		302	133	
Asian	14		64	7	
Black or African American	99		1,068	35	
Hispanic or Latino	339		716	92	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	19		85	4	
White	611		2,293	223	
Two or more races	93		398	25	
Total	1,230		4,926	519	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	838		3,445	328	
Female	392		1,481	191	
Total	1,230		4,926	519	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	0		0	0	
6	8		0	0	
7	3		0	0	
8	5		0	0	
9	1		0	0	
10	6		3	0	
11	9		11	0	
12	52		78	0	
13	80		260	12	
14	86		585	40	
15	132		941	103	
16	278		1,274	193	
17	317		1,412	156	
18	163		333	13	
19	55		16	2	
20	28		13	0	
21	7		0	0	
Total	1,230		4,926	519	

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

No Neglected or Other programs served in WA in subpart 2
--

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

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

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	yes		yes	yes	
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	1,018		2,708	509	

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: No Neglected or Other programs served in WA in subpart 2

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

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

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

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next 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 counted once in each column separately as appropriate. For "Enrolled in their local district school" use the "90 days after exit" columns to provide the number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school after exit.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
	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
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school	//////////	294	//////////		//////////	2,467	//////////	260	//////////	
Earned high school course credits	215	425			2,124	172	460	37		
Enrolled in a GED program	171	118			121	72	31	5		
Earned a GED	19	38			10	27	5	1		
Obtained high school diploma	21	50			2	11	1	1		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	81	22		0		16	1	1		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	87	98			467	325	90	8		
Obtained employment	76	84			8	31	0	2		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: No Neglected or Other programs served in WA in subpart 2

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2013, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	36		8	2	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	123		14	11	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	21		24	2	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	28		17	37	
Comments: No Neglected or Other programs served in WA in subpart 2					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

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

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	41		5	4	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	112		15	10	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	33		16	11	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	36		31	27	
Comments: No Neglected or Other programs served in WA in subpart 2					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	5
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	27
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	21
Parental involvement activities	11
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	16
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	25
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	20
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This year, 41 LEAs were eligible for RLIS grant awards. Each LEA receiving a grant award formally adopted the five ESEA Performance Goals and identified three top priorities for increasing student achievement. These priorities were based on each LEA's strategic school improvement plan and were consistent with the ESEA Performance Goals.

Of the recipients:

- 75 percent of the LEAs utilized some portion of RLIS funding for teacher professional development activities.
- 69 percent of the LEAs utilized some portion of RLIS funding for Title I, A authorized activities.
- 58 percent of the LEAs utilized some portion of RLIS funding for educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, D.
- 55 percent of the LEAs utilized some portion of RLIS funding for Title III activities.
- 50 percent of the LEAs utilized some portion of RLIS funding for Safe and Drug Free Schools activities.
- 33 percent of the LEAs utilized some portion of RLIS funding for parental involvement activities.

Consistent with last year, the majority of eligible LEAs have shown gains in the percentage of students scoring proficient or above on state testing in reading and mathematics in 3rd, 4th, and 10th grades. The gains made in these small, rural, and high-poverty LEAs are in large part attributable to the funding support provided through the RLIS grant awards. The ability for districts to support teachers, implement targeted and schoolwide interventions that might otherwise be too costly, and improve access to technology is a significant impact on the success of students in these LEAs.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

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

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2013-14?	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	0
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2013 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

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

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2013-14). 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. 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	Graduation Rate
All Students	77.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	53.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	84.30
<i>Asian</i>	86.50
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	64.60
Black or African American	67.80
Hispanic or Latino	67.30
White	80.50
Two or more races	75.50
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	55.70
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	53.70
Economically disadvantaged students	66.40

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Your instructions don't necessarily align with the data that you pre-populated for our state. Your instructions are as follows:

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 2013-14). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

However, you pre-populated this screen with data from our 4 Year Adjusted Cohort file, and we are approved to use the 5 Year Adjusted Cohort data for accountability. The data presented is correct, it just isn't what we use for accountability.

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

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

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

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools⁵ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

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

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁶ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 : 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 2014-15 (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.

⁶ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools ⁷ with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2014-15 :

Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

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

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

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

⁷ The definitions of reward, priority, and focus schools are provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>.

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (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))⁸
- | 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.

⁸ 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 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

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

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

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 action⁹ under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2014-15: 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 2014-15 (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.

⁹ 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>.