

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART
I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

83C Review DRAFT

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
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
1.1.4 ASSESSMENTS IN SCIENCE.....	2
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.....	5
1.2.4 PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS ASSESSMENT.....	5
1.2.5 PARTICIPATION OF ALL STUDENTS IN THE SCIENCE ASSESSMENT.....	5
1.2.6 PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN SCIENCE ASSESSMENT.....	5
1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.....	6
1.3.1 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS.....	6
1.3.2 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS.....	7
1.3.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN SCIENCE.....	8
1.4.1 ALL SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS ACCOUNTABILITY.....	8
1.4.2 TITLE I SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY.....	9
1.4.3 ACCOUNTABILITY OF DISTRICTS THAT RECEIVED TITLE I FUNDS.....	9
1.4.4 TITLE I SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT.....	9
1.4.4.1 <i>List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement</i>	9
1.4.4.3 <i>Corrective Action</i>	12
1.4.4.4 <i>Restructuring – Year 2</i>	12
1.4.5 DISTRICTS THAT RECEIVED TITLE I FUNDS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT.....	13
1.4.5.1 <i>List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement</i>	13
1.4.5.2 <i>Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement</i>	16
1.4.5.3 <i>Corrective Action</i>	16
1.4.7 APPEAL OF AYP AND IDENTIFICATION DETERMINATIONS.....	17
1.4.8.2 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STATUS AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ASSISTANCE....	18
1.4.8.4 SHARING OF EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES.....	20
*“SCHOOLS IN IMPROVEMENT” MEANS SCHOOLS IN IMPROVEMENT, CORRECTIVE ACTION, OR RESTRUCTURING UNDER SECTION 1116 OF ESEA.....	21
1.4.8.7 <i>Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement* Supported by Funds Other than Those of Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g)</i>	22
1.4.9 PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES.....	23
LEAS UNABLE TO PROVIDE PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE.....	24
1.5 TEACHER QUALITY.....	26
1.5.1 CORE ACADEMIC CLASSES TAUGHT BY TEACHERS WHO ARE HIGHLY QUALIFIED.....	26
1.5.2 REASONS CORE ACADEMIC CLASSES ARE TAUGHT BY TEACHERS WHO ARE NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED ²⁹	29
1.5.3 POVERTY QUANTILES AND METRICS USED.....	30

83C Review DRAFT

1.6	TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.....	31
1.6.1	LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.....	31
1.6.2	STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....	32
1.6.2.1	<i>Number of ALL LEP Students in the State.....</i>	<i>32</i>
	<i>In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under section 1111(b)(7) if the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition on section 9101(25).....</i>	<i>32</i>
1.6.2.2	<i>Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services.....</i>	<i>33</i>
1.6.2.3	<i>Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State.....</i>	<i>33</i>
1.6.3	STUDENT PERFORMANCE DATA.....	34
1.6.3.1.1	<i>ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment.....</i>	<i>34</i>
1.6.3.1.2	<i>ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results.....</i>	<i>34</i>
1.6.3.2.1	<i>Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency.....</i>	<i>3534</i>
1.6.4	TITLE III SUBGRANTEES.....	4039
1.6.4.1	<i>Title III Subgrantee Performance.....</i>	<i>4039</i>
1.6.4.2	<i>State Accountability.....</i>	<i>4140</i>
1.6.4.3	<i>Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs.....</i>	<i>4140</i>
	<i>This section collects data on the termination of Tile III programs or activities as required by section 3123(b)(7).....</i>	<i>4140</i>
1.6.5	EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES FOR IMMIGRANT STUDENTS.....	4241
1.6.5.1	<i>Immigrant Students.....</i>	<i>4241</i>
1.6.6	TEACHER INFORMATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.....	4342
1.6.6.1	<i>Teacher Information.....</i>	<i>4342</i>
1.6.6.2	<i>Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students.....</i>	<i>4443</i>
1.6.7	STATE SUBGRANT ACTIVITIES.....	4544
1.6.7.1	<i>State Subgrant Process.....</i>	<i>4544</i>
1.6.7.2	<i>Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees.....</i>	<i>4644</i>
1.7	PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS.....	4645
1.8	GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES.....	4645
1.8.1	GRADUATION RATES.....	4645
1.8.2	DROPOUT RATES.....	4847
1.9	EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM.....	4947
1.9.1	ALL LEAS (WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS).....	4948
1.9.1.1	<i>Homeless Children and Youths.....</i>	<i>4948</i>
1.9.1.2	<i>Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths.....</i>	<i>5049</i>
1.9.2	LEAS WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS.....	5049
1.9.2.1	<i>Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants.....</i>	<i>5149</i>
1.9.2.2	<i>Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served.....</i>	<i>5150</i>
1.9.2.3	<i>Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees.....</i>	<i>5250</i>
1.9.2.4	<i>Barriers to the Education of Homeless Children and Youths.....</i>	<i>5251</i>
1.9.2.5	<i>Academic Progress of Homeless Students.....</i>	<i>5352</i>
1.10	MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS.....	5452
1.10.1	CATEGORY 1 CHILD COUNT.....	5553
1.10.1.1	<i>Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases.....</i>	<i>5654</i>
1.10.2	CATEGORY 2 CHILD COUNT.....	5655
1.10.2.1	<i>Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases.....</i>	<i>5756</i>

