

**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 2016-17

NORTH CAROLINA



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018

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) 2016-17 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 2016-17, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2016-17 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2016-17		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: North Carolina		
Address: 301 North Wilmington Street Raleigh, NC 267602		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Karl Pond		
Telephone: 919-807-3241		
Fax: 919-807-4000		
e-mail: karl.pond@dpi.nc.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mark Johnson		
		<u>Wednesday, February 7, 2018, 11:07:46 AM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 15, 2018
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	84,772	38,846	45.82
4	84,695	37,208	43.93
5	80,884	38,070	47.07
6	42,736	14,851	34.75
7	35,173	10,589	30.11
8	37,936	10,358	27.30
High School	8,384	2,203	26.28
Total	374,580	152,125	40.61
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	84,748	32,804	38.71
4	84,696	30,941	36.53
5	80,884	28,341	35.04
6	42,746	16,934	39.62
7	35,179	13,057	37.12
8	37,930	11,656	30.73
High School	8,596	2,866	33.34
Total	374,779	136,599	36.45
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,863	1,805	63.05
4	2,609	1,687	64.66
5	2,637	1,757	66.63
6	1,761	954	54.17
7	1,569	826	52.64
8	1,405	687	48.90
High School	657	316	48.10
Total	13,501	8,032	59.49

Comments:

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	2,862	1,810	63.24
4	2,609	1,597	61.21
5	2,636	1,548	58.73
6	1,762	1,148	65.15
7	1,566	979	62.52
8	1,405	799	56.87
High School	685	439	64.09
Total	13,525	8,320	61.52

Comments:

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	97,135
Limited English proficient students	67,404
Students who are homeless	17,145
Migratory students	2,235
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	12,583
Asian	13,689
Black or African American	227,770
Hispanic or Latino	151,633
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,083
White	267,354
Two or more races	30,843
Total	704,955
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	1,180	0	6	1,186
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	19,149	3	13	19,165
K	306	84,398	85	20	84,809
1	419	85,945	85	29	86,478
2	451	87,722	63	30	88,266
3	500	88,702	70	35	89,307
4	375	88,420	56	39	88,890
5	233	84,494	58	49	84,834
6	140	45,523	41	58	45,762
7	131	37,566	42	76	37,815
8	94	40,509	40	75	40,718
9	49	12,609	12	165	12,835
10	27	10,369	6	103	10,505
11	6	8,128	9	75	8,218
12	8	8,095	4	60	8,167
Ungraded	0	0	0	22	22
TOTALS	2,739	702,809	574	855	706,977
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	1,413
Reading/language arts	2,009
Science	9
Social studies	0
Vocational/career	0
Other instructional services	0
Comments:	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	2,298
Other support services	51
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	16.27	
Paraprofessionals ¹	13.71	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	3.94	
Clerical support staff	0.00	
Administrators (non-clerical)	0.00	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

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

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	631.29	100.00
Comments:		

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2016 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) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	185	103
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	116,954	6,332,241
Sum of LEAs' FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocations	13,004,844	391,523,957
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.90	1.62

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2016 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 2016-17.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. 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

Report a child in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule. The first exception to this rule is a child who turns 3 during the performance period would be reported as "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)," **only if the child's residency in the state was verified after the child turned three.** The second exception to this rule may be a child who turns 22 years of age during the performance period, who would be reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. 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 implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls 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 disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions 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 State has taken action to ensure that 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, youth who are working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness).
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	323
K	348
1	349
2	321
3	320
4	294
5	265
6	231
7	214
8	221
9	229
10	207
11	159
12	165

Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1,076
Total	4,722

Comments: Decline in numbers is 13%. This decline can be explained by a variety of reasons.

