

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

ARIZONA



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:
Arizona Department of Education

Address:
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Richard Valdivia

Telephone: (602) 542-3270

Fax: (602) 542-3050

e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov

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

Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:23:58 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.

The following changes have been or will be made to the academic standards since peer review and approval on July 1, 2006. The Mathematics Standard was revised during School Year (SY) 2007-2008. The State Board of Education approved the revised standard on June 23, 2008. SY 2008-2009 will be a transition year with full implementation of the new mathematics standard during SY 2009-2010. The Language Arts Standards revision process has begun with an anticipated State Board approval date in the spring 2010. Schools will be given one year for transition with full implementation of the new language arts standards during SY 2011-2012. The Science Standard will be revised during the SY 2010-2011 with adoption in the spring 2011. Full implementation will be SY 2012-2013.

As of the fall 2008, the Alternate Achievement Standards have been clarified for greater understanding by educators.

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.

The following changes have been or will be made to the assessments and achievement standards since peer review and approval on July 1, 2006. Arizona will revise Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) Mathematics assessments for Grades 3-8 and high school to align with the new Mathematics Standard adopted June 23, 2008. Field testing of new items will be held spring 2009. New operational assessments will be given spring 2010. Standard setting and adoption of new achievement standards by the State Board will be complete June 2010.

Arizona is developing an alternate assessment for the 2% modified achievement student population, called AIMS Enhanced Accessibility (AIMS EA). Field testing of the AIMS EA will occur September 2009 with the first operational assessment Spring 2010. Standard setting and adoption by the State Board of new modified achievement standards will be completed June 2010.

Arizona is revising the Alternate Assessment for the 1% student population for Spring 2009 of reading and mathematics. Standard setting will be conducted June 2009 with adoption of achievement levels August 2009.

New Language Arts Assessments that will align to the new academic standards proposed for adoption in Spring 2010 will be developed for administration in Spring 2012.

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.

Science assessments were administered for the first time Spring 2008 in Grades 4, 8 and high school. Standard Setting occurred June 2008 with State Board approval of achievement levels June 23, 2008. The Alternate Science Assessment for the 1% population was also administered for the first time spring 2008. The State will submit the Arizona Science Assessments for Peer Review Spring 2009.

There is no plan to develop science assessments with modified achievement standards for the 2% population.

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	571,795	565,257	98.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	30,796	29,932	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,376	16,221	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	32,633	32,128	98.4
Hispanic	236,723	234,465	99.0
White, non-Hispanic	255,267	252,511	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	71,976	70,617	98.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	69,621	69,093	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	279,370	276,298	98.9
Migratory students	1,745	1,726	98.9
Male	292,193	288,486	98.7
Female	279,602	276,771	99.0
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. 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	65,651	93.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.0
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	4,977	7.0

Total	70,628	
-------	--------	--

Comments: The discrepancy in the total number of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating resulted from generating the figures from two different agency divisions. The numbers are based on the same assumptions and ought to be the same. We are working on a reconciliation.

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	572,671	566,424	98.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	30,872	30,048	97.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	16,382	16,224	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	32,675	32,181	98.5
Hispanic	237,165	235,041	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	255,577	252,930	99.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	72,160	70,864	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	69,754	69,231	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	279,953	277,004	99.0
Migratory students	1,754	1,737	99.0
Male	292,650	289,109	98.8
Female	280,021	277,315	99.0
Comments:			

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	65,869	93.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.0
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	4,987	7.0
Total	70,856	
Comments: The discrepancy in the total number of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating resulted from generating the figures from two different agency divisions. The numbers are based on the same assumptions and ought to be the same. We are working on a reconciliation.		

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	240,358	197,461	82.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	13,270	10,682	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,763	5,633	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	13,863	11,506	83.0
Hispanic	97,266	81,398	83.7
White, non-Hispanic	109,196	88,242	80.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	28,877	21,694	75.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	26,510	22,498	84.9
Economically disadvantaged students	109,439	92,344	84.4
Migratory students	818	661	80.8
Male	122,389	99,841	81.6
Female	117,969	97,620	82.8
Comments: Science assessments were done only for grades 4, 8, and 10.			