83C Review DRAFT

1.10.3	CHILD COUNT CALCULATION AND VALIDATION PROCEDURES.....	5756
1.10.3.1	<i>Student Information System</i>	5856
1.10.3.2	<i>Data Collection and Management Procedures</i>	5856
1.10.3.3	<i>Methods Used To Count Children</i>	5957
1.10.3.4	<i>Quality Control Processes</i>	6058

83C Review DRAFT

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. [Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems.](#) Indicate specifically in what [school](#) 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.

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 [and/or academic achievement standards](#) in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. [Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.](#)

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.](#)

83C Review DRAFT

as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond “No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.”

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

~~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 If your State's progress in developing and implementing assessments and academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA~~

83C Review DRAFT

in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline for them. of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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 as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

83C Review DRAFT

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled 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 (LEP) students” includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percentage of Students Tested
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, F, and subtotal 1. 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.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

83C Review DRAFT

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 data 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		(Auto calculated)
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		(Auto calculated)
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		(Auto calculated)
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		(Auto calculated)
Total	(Auto calculated)	

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

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

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and 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.

83C Review DRAFT

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

This section is similar to 1.2.2. and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data 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.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR- Proposed under OMB :83I.

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2. and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment. The data provided should include reading/language arts 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.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 ~~CSPR~~:CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

83C Review DRAFT

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 (LEP) students” does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

83C Review DRAFT

Grade (insert grade #)	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
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 – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

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.

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

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. 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.

83C Review DRAFT

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using 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.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007- 08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools			(Auto calculated)
Districts			(Auto calculated)

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

83C Review DRAFT

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. 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 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
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 *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

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 SY 2007-08. 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 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
			(Auto calculated)

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 2008-09 based

83C Review DRAFT

on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school listed, please 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 the 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 the 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 2008-09 (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)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

¹ 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.

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* were implemented [in SY 2007-08 \(based on SY 2006-07 assessments under section 1111 of ESEA\)](#).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members, not including the principal, who were 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.

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* were implemented [in SY 2007-08 \(based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 111 of ESEA\)](#).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I 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.

In the space below, list specifically the “other major restructuring of the school governance” action(s) that were implemented.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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, please provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. 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 the 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 the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State’s Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State’s Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate “Yes” if the district received Title I funds and “No” if the district did not receive Title I funds (This column must be completed by States that choose to list

² 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>.

all districts or all districts in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

In the space below, briefly 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.

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* were implemented [in SY 2007-08](#) (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
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 or districts abolished between the end of SYs 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

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 SY 2007-08 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.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data were complete	
--	--

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Grants

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.

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in 2007-2008 who were:
 - o Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in 2007-08.
 - o Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08.
- In **both columns**, indicate the number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. (Note: The numbers in both columns should be the same and should equal the total number of schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.)

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07*
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received		

assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		
Number of schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in 2007-08	
Number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in 2007-08	
Number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in 2007-08	

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.

Column 1 Response Options Box

- 1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
- 4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-2008 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under section 1003(a) of ESEA: _____ %

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

<u>Name of LEA with One or</u>	<u>NCES LEA ID</u>	<u>Amount of</u>
---------------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------

<u>More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(a) Funds in SY 2007-08</u>		<u>LEA's 1003(a) Allocation</u>

<u>Name of LEA with One or More Schools Provided Assistance through Section 1003(g) Funds in SY 2007-08</u>	<u>NCES LEA ID</u>	<u>Amount of LEA's 1003(g) Allocation</u>

*"Schools in Improvement" means schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of ESEA.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

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

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

1.4.8.7 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement* Supported by Funds Other than Those of Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

*Improvement means schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of ESEA.

