

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:**

**Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**

**ARKANSAS**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

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

### PART II

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

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

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

### TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

 Part I, 2007-08 Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Arkansas

Address:

#4 Capitol Mall, Rm 401A  
Little Rock, AR 72201

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Heather Gage

Telephone: 501-682-3667

Fax: 501-683-5868

e-mail: heather.gage@arkansas.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Heather Gage

Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:51:00 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



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

## 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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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 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. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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

### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required 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 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.

The State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science have been submitted to the United States Department of Education and reviewed through the peer review process. We are awaiting the response from the USDoE regarding the findings of the review.

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.

### 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 participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the 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 Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, 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

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in 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 participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating 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) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,912	30.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,741	54.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0

Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,816	14.8
Total	32,469	
<b>Comments: Data difference due to post appeals audits.</b>		

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.

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

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

### 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.

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.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,019	30.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	17,190	58.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,196	10.9
Total	29,405	
<b>Comments: Data difference due to post appeals audits.</b>		

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

### 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.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	109,339	107,642	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	832	819	98.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,698	1,679	98.9
Black, non-Hispanic	24,730	23,983	97.0
Hispanic	8,411	8,296	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	73,614	72,811	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,339	13,015	97.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,030	4,966	98.7
Economically disadvantaged students	60,343	59,189	98.1
Migratory students	981	961	98.0
Male	56,146	55,153	98.2
Female	53,190	52,486	98.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 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 science 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) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,877	29.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,421	57.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,717	13.2
Total	13,015	
<b>Comments: Data difference due to post appeal audits.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

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

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the 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.

#### **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.

#### **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.

### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,195	28,379	78.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	253	184	72.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	569	442	77.7
Black, non-Hispanic	8,022	4,948	61.7
Hispanic	3,221	2,263	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	24,130	20,542	85.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,259	2,048	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,528	1,624	64.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,119	15,718	71.1
Migratory students	401	277	69.1
Male	18,505	14,453	78.1
Female	17,690	13,926	78.7
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,317 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 3rd grade math.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

### 1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,149	23,045	63.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	248	139	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	551	351	63.7
Black, non-Hispanic	8,018	3,599	44.9
Hispanic	3,179	1,562	49.1
White, non-Hispanic	24,153	17,394	72.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,267	1,168	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,475	982	39.7
Economically disadvantaged students	22,085	11,855	53.7
Migratory students	395	169	42.8
Male	18,483	10,698	57.9
Female	17,666	12,347	69.9
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,317 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 3rd grade Reading/Language Arts.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Arkansas does not test science at grade 3. To meet NCLB requirements the state assesses science at grade 5, grade 7, and end-of-course biology in high school.</b>			

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.

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

### 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,642	26,343	73.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	198	73.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	596	439	73.7
Black, non-Hispanic	8,003	4,324	54.0
Hispanic	3,093	2,048	66.2
White, non-Hispanic	23,680	19,334	81.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,316	1,672	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,324	1,390	59.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21,570	14,094	65.3
Migratory students	372	235	63.2
Male	18,196	13,241	72.8
Female	17,446	13,102	75.1
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,415 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 4th grade math.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

### 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,616	23,708	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	179	67.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	580	392	67.6
Black, non-Hispanic	8,009	3,841	48.0
Hispanic	3,062	1,655	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,699	17,641	74.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,322	1,108	25.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,289	1,035	45.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,543	12,198	56.6
Migratory students	371	178	48.0
Male	18,184	10,922	60.1
Female	17,432	12,786	73.3
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,415 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 4th grade reading.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# 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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Arkansas does not test science at grade 4. To meet NCLB requirements the state assesses science at grade 5, grade 7, and end-of-course biology in high school.</b>			

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.

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

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,533	23,838	67.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	191	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	549	412	75.0
Black, non-Hispanic	7,916	3,718	47.0
Hispanic	2,975	1,768	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	23,811	17,749	74.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,310	1,194	27.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,004	984	49.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,002	12,059	57.4
Migratory students	387	199	51.4
Male	18,164	11,759	64.7
Female	17,369	12,079	69.5
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,351 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 5th grade math.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,503	22,665	63.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	274	182	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	538	385	71.6
Black, non-Hispanic	7,922	3,376	42.6
Hispanic	2,943	1,587	53.9
White, non-Hispanic	23,823	17,134	71.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,312	846	19.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,966	807	41.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,974	11,118	53.0
Migratory students	383	185	48.3
Male	18,145	10,395	57.3
Female	17,355	12,269	70.7
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,351 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 5th grade reading.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

	# 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
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	35,493	13,147	37.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	282	115	40.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	549	250	45.5
Black, non-Hispanic	7,892	1,079	13.7
Hispanic	2,972	732	24.6
White, non-Hispanic	23,792	10,970	46.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,276	581	13.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,003	296	14.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20,962	5,368	25.6
Migratory students	378	71	18.8
Male	18,135	7,007	38.6
Female	17,354	6,140	35.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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.