- 1) Several counties in southeastern part of North Carolina were devastated by Hurricane Matthew. The southeast contains the majority of NC Migrant Education Programs (MEPs) largest LEA-based programs. The storm hit during the normal sweet potato harvest time. Due to a particularly rainy season in September, there was no chance to begin the harvest before Matthew arrived. There was a \$400 million loss in field crops in North Carolina due to the storm. After the storm, there was little work available and many families were displaced due to damage to their homes or camps. This lack of housing and loss of crops also discouraged many families from migrating to NC during 2016.
- 2) Our largest LEA-based program, in Bladen County and three other "blueberry" counties (Sampson, Pender, and Duplin) lost children due to a highly shortened blueberry season. A late freeze ruined much of the blueberry crop. Many families skipped North Carolina when they migrated or came and only stayed for a couple of weeks after realizing that there was little work available. This was evidenced by Bladen County's normally large two-school summer program having to consolidate into one school due to low student enrollment.
- 3) There continues to be a shift to hire H-2A workers instead of families. Our largest LEA-based program county has seen all but two of its ten largest labor camps transition from family housing to H-2A housing. This trend is statewide, as the number of H-2A jobs certified in North Carolina increased by 14% from SY2015 to SY2016. This trend has caused a shift in program demographics as programs begin to see more out-of-school youth (OSY) and fewer children under 16.

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Decline in numbers is 13%. This decline can be explained by a variety of reasons.

- 1) Several counties in southeastern part of North Carolina were devastated by Hurricane Matthew. The southeast contains the majority of NC Migrant Education Programs (MEPs) largest LEA-based programs. The storm hit during the normal sweet potato harvest time. Due to a particularly rainy season in September, there was no chance to begin the harvest before Matthew arrived. There was a \$400 million loss in field crops in North Carolina due to the storm. After the storm, there was little work available and many families were displaced due to damage to their homes or camps. This lack of housing and loss of crops also discouraged many families from migrating to NC during 2016.
- 2) Our largest LEA-based program, in Bladen County and three other "blueberry" counties (Sampson, Pender, and Duplin) lost children due to a highly shortened blueberry season. A late freeze ruined much of the blueberry crop. Many families skipped North Carolina when they migrated or came and only stayed for a couple of weeks after realizing that there was little work available. This was evidenced by Bladen County's normally large two-school summer program having to consolidate into one school due to low student enrollment.
- 3) There continues to be a shift to hire H-2A workers instead of families. Our largest LEA-based program county has seen all but two of its ten largest labor camps transition from family housing to H-2A housing. This trend is statewide, as the number of H-2A jobs certified in North Carolina increased by 14% from SY2015 to SY2016. This trend has caused a shift in program demographics as programs begin to see more out-of-school youth (OSY) and fewer children under 16.

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, 2016 through August 31, 2017.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	193
Comments:	

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

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, 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 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)	132
K	165
1	176
2	158
3	172
4	167
5	140
6	127
7	127
8	122
9	114
10	110
11	90
12	52
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	318
Total	2,170
Comments:	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Decline in numbers is 11% for this count. This is reflective of the overall A1 decrease of 13%; therefore, the narratives provided in 2.3.1.1.1 address this decline as well

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, 2016 through August 31, 2017. 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	42
Comments:	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21, are accounted for in the performance period. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- | The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- | Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- | Children who-in the case of Category 2-were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- | Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- | Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migrant student database.

The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children includes children and youth ages 3-21. The student's age must be between 3 and 21 years during the reporting year. Children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three during the program year are also included, along with those students who reach their 22nd birthday within the program year (i.e., 09/01/16-08/31/17).

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

A child will be counted if they turn 3 or 22 during the reporting period and meet the program eligibility criteria (e.g., are within 36 months of a last qualifying move and had a qualifying activity). The End of Eligibility date must be greater than the beginning of the reporting period. The Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) must be equal to or greater than 09/01/13 and be within 36 months of the Residency date.

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

A child will be counted in the A1 count if the QAD plus 36 months is equal or greater than the beginning of the reporting period and if any of the following dates falls within the reporting range period 09/01/16 to 08/31/17: Enroll Date, Withdraw Date, Supplemental Program Start Date, or Supplemental Program End Date. The interview date must also be before or equal to the last date of the reporting period.