83C Review DRAFT

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 from which students transferred for public school choice	
Public Schools to which 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, [corrective action, or restructuring](#).
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and

83C Review DRAFT

(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 Applied to transfer	
Who transferred Transferred to another school under <u>the</u> 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 populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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.

83C Review DRAFT

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	

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

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.³
- 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 provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

³ 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>.

83C Review DRAFT

~~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. A FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ) SECTION 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 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 <u>Applied</u> for supplemental educational services	
Who received <u>Received</u> supplemental educational services	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

83C Review DRAFT

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 populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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 (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) 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 <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All schools			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)
Elementary level					
High-poverty			(Auto calculated)		(Auto calculated)

83C Review DRAFT

schools					
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.	Yes	No

If the answer above is no, please explain [below](#). [The response is limited to 8,000 characters.](#)

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.

83C Review DRAFT

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

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 percent 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.

83C Review DRAFT

- 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 were 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 teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. 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	

83C Review DRAFT

	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	(Auto calculated)

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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)	
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 in comment box below)	
Total	(Auto calculated)

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

83C Review DRAFT

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 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.~~

83C Review DRAFT

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

In the table below, provide the types of language instruction educational programs implemented in the ~~state~~State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2). 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. **Types of Programs** = Types 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 programs.~~
- ~~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.~~
- ~~6.~~

# Using Program Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
	Dual language	
	Two-way immersion	
	Transitional bilingual	
	Developmental bilingual	
	Heritage language	

83C Review DRAFT

<u># Using Program Check Types of Programs</u>	Type of Program	Other Language
	Sheltered English instruction	
	Structured English immersion	
	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
	Content-based ESL	
	Pull-out ESL	
	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under section 1111(b)(7) if the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition on section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count. in this table.

<u>Number of ALL LEP students in the State</u>	
--	--

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

83C Review DRAFT

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

1.6.2.21 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students in the State who received services in Title III language instructional education programs. _

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the
For additional significant languages please use comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

83C Review DRAFT

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, ~~and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).~~ as required by sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing- Status ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

~~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. In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).~~

	<u>#</u>
<u>Number tested on State annual ELP assessment</u>	
<u>Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment</u>	
<u>Subtotal</u>	<u>(Auto-calculated)</u>

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

1.6.3.1.2 1.6.3.1.2—ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	<u>#</u>
<u>Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment</u>	
<u>Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment</u>	<u>(Auto-calculated)</u>

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

83C Review DRAFT

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Subtotal	(Auto-calculated)

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

1.6.3.2.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

- 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 students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of “Tested/State Annual ELP” and “Not Tested/State Annual ELP” (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).

83C Review DRAFT

- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that “LEP/One Data Point” is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	-
Not tested/State annual ELP	-
Subtotal	(Auto-calculated)
-	-
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.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

Tested/State Annual ELP = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Not Tested/State Annual ELP = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

Subtotal = Sum of “Tested/State Annual ELP” and “Not Tested/State Annual ELP” (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).

LEP/One Data Point = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that “LEP/One Data Point” is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	-
Not tested/State annual ELP	-
Subtotal	(Auto-calculated)
-	-

83C Review DRAFT

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 annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, 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 (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

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

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

All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked “Yes” in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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.

83C Review DRAFT

No Progress = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of “Making Progress.”

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.

Target = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of “Making Progress” and “Attainment” of ELP.

Results = Number and percent 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.

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)	(Auto-calculated)
No progress	-	-	-	-
ELP attainment	-	-	(Auto calculated)	(Auto-calculated)

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

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

If a State does not count “ELP attainment” students as also “Making Progress”, the number for “No Progress” should be the “Subtotal” in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number “Making Progress” and “Attainment.” If a State counts “ELP attainment” students as also “Making Progress”, the number for “No Progress” should be the “Subtotal” in 1.6.3.1.1 minus “Making Progress”.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked “No” in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual **State** English language proficiency assessment for Title III served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

83C Review DRAFT

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. Making Progress = Number of Title III 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.