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

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	34,937	25,003	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	242	173	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	496	383	77.2
Black, non-Hispanic	7,648	3,797	49.6
Hispanic	2,796	1,809	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	23,755	18,841	79.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,129	1,179	28.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,816	963	53.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,270	12,503	61.7
Migratory students	347	205	59.1
Male	17,685	12,306	69.6
Female	17,252	12,697	73.6
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,272 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 6th grade math.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

### 1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	34,920	22,091	63.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	241	171	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	487	330	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	7,654	2,978	38.9
Hispanic	2,778	1,390	50.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,760	17,222	72.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,137	740	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,790	594	33.2
Economically disadvantaged students	20,260	10,325	51.0
Migratory students	344	160	46.5
Male	17,682	10,071	57.0
Female	17,238	12,020	69.7
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,272 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 6th grade reading.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# 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
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Arkansas does not test science at grade 6. To meet NCLB requirements the state assesses science at grade 5, grade 7, and end-of-course biology in high school.</b>			

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.

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

### 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,085	21,680	61.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	180	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	516	368	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	7,756	2,865	36.9
Hispanic	2,727	1,483	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	23,818	16,783	70.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,162	810	19.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,622	641	39.5
Economically disadvantaged students	19,834	9,878	49.8
Migratory students	327	156	47.7
Male	18,082	10,557	58.4
Female	17,000	11,122	65.4
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,536 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 7th grade math.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

### 1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,065	20,115	57.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	265	160	60.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	511	313	61.3
Black, non-Hispanic	7,757	2,620	33.8
Hispanic	2,702	1,268	46.9
White, non-Hispanic	23,830	15,754	66.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,163	581	14.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,593	452	28.4
Economically disadvantaged students	19,815	8,847	44.6
Migratory students	324	124	38.3
Male	18,072	8,861	49.0
Female	16,993	11,254	66.2
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,536 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 7th grade reading.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

	# 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
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	35,031	11,408	32.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	266	90	33.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	514	195	37.9
Black, non-Hispanic	7,732	717	9.3
Hispanic	2,719	571	21.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,796	9,834	41.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,141	531	12.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,615	175	10.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19,787	4,189	21.2
Migratory students	319	51	16.0
Male	18,053	6,303	34.9
Female	16,974	5,104	30.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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.

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

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,332	19,847	56.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	144	61.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	514	345	67.1
Black, non-Hispanic	7,942	2,519	31.7
Hispanic	2,637	1,199	45.5
White, non-Hispanic	24,003	15,640	65.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,347	629	14.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,464	434	29.6
Economically disadvantaged students	19,290	8,335	43.2
Migratory students	311	119	38.3
Male	18,065	9,974	55.2
Female	17,264	9,873	57.2
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,549 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 8th grade math.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

### 1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	35,304	23,504	66.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	170	71.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	501	361	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	7,949	3,566	44.9
Hispanic	2,608	1,395	53.5
White, non-Hispanic	24,006	18,012	75.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,353	710	16.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,424	461	32.4
Economically disadvantaged students	19,268	10,518	54.6
Migratory students	310	131	42.3
Male	18,054	10,859	60.1
Female	17,250	12,645	73.3
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 4,549 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for 8th grade reading.</b>			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Arkansas does not test science at grade 8. To meet NCLB requirements the state assesses science at grade 5, grade 7, and end-of-course biology in high school.</b>			

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.

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

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

	# 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
<b>High School</b>			
All students	72,753	46,082	63.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	571	377	66.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,169	878	75.1
Black, non-Hispanic	16,849	6,215	36.9
Hispanic	5,010	2,789	55.7
White, non-Hispanic	49,154	35,823	72.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,923	2,673	38.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,567	1,083	42.2
Economically disadvantaged students	35,934	18,824	52.4
Migratory students	520	256	49.2
Male	36,375	22,926	63.0
Female	36,377	23,156	63.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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.

### 1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

	# 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
<b>High School</b>			
All students	31,717	16,329	51.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	129	52.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	498	250	50.2
Black, non-Hispanic	6,905	1,666	24.1
Hispanic	1,801	592	32.9
White, non-Hispanic	22,267	13,692	61.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,853	584	15.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	864	102	11.8
Economically disadvantaged students	13,981	5,004	35.8
Migratory students	187	42	22.5
Male	16,155	7,262	45.0
Female	15,562	9,067	58.3
<b>Comments: For the 06-07 school year, the corrected numbers should have been 3,812 students with disabilities for whom proficiency level was assigned for the state's 11th grade literacy exam.</b>			

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.