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

Students who were residents in North Carolina for at least one day during the reporting period (09/01/16-08/31/17) and who have activity in PowerSchool in any of the fields listed above will be counted in the Category 1 count.

For this purpose, the reporting period for the A1 count and for Intersession in the A2 count goes from 09/01/16 to 08/31/17. The reporting period for summer in the A2 count goes from 06/16/17 to 08/31/17. A child will be counted in the A2 count if, in addition to the criteria for the A1 count, the child's end of eligibility is equal to or greater than the beginning of the summer program (defined as 06/16/17) and if the child's summer services were paid in whole or part with MEP funds.

For a child to be counted in Category 2 count the "enrollment type" must be summer. Summer participants are defined as children receiving supplemental programs as supportive services or instructional programs provided by the local MEP during 06/16-08/31. At least one service must be paid in whole or in part with migrant funds. For a child with summer "enrollment type" to be counted, one of the following dates must fall within the specified summer time frame (06/16 to 08/31): Enroll Date, Withdraw Date, Supplemental Program Start Date, or Supplemental Program End Date. Students must have been residents in North Carolina for at least one day and have been eligible during the summer/intersession reporting period and have received at least one supplemental service for at least one day during the summer/intersession reporting period. PowerSchool must confirm activity in any of the field named above for children to be counted in Category 2.

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

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

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

- 1) We conduct an enrollment verification process twice per year (during September and June) in which each child's home is visited by a local, regional, or state-level MEP staff member to verify residence in the state. The state's enrollment methodology also ensures that only students with a residency date between September 1, 2016 and August 31, 2017 are included in the Category 1 child count. The enrollment process also avoids duplicate students by having as its first step the investigation of the Unique PowerSchool ID to ensure that there is only one PowerSchool ID per child. During our initial PowerSchool use, we found that historically imported data (from old MIS2000 files) generated numerous duplicates, but we have removed those, and the newly entered data has resulted in few to no duplicates.
- 2) For the C-122 count, we again enter data on student services received during the summer into the PowerSchool system, which is the same database as for all students (including OSY and Pre-K children) throughout the state.

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

Student data is uploaded from LEAs and Regional Recruiters to a secure server maintained at DPI. It is the highly secure accountability server. The Migrant Data Specialists then retrieve the data forms (COEs, Service Reports, or Enrollment Verification Reports) and enter data into PowerSchool. There is a maximum of ten calendar days that may occur between MEP enrollment and entry into the PowerSchool system. The PowerSchool record can then be reviewed by the Data Specialist or State staff after it has been created or modified. Data Specialists and State staff will be using the same system of

periodic review of data quality by checking several reports (Migrant Services, A1, Coe Up-to-Date) that are either generated within PowerSchool or extracted from PowerSchool.

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

- 1) We conduct an enrollment verification process twice per year (during September and June) in which each child's home is visited by a local, regional, or state-level MEP staff member to verify residence in the state. The state's enrollment methodology also ensures that only students with a residency date between September 1, 2016 and August 31, 2017 are included in the Category 1 child count. The enrollment process also avoids duplicate students by having as its first step the investigation of the Unique PowerSchool ID to ensure that there is only one PowerSchool ID per child. During our initial PowerSchool use, we found that historically imported data (from old MIS2000 files) generated numerous duplicates, but we have removed those, and the newly entered data has resulted in few to no duplicates.
- 2) For the C-122 count, we again enter data on student services received during the summer into the PowerSchool system, which is the same database as for all students (including OSY and Pre-K children) throughout the state.

