

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2006-07**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 21, 2007**

Table of Contents

Page

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:**

**PART I.....1**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT.....1**

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards.....1

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts.....1

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts.....2

1.1.4 Assessments in Science.....2

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science.....3

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS.....3**

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment.....3

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment.....6

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment.....6

**1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.....7**

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics.....7

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts.....8

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability.....9

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability.....9

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds 10

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement.....10

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement.....14

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations.....18

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations...18

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds.....19

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services.....19

**LEAS UNABLE TO PROVIDE PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE.....21**

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY.....23**

	1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified.....	23
	1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified.....	26
	1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used.....	28
<b>1.6</b>	<b>TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.....</b>	<b>29</b>
	1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection).....	29
	1.6.2 Student Demographic Data.....	30
	1.6.3 Student Performance Data.....	31
	1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees.....	43
	1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection).....	45
	1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development.....	46
	1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities.....	48
<b>1.7</b>	<b>PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>1.8</b>	<b>GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES.....</b>	<b>50</b>
	1.8.1 Graduation Rates.....	50
	1.8.2 Dropout Rates.....	51
<b>1.9</b>	<b>EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM.....</b>	<b>52</b>
	1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants).....	52
	1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants.....	54
<b>1.10</b>	<b>MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS.....</b>	<b>57</b>
	1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count.....	58
	1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count.....	59
	1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures.....	61

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science approved under *NCLB*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

### **1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

### **1.1.4 Assessments in Science**

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards,

native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### **1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science**

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005–06 CSPR.

## **1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State *NCLB* assessments.

### **1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of students tested during the State's testing window for *NCLB* mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who were tested in mathematics.

The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group “children with disabilities (*IDEA*)” includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group “limited English proficient students (LEP)” includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; it does not include former LEP students.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Tested</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Tested</b>
All students			(Auto calculated)
American Indian or Alaska Native			(Auto calculated)
Asian or Pacific Islander			(Auto calculated)
Black, non-Hispanic			(Auto calculated)
Hispanic			(Auto calculated)
White, non-Hispanic			(Auto calculated)
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			(Auto calculated)
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			(Auto calculated)
Economically disadvantaged students			(Auto calculated)
Migratory students			(Auto calculated)
Male			(Auto calculated)
Female			(Auto calculated)

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005–06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) tested during the State’s testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for

a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.



Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations		(Auto calculated)
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		“
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		“
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		“
Total	(Auto calculated)	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005–06 CSPR.

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State’s *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005–06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State’s *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005–06 CSPR.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State *NCLB* assessments.

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group “children with disabilities (*IDEA*)” includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group “limited English proficient students (LEP)” does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does not include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

<b>Grade (insert grade #)</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			(Auto calculated)
American Indian or Alaska Native			(Auto calculated)
Asian or Pacific Islander			(Auto calculated)
Black, non-Hispanic			(Auto calculated)
Hispanic			(Auto calculated)
White, non-Hispanic			(Auto calculated)
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			(Auto calculated)
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			(Auto calculated)
Economically disadvantaged students			(Auto calculated)
Migratory students			(Auto calculated)
Male			(Auto calculated)
Female			(Auto calculated)

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State’s *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Source – The table will be produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006- 07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools			(Auto calculated)
Districts			(Auto calculated)

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools			(Auto calculated)
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools			(Auto calculated)
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools			(Auto calculated)

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for the 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

	# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Districts that received Title I funds			(Auto calculated)

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X103 that is data group 461 and 582 (derived). If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005–06 CSPR.

### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

#### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State’s Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met its participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State’s Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met its participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>1</sup>
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

---

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.







### 1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	

Source: Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District name and NCES ID code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State’s Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met its participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State’s Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met its participation rate target for the mathematics assessment

- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

---

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.



### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification determinations to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations		
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	
---	--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State’s use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State’s methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred	

for public school choice	
--------------------------	--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice - Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	
Who applied to transfer	
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	

Indicate with a check in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	√
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.



### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$
--	----

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.4.9.1.4 - Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

Source: Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:*
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives

Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and

- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>

b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. An FAQ related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

#### FAQ about supplemental education services

*How should a State define the phrase “students who received supplemental educational services”?* States should consider students who “received” supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department’s Web page at:  
<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have “received” services.

### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	
Who applied for supplemental educational services	
Who received supplemental educational services	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$
--	----

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on “highly qualified” teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*.

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)
Low-poverty schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)
All elementary schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)
Low-poverty schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)
All secondary schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>

If the answer above is no, please explain:

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including

cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES *Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education*, 2003].

- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a “high-poverty school”?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a “low-poverty school”?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “low-poverty” schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

## 1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, **estimate** the percentages for each of the reasons why core academic classes are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled “other” and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are **NOT** highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
Elementary School Classes (cont'd)	
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	(Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	

	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain)	
Total	(Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
Elementary schools	More than _____%	Less than _____%
Poverty metric used		
Secondary schools	More than _____%	Less than _____%
Poverty metric used		

Source: Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12



schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

Throughout this section:

- “AYP grades” is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- “Non-AYP grades” is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

**Note:** Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees’ use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

#### **Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee’s local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
	Dual language			
	Two-way immersion			
	Transitional bilingual			
	Developmental bilingual			
	Heritage language			
	Sheltered English instruction			
	Structured English immersion			
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
	Content-based ESL			
	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students and Number of LEP Students Who received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services (formally 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of: (1) all LEP students enrolled in K through 12; and (2) the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

**Table 1.6.2.1 Definitions:**

**ALL LEP students** includes:

1. Newly enrolled in the year of reporting and assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using a State-selected/approved ELP placement assessment and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25), and
2. Assessed by State annual English language proficiency assessment and achieved below proficient,

- a. in the previous year and continued to be enrolled in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency assessment is at the end of the school year); or
- b. in the year of reporting, (if the State English language proficiency is at the beginning of the school year, or in the middle of the year), and
- c. Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.

	#
All LEP students <b>enrolled</b> in K through 12 this reporting year.	
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	

Source – Part of the table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The first row is manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. For the second row, the SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, grand total.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency.

### 1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. The definitions below apply to both 1.6.3.1.1. and 1.6.3.1.2.

**Table 1.6.3.1.1. AND 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:**

1. **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students (or LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs) who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment in this reporting year.
2. **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students (or LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs) at the time of testing but did not take the State annual English language proficiency assessment for whatever reason.
3. **Subtotal**=the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing.
4. **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the State annual English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year.

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	
Not tested/State annual ELP	
Subtotal	
LEP/One Data Point	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	

Not tested/State annual ELP	
Subtotal	
LEP/One Data Point	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the State annual English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2, please indicate your State’s use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

#### 1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to ALL LEP students.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO

Source: Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, report the results from the State annual English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

If the State answered, “YES” to row 1 of 1.6.3.2.1, report the results from the annual ELP assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in K through 12 and the progress of LEP students based on AMAO targets in 1.6.3.2.2.

If the State answered, “NO” to row 1 of 1.6.3.2.1, report the results from other annual ELP assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in K through 12 and the progress of LEP students based on local established performance targets (in place of AMAO targets) in 1.6.3.2.2.

#### **Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of “Making Progress” as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended. Or as defined by LEAs, if answered “NO” to 1.6.3.2.2.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of “Making Progress.” Or as defined by LEAs, if answered “NO” to 1.6.3.2.2. The number for “No Progress” should be the “Subtotal” in the respective table for 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number “Making Progress” and “Attainment”, if th

the State uses unduplicated counts in making progress (e.g., did not count “ELP Attainment” into “Making Progress”). “# No Progress” = Subtotal in 1.6.3.1.1 minus “# Making Progress”, if the State counted “# Attainment” into “# Making Progress”.

3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended. (If the State is tracking true cohorts of LEP students, the number of monitored former LEP students included in the cohorts can be cumulative for AMAO/ attainment, while they are monitored for 2 consecutive years).
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved by OELA, for each of “Making Progress” and “Attainment” of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number of LEP students who met the State definition of “Making Progress” and the definition of “Attainment” of English language proficiency. Number and percentage of LEP students who did not meet either “Making Progress” or “Attainment” will be automatically calculated based on the total enrolled LEP students in the State.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, “Met/N” = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress				(Auto calculated)
No progress				
ELP attainment				(Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program and who took the annual State ELP assessment for LEP students, by performance level.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				(Auto calculated)
No progress				
ELP attainment				(Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly section 1.6.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

For 1.6.3.2.3, the number for “No Progress” should be the “Subtotal” in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number “Making Progress” and “Attainment”, if the State uses unduplicated counts in making progress (e.g., did not count “ELP Attainment” into “Making Progress”). “# No Progress” = Subtotal in 1.6.3.1.2 minus “# Making Progress”, if the State counted “# Attainment” into “# Making Progress”.

### 1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

#### 1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for recent arrivals and monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

Recent Arrivals	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
MFLEP	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.4.2 Status of Recent Arrivals

In the table below, report the number of recent arrivals of LEP students in all grades and in grades used for AYP accountability determinations.

**Table 1.6.3.4.2 Definitions:**

1. **Recent Arrivals** = LEP students who have attended schools in the U.S. for fewer than 12 months. This definition does not include students who have lived in the U.S. for much of their lives and/or have attended U.S. schools for more than 12 months but are still limited English proficient. “U.S. schools” are those schools in the 50 states and the District of Columbia only. Recently arrived LEP students are exempted from one administration of the State NCLB assessment in reading/language arts. (Section 200.6(b)(4)(i),(iv))
2. **Total Recent Arrivals** = State aggregated number of all recently arrived LEP students in grades K through 12.
3. **Recent Arrivals/AYP Grades** = State-aggregated number of recently arrived LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8, once in high school). These students may be exempted for the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total recent arrivals	
Recent arrivals/AYP grades	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-2007, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

**Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**

- **Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP)** = State or LEA may include the scores of former LEP students as part of the LEP subgroup only for the purpose of reporting AYP. If a State or LEA chooses to include the scores of former LEP students as part of the LEP subgroup for calculating and reporting AYP, the State or LEA must include the scores of all students defined as former LEP students in AYP calculations and reporting. (Section 200.20(f)(2)(iii)). Monitored former LEP students:
  - have achieved “Proficient” on the State ELP assessment;



- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
  - are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.
- 2. Total MFLEP** = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.
- 3. MFLEP/AYP Grades** = State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	
MFLEP/AYP grades	

Source – MFLEP information will be produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X126 that contains data group ID 668, category set A.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

**Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**

- LEP K-2** = All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.
- LEP HS/Non-AYP** = High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).
- LEP Other Grades** = Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	
LEP HS/Non-AYP	
LEP other grades	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formally 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No*
--	------------------------------	------------------------------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

\* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each s grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

**Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:**

- # Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
- % Target** = AYP targets will be migrated from the CSA workbook.
- # At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
- % Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number tested divided by the number who scored at or above proficient.

# Tested	% Target	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
	CSA wkbk		(Auto calculated)

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X049 that contains data group ID 272, category set A.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)**

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

**Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **% Target** = AYP targets will be migrated from the CSA workbook.
3. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
4. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number tested divided by the number who scored at or above proficient.

# Tested	% Target	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
	CSA wkbk		(Auto calculated)

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X049 that contains data group ID 272, category set A.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6 Former LEP Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

**1.6.3.6.1 Former LEP Students by Year Monitored (MFLEP)**  
 (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
		(Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP  
 Grades Results for Mathematics** (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **% Target** = State AYP/performance target in the State accountability workbook will be automatically migrated.
3. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
4. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
5. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	% Target	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
	CSA wkbk		(Auto calculated)	(Auto calculated)

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
2. **% Target** = State AYP/performance target in the State accountability workbook will be automatically migrated.
3. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
4. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
5. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	% Target	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
	CSA wkbk		(Auto calculated)	((Auto calculated)

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.



Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### **1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

#### **1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)**

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs. **Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.



### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and in qualifying language programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

- 1. Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
- 2. Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities.
- 3. 3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain.

Source –The first two columns of the table are prepopulated by ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X045 that contains data group ID 519, grand total and category C. The third column is manual entry by the SEA.

**Note:** This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle	<input type="checkbox"/> Annual	<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-year
Type of subgrant awarded	<input type="checkbox"/> Competitive	<input type="checkbox"/> Formula

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

#### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information and Professional Development

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

**Note:** Section 3301(8) – The term ‘Language instruction educational program’ means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child’s native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III	

language instruction educational programs.	
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	

Comment:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**\*Note:** This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. **Do not** include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

### **1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students (formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)**

In the table below, provide the number of professional development/activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or is related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

- 1. Types of Professional Development Activity** = Subgrantee activities for professional development required under Title III.
- 2. #Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
- 3. Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
- 4. Total=number of all participants in PD activities**

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees		
Instructional strategies for LEP students			
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students			
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students			
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards			
Subject matter knowledge for teachers			
Other (Explain)			
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants	
PD provided to content classroom teachers			
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers			
PD provided to principals			
PD provided to administrators/other than principals			
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative			
PD provided to community-based organization personnel			
	Total	Auto calc	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year.

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

- Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
- Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
- # of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning

from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the “# of days/\$\$ Distribution” is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B “Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools” in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	
--------------------------------	--

--	--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 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 **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All students	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic’s (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All students	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

*What is a dropout?* A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public 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.

## 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants		
LEAs with subgrants		
Total	(Auto calculated)	(Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not		



<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Kindergarten)		
K		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
Ungraded		
Total	(Auto calculated)	((Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care		
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)		
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)		
Hotels/Motels		
Total	((Auto calculated)	(Auto calculated)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	(Auto calculated)

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	
Migratory children/youth	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	
Limit English proficient students	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	
2. Expedited evaluations	
3. Staff professional development and awareness	
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	
5. Transportation	
6. Early childhood programs	
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	
12. Counseling	
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	
15. School supplies	
16. Referral to other programs and services	
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	
18. Other (optional)	
19. Other (optional)	
20. Other (optional)	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers to the Education of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	
2. School selection	
3. Transportation	
4. School records	
5. Immunizations	
6. Other medical records	
7. Other barriers	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 3 through 6 only for those grades tested for *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3		
4		
5		
6		

7		
8		
High School		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

## 1.10 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 reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

Please note that in submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information

contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

**FAQs on Child Count:**

*How is “out-of-school” defined?* Out-of-school means youth 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 GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are “here-to-work” only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

*How is “ungraded” defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

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 reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
------------------	--

Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	(Auto-calculated)

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.1.1 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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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 reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (no Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	(Auto-calculated)

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.



### **1.10.2.1 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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### **1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

#### **1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### **1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to

collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### **1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are

built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### **1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State’s MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.