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# 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
<b>High School</b>			
All students	37,038	11,220	30.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	271	102	37.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	613	237	38.7
Black, non-Hispanic	8,327	801	9.6
Hispanic	2,598	462	17.8
White, non-Hispanic	25,188	9,613	38.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,582	788	17.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,343	97	7.2
Economically disadvantaged students	18,371	3,505	19.1
Migratory students	262	30	11.5
Male	18,894	6,228	33.0
Female	18,083	4,984	27.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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.

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

#### 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 schools and districts 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	1,079	626	58.0
Districts	257	217	84.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	818	495	60.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	679	400	58.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	139	95	68.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. 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
255	213	83.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

## 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 on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met 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 met 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 met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the school 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: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>1</sup>)
- 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).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

#### 1.4.4.3 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	32
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	32
<p><b>Comments:</b> Thirty-two schools implemented the state-preferred corrective action process in 2007-2008. New pedagogical strategies and curriculum/instructional materials are a major part of the process and were part of the design of the corrective action process. Schools identified for improvement receive priority in participating in statewide delivered professional development. These schools also receive priority in receiving grants that might be available through the US Department of Education. The Arkansas Department of Education has adopted a comprehensive low performing school turn around model including a scholastic audit for schools in corrective action and restructuring. The scholastic audit is part of the state's assistance for low performing schools. The audit is a comprehensive review of a school's learning environment, organizational efficiency and student academic performance. Results of the audit will be used to determine revisions to the comprehensive school improvement plan and level of support necessary to improve student academic performance. Arkansas educators have been trained to conduct the scholastic audits. The low performing turn around model focuses on 5 key areas: • Standards and assessment • Aligned instructional systems • High performance leadership, management and organization • Professional learning communities • Parent and community engagement Highly skilled literacy and mathematics coaches are assigned to the schools to provide on-going support to classroom teachers. A leadership team will participate in strategic professional development to build leadership capacity. All staff members will participate in specific professional development based on results of the scholastic audit. For school in School Improvement Years 3 and beyond the Arkansas Department of Education and its Committee of Practitioners with agreement of the school district superintendents selected a uniform school design choice for implement for implementation beginning with the 2006-2007 academic year. This design has been implemented in 31 schools determined to be most in need of additional support in the areas of curriculum, capacity building and leadership. The SEA will use funds from the School Improvement Fund Grant to provide additional support in the areas of capacity building, leadership and/or support for personnel beyond those required to meet the state standard for maximum class size.</p>	

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 1111 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)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0

Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Actions identified in the Arkansas Accountability Workbook were implemented in LEAs in restructuring.

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

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 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 met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the 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 Action )
- 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 all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were 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.

Schools identified for improvement receive priority in participating in statewide delivered professional development. These schools also receive priority in receiving grants that might be available through the US Department of Education.

The Arkansas Department of Education has adopted a comprehensive low performing school turn around model including a scholastic audit for schools in corrective action and restructuring.

The scholastic audit is part of the state's assistance for low performing schools. The audit is a comprehensive review of a school's learning environment, organizational efficiency and student academic performance. Results of the audit will be used to determine revisions to the comprehensive school improvement plan and level of support necessary to improve student academic performance. Arkansas educators have been trained to conduct the scholastic audits.

The low performing turn around model focuses on 5 key areas:

- Standards and assessment
- Aligned instructional systems
- High performance leadership, management and organization
- Professional learning communities
- Parent and community engagement

Highly skilled literacy and mathematics coaches are assigned to the schools to provide on-going support to classroom teachers. A leadership team will participate in strategic professional development to build leadership capacity. All staff members will participate in specific professional development based on results of the scholastic audit.

For school in School Improvement Years 3 and beyond the Arkansas Department of Education and its Committee of Practitioners with agreement of the school district superintendents selected a uniform school design choice for implement for implementation beginning with the 2006-2007 academic year. This design has been implemented in 31 schools determined to be most in need of additional support in the areas of curriculum, capacity building and leadership.

The SEA will use funds from the School Improvement Fund Grant to provide additional support in the areas of capacity building, leadership and/or support for personnel beyond those required to meet the state standard for maximum class size.