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	(Yes/No)
---	-----------------

Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- 1) The NC MEP Administrators review all near matches that are placed on the MSIX worklist and makes a determination to split or merge the records. There continues to be an ongoing issue with the worklist creating an error when a split or merge request is made. This continues to be communicated to DeLoitte (since 04/16), and they are attempting to resolve the issue. When near matches are being resolved in MSIX, if it appears that the near match has originated within our PowerSchool system, the regional Data Specialists are sent an e-mail to correct the error within PowerSchool.
- 2) In some cases, during the worklist process, spelling discrepancies are noted between NC and other states. Normally, our NC MEP Administrators communicate the discrepancy to the other state to decide how it will be resolved.
- 3) The NC MEP Administrators run the following MSIX reports: Data Quality, Data Completeness, and Potential Duplicates. We also compare NC data to National Data in an attempt to understand if a particular minimum data element (MDE) is problematic only for NC or for other states.
- 4) We make frequent (at least once per week) use of the "alert" feature on the Consolidated Record to inform our sister states when a student has arrived or is leaving. This has been an extremely useful feature of MSIX.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

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

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

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	210
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	188
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	188

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Non-responses were primarily due to families having moved prior to the re-interview dates, which took place approximately one month later than planned due to schedule conflicts with South Carolina re-interviewers. Many families also left counties early due to a failed blueberry crop and/or lack of affordable housing. Additionally, many of the phone numbers on the original COEs had either changed or been disconnected.

Procedures For Independent Prospective Re-Interviews	
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)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	SY 2016-17
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

Comment:

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

- 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. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Three stratified random samples were created in Excel to allow for representation of all LEAs, large and small. The LEAs were grouped into three strata: small programs (<75 students in MEP), medium programs (76-250 students in MEP), and large programs (>251 students in MEP). An average of 2-3 COEs were selected for small LEAs, 3-5 COEs for medium LEAs, and 5-7 COEs for large LEAs. There was a minimum of two backup lists for each group due to the possibility that families may have moved or be otherwise unreachable.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17 .

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Re-interviewers from South Carolina were accompanied by the NC MEP Administrator or a local recruiter, who guided them to each family's house. The NC staff did not participate in the re-interview but served to introduce the SC re-interviewer to the migratory youth or family. The re-interviews took place in the family's homes or at MEP centers in some LEAs. NC MEP staff were not present when the re-interviewer began the re-interview. Additionally, re-interviewers conducted many re-interviews by telephone since many families or students were at work or otherwise unavailable to meet in person. Refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations. The error rate for students determined to be ineligible for the program was 0%. No students needed to be withdrawn from the program. The error rate for minor changes on COEs was 44.7%. In 17.9% of cases, a new COE needed to be written due to moves since the original qualification. The SEA will provide further trainings to make sure that qualifying arrival dates and qualifying work activities are correctly recorded by recruiters. Families should be provided with copies of COEs so that they can check them and alert the recruiter to any incorrect information. The NC MEP Administrators will determine where trainings and re-trainings need to occur due to higher discrepancy rates. Additionally, all recruiters will now be required to attend biannual regional ID&R trainings instead of relying on short presentations given at Service Area Meetings in the past. Regional Data Specialists will also receive mandatory training/re-training on eligibility requirements and COE review in order to help recruiters and reviewers identify errors on COEs that they submit. 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.

N/A

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

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

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	25
1	68
2	57
3	59
4	50
5	48
6	36
7	44
8	42
9	44
10	35
11	24
12	17
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	553

Comments: C121 no longer includes the OOS count in the PFS category set (Cat Set B), the C121 count will not match the C054 and C192 count. C054 and C192 still include OOS in the PFS count.

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)	1
K	68
1	214
2	188
3	206
4	171
5	85
6	86
7	70
8	80
9	86
10	71
11	60
12	37
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1,423
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	15
1	20
2	14
3	24
4	34
5	17
6	19
7	17
8	10
9	3
10	12
11	5
12	5
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	203
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, 2017 (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	133
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	131
K	161
1	107
2	99
3	102
4	76
5	98
6	55
7	72
8	69
9	82
10	59
11	47
12	28
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	524
Total	1,843
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 2016-17 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	80
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	78
K	126
1	77
2	65
3	59
4	48
5	56
6	32
7	39
8	35
9	47
10	33
11	12
12	14
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	303
Total	1,104

Comments:**FAQ on Regular School Year:**

How is "regular school year" defined? For schools that operate on a traditional calendar, the regular school year is the period from the beginning of school in the State in the fall to the end in the spring, generally from September to June. For schools that operate on a year-round schedule without a traditional long summer break, the regular school term is the aggregate of all those periods throughout the year when the school (or part of the school) is in session providing the annual amount of instruction analogous to the traditional school-year regular term.