~~**2. No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of “Making Progress.”~~

~~**3. ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III 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.~~

~~**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, for each of “Making Progress” and “Attainment” of ELP.~~

~~**5. Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of “Making Progress” and the [number and percent that met the State](#) 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 Title III 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 %.~~

~~7.~~

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress		
No progress		
ELP attainment		

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

~~**Note:** If a State does not count “ELP attainment” students as also “Making Progress”, the number for “No Progress” should be the “Subtotal” in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number “Making Progress” and “Attainment.” If a State counts “ELP attainment” students as also “Making Progress”, the number for “No Progress” should be the “Subtotal” in 1.6.3.1.2 minus “Making Progress”.~~

83C Review DRAFT

~~1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results~~ (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

~~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 monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.~~

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.~~

83C Review DRAFT

~~1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)~~

~~In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K through 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:~~

~~1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:~~

~~Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;~~

~~Students that 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 — Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. 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.~~

83C Review DRAFT

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 all LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:

1. **LEP K-2** = All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.
2. **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).
3. **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.

4. _____

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 (section 1111(b)(6)).

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

83C Review DRAFT

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 grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

<u>Language (s)</u>

<u>Grade</u> <u>(s)</u>	<u>Language</u>
3	-
4	-
5	-
6	-
7	-
8	-
HS	-

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

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.

<u>Language (s)</u>

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Language</u>
3	-
4	-
5	-
6	-
7	-

83C Review DRAFT

8	-
HS	-

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for science.

<u>Language (s)</u>

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

~~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:**~~

- ~~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 mathematics assessment.~~
- ~~2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.~~
- ~~3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.~~
- ~~4.~~

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
-	-	(Auto-calculated)

83C Review DRAFT

Source—Initially pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. 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.

1.6.3.5.5 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:

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.

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.

% Results = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
		(Auto-calculated)

Source—Initially pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. 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.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (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.

83C Review DRAFT

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

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.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
-----------------	---------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

83C Review DRAFT

		(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.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students ~~in AYP Grades~~ Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, ~~report results for provide the number of~~ monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year.

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. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated. This calculated. This will be automatically calculated.

5.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
		(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.

83C Review DRAFT

1.6.3.6.4. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

6. # Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.

7. # At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.

8. % Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.

9. # Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007 -08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

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

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

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 only + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.~~

83C Review DRAFT

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved ~~funds~~ for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

83C Review DRAFT

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Number of subgrantees implementing 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.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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. [This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under section 6161.](#)

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.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

[This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by section 3123\(b\)\(7\).](#)

Were 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.		

83C Review DRAFT

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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 schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational 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. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ~~ONLY~~.
- 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. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have-serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# 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 in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

83C Review DRAFT

~~1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds~~ (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

~~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

~~If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.~~

~~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 as required under section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under section 3123(b)(5).

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 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.

83C Review DRAFT

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	
Number of all certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. Or 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 additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

[The response is limited to 8,000 characters.](#)

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

* 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

In the table below, provide ~~information about the subgrantee the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.~~ meets the requirements of section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. ~~Types of Professional Development Activity~~ **Professional Development Topics:** Subgrantee ~~activities for~~ professional development topics 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

83C Review DRAFT

counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in [1.6.1.1](#) and [1.6.1](#) 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 Topics	# 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 in comment box)			
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-calculated)

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-calculated)

[The response is limited to 8,000 characters.](#)

83C Review DRAFT

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

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:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from U.S. Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# 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 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 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.

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

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

[The response is limited to 8,000 characters.](#)

83C Review DRAFT

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

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 2006-07). 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	

83C Review DRAFT

Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

83C Review DRAFT

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 2006-07). Below the table is a 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.

83C Review DRAFT

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 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.

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

83C Review DRAFT

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.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
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	<i>(Auto calculated)</i>	<i>(Auto calculated)</i>

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

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	

83C Review DRAFT

4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	(Auto calculated)

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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~~ Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: C*SPR* & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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	

83C Review DRAFT

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 – in comment box below)	
19. Other (optional – in comment box below)	
20. Other (optional – in comment box below)	

[This response is limited to 8,000 characters.](#)

[Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.](#)

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 – in comment box below	

[The response is limited to 8,000 characters.](#)

83C Review DRAFT

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

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 9 through 12 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 populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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 – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

83C Review DRAFT

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*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 ~~who that~~ 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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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:

83C Review DRAFT

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
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~~ Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

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.

83C Review DRAFT

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, 2007 through August 31, 2008. 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).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
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~~ Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

83C Review DRAFT

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 percent.

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.

83C Review DRAFT

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.

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.

83C Review DRAFT

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.

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.

83C Review DRAFT

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

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.

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.

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.

83C Review DRAFT

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

In the space below, 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.

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.