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	32
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	32
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	4
Schools	63	40
<b>Comments: All appeals are handled at student level through school appeals procedures and these student level approved changes are included in final calculations for school and district AYP.</b>		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	10/31/08
---	----------

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

#### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

##### 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 SY 2007-08 who were:
- Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
- Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
- Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2006-07. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	19,492	20,619
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	5,866	5,216
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	30.1	25.3
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	4,852	4,978
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	24.9	24.1
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	37	
<b>Comments: Clarification: The number above are only for 1003 (a) schools.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### 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 SY 2007-08	8
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 SY 2007-08	3
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 SY 2007-08	27
<b>Comments: Workshop model used in the classroom Professional Learning Communities Comprehensive, standards-drive, research-based strategies Intensive training in leadership and content areas Purchase of materials for building capacity and leadership Use of consultants to assess, diagnose, recommend and help implement strategies for improving student achievement Systematic, systemic, on-going change to the school organizational culture</b>	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>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.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1	These are schools receiving 1003(g) funds.	13	0	0	D	These are recipients of School Improvement Grant Funds 1003 (g). Implementation of new strategies began less than 1 year ago, so no data has been collected on the impact of these strategies
6 = Combo 1	Combination of Strategies 2-4. These are schools receiving both 1003(a) AND 1003(g) funds.	33	0	2	D	The 33 schools identified as using this strategy received 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds. The two schools that made AYP were recipients of 1003(a) funds for the implementation of the state-preferred corrective action process. These two schools were not recipients of 1003(g) School Improvement Grant Funds.

**Comments: Title I 1003(g) funds have not been utilized for a full year, so the full effects of these funds on School Improvement and AYP cannot be determined yet. column 6 Response options -This data was not collected for this year. It will be collected in subsequent years**

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.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

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

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

#### 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.

Intensive Professional Development focusing in the following three grade level areas:

Elementary: 5 days of Leadership Training 8 days of Literacy Training, Coaches Training 2 days of Mathematics Training

Middle School: 5 days of Leadership Training 8 days of Literacy Training, Coaches Training 2 days of Mathematics Training

High School: 7 days of Pre Algebra 7 days of Algebra 7 days of Literacy 7 days of Advanced Literacy 2 days Content Literacy Workshop/Strategies

Each site/school has an assigned Math Cluster Leader and a Literacy Cluster Leader that provides On-Site Technical Assistance and Individual School Instructional Coaching/Modeling

15 days Literacy Coaching/Modeling in each school 15 days Mathematics Coaching/Modeling in each school 30 days Literacy Coaching/Modeling in each school for 4 Intensive Schools 30 days Mathematics Coaching/Modeling in each school for 5 Intensive Schools  
\*Rose City Middle School \*Lynch Drive Elementary School \*Lucilia Wood Elementary School \*Marvell Elementary School \*Marvell High School

Each site/school has implemented a Leadership Team that meets weekly

Administrators have bimonthly networking meetings together with other administrators that is facilitated by America's Choice Instructors.

Implement Book Study Groups Implement Book of the Month Strategy Implement Standards Based Bulletin Boards Mathematics and Literacy Navigator used as a Safety Net tool Mandates a parent a community coordinator individual school mathematics and literacy coaches

Pre and Post Individual School Progress with Diagnostic Assessment Test (DAT) \*Assesses school culture \*Assesses school environment \*Implementation of strategies \*Leadership team progress \*Instructional strategies \*Parent and community involvement \*Implementation of the workshop model \*organizational structure and scheduling

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 2007-08 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

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### 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).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

##### 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.

ADE will retain 5% of its allocation under Section 1003(g). These retained funds will be used for administration, evaluation and technical assistance with this program. These funds 1003 (g), along with the funds reserved under section 1003 (a), are intended to support high-quality, sustainable school improvement activities that increase the likelihood that students learn challenging academic content and achieve proficiency.

Schools identified for improvement receive priority in participating in statewide delivered professional development. These schools also receive priority in receiving grants that might be available through the US Department of Education.

The Arkansas Department of Education has adopted a comprehensive low performing school turn around model including a scholastic audit for schools in corrective action and restructuring.

The scholastic audit is part of the state's assistance for low performing schools. The audit is a comprehensive review of a school's learning environment, organizational efficiency and student academic performance. Results of the audit will be used to determine revisions to the comprehensive school improvement plan and level of support necessary to improve student academic performance. Arkansas educators have been trained to conduct the scholastic audits.

The low performing turn around model focuses on 5 key areas:

- Standards and assessment
- Aligned instructional systems
- High performance leadership, management and organization
- Professional learning communities
- Parent and community engagement

Highly skilled literacy and mathematics coaches are assigned to the schools to provide on-going support to classroom teachers. A leadership team will participate in strategic professional development to build leadership capacity. All staff members will participate in specific professional development based on results of the scholastic audit.