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	21
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	49
K	38
1	32
2	36
3	31
4	33
5	37
6	18
7	11
8	16
9	17
10	23
11	10
12	18
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	47
Total	437

Comments: The number of referrals continues to increase in NC due to continued staff training in how to designate a referral service during two regional trainings in October and March of 2016-2017. NC MEP also continues to bring in several community agencies at regional meetings to introduce their services. Consequently, referrals to those agencies subsequently increased. Increasing the number of community partnerships has allowed us to increase services through referrals.

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	0
8	1
9	8
10	6
11	4
12	0
Ungraded	0
Total	19
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropouts" defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2016-17 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2017-18) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another school district, private school or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), (b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or (c) death. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2016-17 performance period should not be reported in this item.

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	4
Comments:	

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.
- ▮ Migrant children who are not included in your State's Category I or Category II child counts because they did not reside in your State for at least one day during the performance period (e.g., interstate collaboration), but who were eligible in another State and received instructional services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds in your State. If you report such children, please provide an explanatory comment in the comment box for each relevant CSPR question.

Do not include:

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	12
1	30
2	21
3	20
4	15
5	16
6	7
7	11
8	12
9	13
10	9
11	3
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	16
Total	191

Comments: C121 no longer includes the OOS count in the PFS category set (Cat Set B), the C121 count will not match the C054 and C192 count. C054 and C192 still include OOS in the PFS count.

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	13
1	38
2	36
3	39
4	35
5	32
6	29
7	33
8	30
9	31
10	26
11	21
12	12
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	25
Total	403

Comments: C121 no longer includes the OOS count in the PFS category set (Cat Set B), the C121 count will not match the C054 and C192 count. C054 and C192 still include OOS in the PFS count.

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	71
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	221
K	266
1	288
2	264
3	271
4	247
5	230
6	191
7	195
8	206
9	191
10	154
11	125
12	124
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	691
Total	3,735
Comments:	

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	33
1	70
2	53
3	61
4	48
5	47
6	36
7	44
8	46
9	43
10	28
11	22
12	17
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	42
Total	594

Comments: C121 no longer includes the OOS count in the PFS category set (Cat Set B), the C121 count will not match the C054 and C192 count. C054 and C192 still include OOS in the PFS count.

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)	0
K	3
1	2
2	4
3	2
4	3
5	1
6	1
7	1
8	0
9	3
10	3
11	8
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	37
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	18
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	109
K	174
1	206
2	203
3	214
4	183
5	173
6	134
7	140
8	138
9	129
10	111
11	85
12	104
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	342
Total	2,463
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	1	1	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7	4	////////////////////////////////////
K	38	31	////////////////////////////////////
1	80	75	////////////////////////////////////
2	72	61	////////////////////////////////////
3	71	67	////////////////////////////////////
4	81	74	////////////////////////////////////
5	56	54	////////////////////////////////////
6	62	59	////////////////////////////////////
7	53	49	////////////////////////////////////
8	68	67	
9	45	47	
10	25	26	
11	19	20	
12	25	21	
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	20	8	
Total	723	664	

Comments: Data are accurate as reported. The overall decline in numbers of school-aged eligible MEP students explains the decline in instructional services provided in several of the age/grade categories.

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. Beginning with SY 2016-17, high school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12.

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	47	24
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	133	69
K	243	83
1	239	79
2	223	72
3	228	74
4	190	64
5	181	62
6	165	59
7	154	56
8	155	51
9	164	72
10	133	63
11	98	37
12	101	38
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	471	182
Total	2,925	1,085

Comments: Data are accurate as reported. The decline in support services offered to ages 3 through 5 (not kindergarten) and Out-of-school students is explained by the decrease in number of eligible MEP students in this age/grade band. The increase in number of eligible migrant students in grade 12 from SY15-16 to SY16-17 explains the increase in support services to these students.