For school in School Improvement Years 3 and beyond the Arkansas Department of Education and its Committee of Practitioners with agreement of the school district superintendents selected a uniform school design choice for implement for implementation beginning with the 2006-2007 academic year. This design has been implemented in 31 schools determined to be most in need of additional support in the areas of curriculum, capacity building and leadership.

The SEA will use funds from the School Improvement Fund Grant to provide additional support in the areas of capacity building,

leadership and/or support for personnel beyond those required to meet the state standard for maximum class size.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### **1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 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.

Funds other than 1003(a) and 1003(g) used to support districts identified for School Improvement include: District funds Local grant funds Foundation grant funds Local city taxes and revenue Title Funds Categorical: \*English as a Second Language \*Professional Development \*Alternative Learning Environment \*National School Lunch Association

Schools identified for improvement receive priority in participating in statewide delivered professional development. These schools also receive priority in receiving grants that might be available through the US Department of Education.

The Arkansas Department of Education has adopted a comprehensive low performing school turn around model including a scholastic audit for schools in corrective action and restructuring.

The scholastic audit is part of the state's assistance for low performing schools. The audit is a comprehensive review of a school's learning environment, organizational efficiency and student academic performance. Results of the audit will be used to determine revisions to the comprehensive school improvement plan and level of support necessary to improve student academic performance. Arkansas educators have been trained to conduct the scholastic audits.

The low performing turn around model focuses on 5 key areas:

- Standards and assessment
- Aligned instructional systems
- High performance leadership, management and organization
- Professional learning communities
- Parent and community engagement

Highly skilled literacy and mathematics coaches are assigned to the schools to provide on-going support to classroom teachers. A leadership team will participate in strategic professional development to build leadership capacity. All staff members will participate in specific professional development based on results of the scholastic audit.

For school in School Improvement Years 3 and beyond the Arkansas Department of Education and its Committee of Practitioners with agreement of the school district superintendents selected a uniform school design choice for implement for implementation beginning with the 2006-2007 academic year. This design has been implemented in schools determined to be most in need of additional support in the areas of curriculum, capacity building and leadership.

The SEA will use funds from the School Improvement Fund Grant to provide additional support in the areas of capacity building, leadership and/or support for personnel beyond those required to meet the state standard for maximum class size.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

## 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.

#### 1.4.9.1.2 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
- (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	195,861
Applied to transfer	240
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	240

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes

**Comments: The calculation / number is based on USDoE guidance that indicated -in a district in which ANY student could take advantage of choice transportation, than all children in Title I schools in any year of school improvement should be included in the total count. Our understanding is this is a different interpretation from previous years count.**

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0
<b>Comments: Due to coding errors on the part of the LEA's and the lack of technical assistance from the SEA, information was not accurately gathered. To fix this problem for the 08-09 school year a new specific program code has been implemented and the data will be collected through the Arkansas Department of Education's computer reporting network. This change was included in the annual coding training for LEA bookkeepers and business managers. Arkansas will also be collecting this information on a separate budget set-aside form for the 09-10 school year.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDData. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDData 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.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	75
<b>Comments: This count includes school districts in which school choice was possible at some grade levels, but not at others. For example, a school district with multiple elementary schools, but only one middle and/or high school may be able to provide choice at the elementary level, but not at the upper grades.</b>	

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.<sup>3</sup>

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

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

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational 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	63,444
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,233
Received supplemental educational services	2,233
<b>Comments: This number is an under-representation of the actual number of students participating in SES in Arkansas. School Districts self-report on a child by child basis. A new data collection process is being investigated and is expected to be implemented in Arkansas. This system will provide more accurate child count and expenditure information for the future.</b>	

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

#### 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.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,197,556
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of 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 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 NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	167,536	164,941	98.5	2,595	1.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	18,601	18,086	97.2	515	2.8
Low-poverty schools	23,056	22,911	99.4	145	0.6
All elementary schools	81,397	80,267	98.6	1,130	1.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	17,131	16,605	96.9	526	3.1
Low-poverty schools	26,870	26,595	99.0	275	1.0
All secondary schools	86,139	84,674	98.3	1,465	1.7
<b>Comments: The inconsistency of the data from last year (22% decrease in the number of elementary classes and a 62% increase in the number of secondary classes) is most likely due to errors in new coding requirements. The problem occurred when code numbers were used to identify classes that do not require HQT (code "6"). It is possible that the year before (when the school districts were not so familiar with the system) they incorrectly coded more classes with a "6" indicating that the class did not require HQT (when it actually did require HQT). This possibility has been addressed and will be corrected in the software for next year's data collection.</b>					

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

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.

The state uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

Source – Manual entry by 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% 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. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher 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)(vii) 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	99.0
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	1.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by 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)	95.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	5.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	78.1	50.9
Poverty metric used	Percent of enrollment on Free and Reduced Price Lunch	
Secondary schools	65.9	40.7
Poverty metric used	Percent of enrollment on Free and Reduced Price Lunch	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by 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.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **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>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ELL/Mainstream collaboration; ELLIS (interactive computer program).

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) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in 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.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	26,003
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.2.2 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 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.	23,237
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 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
Spanish	22,838
Marshallese	910
Hmong	406
Laotian	387
Vietnamese	384

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	24,996
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,007
Total	26,003
<b>Comments: Arkansas is a high mobility state, which may explain the number of students not tested. ELL students may also be exited from an ESL program during the school year prior to English language proficiency testing, thus resulting in a discrepancy in the number of student tested and the number of students initially reported.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	1,384
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	5.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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	22,783
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	454
Total	23,237
<b>Comments: The percent making progress is calculated based on AMAO targets set by a committee of Arkansas educators under the direction of Mike Bunch, psychometrician and vice president of Measurement Incorporated, test vendor for Arkansas's English Language Development Assessment. The URL for Arkansas's AMAO targets is <a href="http://www.arkansased.org/lep/pdf/amao_objectives_053008.pdf">http://www.arkansased.org/lep/pdf/amao_objectives_053008.pdf</a>. AMAO #1 is calculated on an annual basis by comparing grade level cohort progress on the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA). Progress is defined by movement on the ELDA from one level to a higher level.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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.

#### **Table 1.6.3.2.2 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. 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.**
- 3. 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.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	6,891	46.1
ELP attainment	1,249	5.6
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments: Arkansas does not offer assessments in a language other than English.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 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 for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
0
<b>Comments: Arkansas does not offer assessments in a language other than English.</b>

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 for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
<b>Comments:</b> Arkansas does not offer assessments in a language other than English.

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.

Language(s)
0
0
0
0
0
<b>Comments:</b> Arkansas does not offer assessments in a language other than English.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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

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.

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
1,390	2,089	3,479
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students 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. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
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 mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,189	1,722	78.7	467
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results 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. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

1. **Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,013	1,504	74.7	509
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 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. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science 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.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
841	337	40.1	504
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 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. 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.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	36
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	29
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	33
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	36
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	31
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	7
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	7
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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 or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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 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) and 3115(a).**
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) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
4,169	2,800	8

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.

## 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) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	3,000
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	817

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 professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **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 counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. **Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.**
4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	24	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	21	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	18	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	16	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	10	
Other (Explain in comment box)	6	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	25	4,546
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	23	648
PD provided to principals	22	268
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	19	261
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	15	494
PD provided to community based organization personnel	19	163
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>6,380</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other: Family English instruction (teaching English to ELL families); teaching Spanish to school personnel for purposes of parental/home communication (Spanish for Educators); workshops on cultural competence; workshops on school districts's (legal) responsibilities to serve ELL students

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. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

#### **Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US 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.

<b>Date State Received Allocation</b>	<b>Date Funds Available to Subgrantees</b>	<b># of Days/\$\$ Distribution</b>
07/12/07	07/24/07	90
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.

Accelerate the review process of proposed Title III budgets submitted by Title III grantees.

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	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	86.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	86.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	87.1
Hispanic	85.3
White, non-Hispanic	89.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	90.8
Limited English proficient	81.6
Economically disadvantaged	89.5
Migratory students	90.0
Male	85.7
Female	87.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

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:

- 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.
- 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.

### 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	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4.9
Hispanic	3.8
White, non-Hispanic	2.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.9
Limited English proficient	3.6
Economically disadvantaged	2.7
Migratory students	4.1
Male	3.9
Female	2.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.*

## 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	245	245
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	257	257
<b>Comments:</b>		

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 Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	210	137
K	413	138
1	430	121
2	374	127
3	433	113
4	372	118
5	330	112
6	313	99
7	261	109
8	283	110
9	286	90
10	264	96
11	227	62
12	234	48
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total	4,436	1,481
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 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 Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	153	195
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,216	870
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	149	104
Hotels/Motels	708	175
Total	4,226	1,344
<b>Comments: Arkansas does not collect data for primary night-time residence of pre-k children. The discrepancy in total of homeless enrolled and primary residency of homeless is due to our collection data. Homeless pre-k students are counted but we do not document the primary residence. If the count of age 3-5 is added to the primary residency the two sections would be equal.</b>		