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	443
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	3,024
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: NC does not consolidate funds into schoolwide programs.	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	0	0
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	34	3,735
Comments:		

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.

2.4 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, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	6	29
Juvenile corrections	7	220
Adult corrections	4	90
Other	0	0
Total	17	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	6
Juvenile corrections	7
Adult corrections	4
Other	0
Total	17
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served		121	244	863	
Total Long Term Students Served		9	83	437	

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)		0	48	0	
LEP Students		0	0	0	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		3	2	14	
Asian		0	0	0	
Black or African American		81	172	640	
Hispanic or Latino		6	19	30	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander		0	0	0	
White		27	44	167	
Two or more races		4	7	12	
Total		121	244	863	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		101	218	722	
Female		20	26	141	
Total		121	244	863	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5		0	0	0	
6		0	0	0	
7		0	0	0	
8		0	0	0	
9		0	0	0	
10		0	0	0	
11		0	0	0	
12		3	0	0	
13		13	3	0	
14		30	15	0	
15		51	93	0	
16		16	91	13	
17		8	41	169	
18		0	1	134	
19		0	0	209	
20		0	0	191	
21		0	0	147	
Total		121	244	863	

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

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

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

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

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

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

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit			0	0	0	0				
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED			0	0	20	0	193	0		
Obtained high school diploma			0	0	4	0	0	0		
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits			2	0	234	0	0	0		
Enrolled in a GED program			0	0	16	0	863	0		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education			0	0	2	0	0	0		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs			0	0	10	0	0	0		
Obtained employment			0	0	0	0	5	0		

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2016, 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		0	0	5	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	0	7	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		9	83	363	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	0	62	
Total		9	83	437	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams		0	0	0	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	0	0	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		9	83	437	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams		0	0	0	
Comments:					

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total		////////////////////
Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2.		

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	
Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2.	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NC does not participate in Subpart 2.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

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

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

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

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

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

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

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: NC does not participate in Subpart 2.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student’s most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2016, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

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

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

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	14
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	25
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	30
Parental involvement activities	17
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	3
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	36
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	6
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. The number of eligible LEAs and the number using RLIS funding: During 2016-2017 academic year, the number of eligible LEAs and the number that used RLIS funds was 55. During 2015-2016 was also 55; there was no increase.
2. Percent of students performing at or above proficiency increased by 5%: There was a small increase in the total number of LEAs reporting an increase of students performing at or above proficiency that used RLIS funds. During 2016-2017 there the number of LEAS reporting increase by 5 % was 18. There was total of 15 LEAs reporting an increase by 5% for 2015-2016.
3. Student access to technology: There were 20 LEAS using RLIS funding for technology with 18 reporting teacher training in technology during 2015-2016. For 2016-2017 there were approximately 30 LEAs using RLIS funding to technology integration.
4. Students graduating from high school of those LEAs using RLIS funds to support that initiative: 4 LEAS reported increased graduation rates from 5-10% increase during 2015-2016. There was no increase for 2016-2017. There were 4 LEAS that used RLIS funds to support the initiative for 2016-2017 that reported an increased graduation rate from 15-10%.

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 2016-17?	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

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

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2016 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

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

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2016-17). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

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

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	115,730	100,164	86.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,633	1,376	84.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,095	2,904	93.80
<i>Asian</i>			
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>			
Black or African American	30,855	25,893	83.90
Hispanic or Latino	15,279	12,307	80.50
White	60,630	54,114	89.30
Two or more races	4,110	3,464	84.30
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12,229	8,600	70.30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,884	1,674	58.00
Economically disadvantaged students	46,465	38,029	81.80

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 500 characters.

Asian or Pacific Islander categories are combined and reported above, rather than separately.

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

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

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

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁵ under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

Comments:

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

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)⁶
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

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

Comments:

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