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)	16
K	80
1	65
2	83
3	82
4	72
5	80
6	61
7	70
8	75
9	68
10	59
11	50
12	36
Ungraded	N<10
Total	899
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	55
Migratory children/youth	10
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16
Limited English proficient students	49
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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
Tutoring or other instructional support	12
Expedited evaluations	N<10
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	10
Transportation	11
Early childhood programs	10
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	11
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	N<10
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	N<10
Counseling	N<10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	N<10
Clothing to meet a school requirement	N<10
School supplies	10
Referral to other programs and services	10
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	N<10
Other (optional – in comment box below)	N<10
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Books and Supplemental Reading Materials School Fees Hygiene Supplies Doctor Visit and medicine

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

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	0
Transportation	3
School records	4
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	2
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

High Mobility Immediate Enrollment

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	102	53
4	104	55
5	136	67
6	93	27
7	107	38
8	102	50
High School	56	22
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	102	66
4	105	62
5	135	70
6	93	26
7	106	40
8	103	32
High School	101	65
<b>Comments:</b>		

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.

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 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:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	888
K	533
1	562
2	549
3	518
4	540
5	478
6	480
7	429
8	373
9	359
10	366
11	237
12	244
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	871
Total	7,427
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

### 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 (not Kindergarten)	20
K	66
1	60
2	62
3	50
4	60
5	49
6	22
7	20
8	13
9	22
10	13
11	20
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	164
Total	648
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**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.

N/A

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

### 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.

The state of Arkansas MEP used MIS 2000 system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts. Yes, child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system.

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

### 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.

The Migrant Child counts are based first on eligibility data and individual student data from the COE, which is collected and entered throughout the year. These data are collected by means of interviews with the migrant families. The pertinent eligibility data and further documentation are noted on the Arkansas COE and the Supplementary Documentation Form. These data are then entered in the SIS after being reviewed by designated staff. Educational and other service data are also used in the calculation of child counts. These data are collected on student records, data entry forms and lists and are entered in the SIS throughout the year as services are provided. The Summer/Intercession count requires further data to be collected and recorded from migrant intercession staff demonstrating a Summer Enrollment and receipt of a migrant funded instructional service during the Summer Enrollment period. The following eligibility, student and educational data items are collected: Names of Migrant Children Parent or Guardian Names Complete Address Sex Birthdate Birthplace Grade Ethnicity Moved from city, state, country Moved to school district and state Qualifying Arrival Date Residency Date Qualifying Worker Name Qualifying Activity If work was Obtained or Sought Temporary or Seasonal With whom the move was made Interview Date Interviewer Name Interviewee Name General Comments Further Documentation Enroll Date Supplemental Program Start Dates Withdraw Date Generation Date

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.

The data are inputted on each regional database and uploaded to the state database daily when any COE or intercession data is entered. This uploading process involves Internet contact to the state database and is usually done first thing in the morning or last thing in the day. The data uploaded can be verified by reconnecting with the state database through the Internet. At the state database all uploaded data is processed and stored on tables and can be accessed by searches and queries. Each day after all the data is processed the regional databases are updated with any updates made to the state database insuring that each database is identical. As the information is processed Student Records are printed from the local database and sent to the Migrant Clerks to be checked for errors and filed after any necessary corrections are made and processed.

Three times a year complete lists of the students are sent to the projects to be checked for accuracy and completeness. Projects are also encouraged to check the database through the internet for individual students and complete lists of all of the migrant children in their district. Lists and special reports are provided any time during the year upon request. During the year when updates are made a record is sent to the school/district for verification of accuracy.

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.

N/A

### 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.

The child counts are retrieved from the state database through queries that count only distinct student numbers statewide. The Category 1 queries calculate all eligible children who were residing in the state between the dates of 09/01/2007 and 08/31/2008. The queries are set up to only count the children who have completed three years of age before 08/31/2008 and have not left the state before their third birthday and children who turn twenty-two years of age after 09/01/2007. The queries are also designed to eliminate, from the count, children whose three-year eligibility have run out before 09/01/2007 or have a termination date before 09/01/2007. The Summer/Intersession queries count all children who show a Summer Enrollment, have a MEP funded Supplemental Instructional Code attached to that enrollment and remain eligible for funding purposes during the Summer Enrollment period.

Any preschooler or Out of School Youth who was a migrant in the previous year must have their residency verified for the present year before they can be counted in the system. This is verified by a visit to the home, a call to the family or an interview with the youth or family member. Once their residency is verified they may have a new school history line placed on the database and will be counted in the query.

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.

N/A

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.

Quality Control begins with staff development. All recruiting staff goes through a thorough training regimen with state and regional level workshops. They also work with veteran recruiters before they complete their training. These trained recruiters interview the potential migrant parent, guardian, out-of-school youth or other person to determine eligibility. If the children are determined to be qualifying Migrant Students or Out-of-School Youth a COE will be filled out with the necessary information and a supplementary documentation form if needed. The Recruiter/Interviewer then sends the COE to the regional offices where it is reviewed and verified by the Recruitment/Eligibility/Data Specialist (REDS). If there is any discrepancy or doubt on COE data it is returned to the Recruiter/Interviewer for clarification or contacted for further explanation. Once it has been reviewed and accepted by the REDS regional directors examine it for final review before the data is input to the SIS. After the student is enrolled in the ARMEP and is in the SIS random lists of students are pulled in a report and re-interviews are done on many of the newly entered students and phone re-interviews are conducted by the REDS on a small number of students statewide. If the re-interview finds that the student is ineligible the student is removed from the SIS. All eligibility questions that arise are dealt with by a standard procedure. The procedure is included in the ARMEP Handbook and is incorporated in the training that each recruiter is given. The following is a simple outline of the eligibility question process used in training:

1. Check your manuals and other materials. You may have the information you need in some of the literature that you have received in the past.
2. If you cannot find the information by researching you should then call your Recruitment / Eligibility / Data Specialist (REDS). She will generally know the answer. If she has doubts and cannot locate the answer she will refer the question to the State Education Agency (SEA).
3. The SEA will attempt to answer the question immediately or research it. If the SEA has no set policy on the question and is unable to respond or locate the answer they may refer the question to OME for a decision.

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.

The ARMEP Re-Interview process is conducted throughout the year. The state is divided into five different regions and each region conducts its own re-interviews under the guidance of the SEA. The REDS conduct phone re-interviews on a small number of students as soon as possible after entering them into the SIS so that problem areas may be identified quickly. Each region is given random lists generated by the SIS of students recruited during the previous months in their respective regions. The reports are broken by school districts in order to facilitate location of the families. The re-interviewer obtains a copy of the original COE and works with local district personnel to assist in locating the families. The re-interviewer attempts to make a home visit or arrange for the parents to meet them at the school for the interview. If the family cannot be located the first time no more than 2 further attempts are made to re-interview the family. During the interview all data regarding eligibility and student information is verified. All discrepancies are noted for review and correction and a decision is made on the validity of the original eligibility determination by the state designee. When the random list is completed or no more families can be located the re-interviewer reports the results of the re-interviews to the regional director who reviews the report and determines, with assistance of the SEA, what actions need to be taken if errors or ineligible children are found. The following is a summary of the Arkansas Migrant Education Re-Interviews: Random Sample: 481 Re-Interviews Conducted: 282 Eligible: 281

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.

Before entering data from a COE on any child a name and birthdate based search is run on the state database to verify for previous information. If the child is already on the database the REDS input the new data with the existing Student Identification Number. If the child is not found on the database a distinct Student Identification Number is created by the SIS and the data is input with the new number. All enrollments, updates and records entered in the SIS during the year are printed and sent to the school or staff who requested the data input for verification of accuracy. During the year there are opportunities to validate the data on the databases by means of lists of eligible students currently enrolled, printing of the Migrant Student Records, lists of residency only and preschool children, and reports written for specific needs as per school district request. Another valuable tool in the process is access to our online version of the database where 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.

The State Recruitment Coordinator runs a complete list of all eligible Migrant Children for each region and district from the state database. These lists and counts are run with the Category I queries first. The same queries are run on the regional database and compared with results on the state database. If there are discrepancies they are researched by student number. REDS send a copy of the list report to the Migrant Clerk in their respective region to verify that the list compares correctly with the students in their schools. Any discrepancies are also reviewed individually. Running the queries for Summer/Intercession on the state database and breaking it by district is done after the Category I verification. The REDS for each region are given the counts and relay those district counts to the LEA Migrant Clerks. If there is any disagreement in the numbers the Migrant Clerks send a list of the Migrant Children that were served in the summer to the REDS and they check that each student has the proper information in order to appear on the Summer/Intercession count.

After the complete review the State Recruitment Coordinator presents all data results to the State Director for further review. The State Director and the Recruitment Coordinator compare all district and LEA results to the previous year's data. If there are dramatic changes in a region or LEA, or if there are any doubts about the data, the State Director will request that the Recruitment Coordinator return to the REDS and the Migrant Clerk for additional review and an explanation of the changes.

Once all reviews are made and notable changes are explained the State Director will approve the counts for submission.

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.

Individualized training will be provided for recruiters who need review on areas of eligibility. The SEA will adjust the state and regional trainings for any topics that have caused students to be considered ineligible.

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.

N/A

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