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	21,733	90.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	2,239	9.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	23,972	
Comments: The discrepancy in the total number of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating resulted from generating the figures from two different agency divisions. The numbers are based on the same assumptions and ought to be the same. We are working on a reconciliation and will update the numbers when we can.		

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

Grade 3	# 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	83,601	59,421	71.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,471	2,351	52.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,458	2,101	85.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,690	2,819	60.1
Hispanic	36,443	22,648	62.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,539	29,502	83.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,955	4,603	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,446	7,002	45.3
Economically disadvantaged students	45,261	27,561	60.9
Migratory students	205	106	51.7
Male	42,872	30,161	70.4
Female	40,729	29,260	71.8
Comments:			

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.

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

Grade 3	# 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	83,605	57,291	68.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,471	2,306	51.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,458	2,023	82.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,691	2,904	61.9
Hispanic	36,440	20,985	57.6
White, non-Hispanic	35,545	29,073	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,954	3,777	34.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,442	5,410	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	45,254	25,878	57.2
Migratory students	205	88	42.9
Male	42,876	27,612	64.4
Female	40,729	29,679	72.9
Comments:			

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.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# 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
Grade 3			
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
Comments:			

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

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	82,021	60,918	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,178	2,355	56.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,402	2,112	87.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,751	3,037	63.9
Hispanic	35,114	23,220	66.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,576	30,194	84.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,122	4,727	42.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,994	5,717	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	43,050	27,716	64.4
Migratory students	234	144	61.5
Male	42,009	30,741	73.2
Female	40,012	30,177	75.4
Comments:			

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

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	82,040	57,052	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,181	2,114	50.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,400	1,977	82.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4,753	2,957	62.2
Hispanic	35,117	20,413	58.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,589	29,591	83.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,129	3,880	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,994	3,623	27.9
Economically disadvantaged students	43,061	24,652	57.2
Migratory students	234	112	47.9
Male	42,020	27,583	65.6
Female	40,020	29,469	73.6
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 4			
All students	76,825	40,922	53.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,847	1,131	29.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,291	1,616	70.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,435	1,857	41.9
Hispanic	32,748	12,163	37.1
White, non-Hispanic	33,504	24,155	72.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,654	2,798	29.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,095	1,405	11.6
Economically disadvantaged students	39,924	14,777	37.0
Migratory students	214	54	25.2
Male	39,149	21,140	54.0
Female	37,676	19,782	52.5
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 5			
All students	81,555	56,685	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,082	2,101	51.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,315	1,985	85.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,639	2,674	57.6
Hispanic	34,930	20,821	59.6
White, non-Hispanic	35,589	29,104	81.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,000	3,659	33.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,286	3,083	30.0
Economically disadvantaged students	42,727	24,880	58.2
Migratory students	231	122	52.8
Male	41,859	28,871	69.0
Female	39,696	27,814	70.1
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 5			
All students	81,577	55,558	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,083	2,010	49.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,314	1,903	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,638	2,779	59.9
Hispanic	34,933	19,673	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,609	29,193	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,010	3,367	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,280	2,072	20.2
Economically disadvantaged students	42,743	23,725	55.5
Migratory students	231	105	45.5
Male	41,872	26,914	64.3
Female	39,705	28,644	72.1
Comments:			

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
Grade 5			
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
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 6			
All students	81,973	55,175	67.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,269	2,041	47.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,344	2,026	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	4,602	2,555	55.5
Hispanic	33,934	19,348	57.0
White, non-Hispanic	36,824	29,205	79.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,493	2,718	25.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,625	2,077	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	41,179	22,640	55.0
Migratory students	248	127	51.2
Male	41,753	27,247	65.3
Female	40,220	27,928	69.4
Comments:			

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.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -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
Grade 6			
All students	82,003	56,102	68.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,273	2,039	47.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,347	1,953	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,603	2,811	61.1
Hispanic	33,945	19,064	56.2
White, non-Hispanic	36,835	30,235	82.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,506	2,833	27.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,628	1,367	15.8
Economically disadvantaged students	41,199	22,622	54.9
Migratory students	248	120	48.4
Male	41,766	26,997	64.6
Female	40,237	29,105	72.3
Comments:			

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.

1.3.3.4 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
Grade 6			
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
Comments:			

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

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
All students	81,084	57,513	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,254	2,223	52.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,403	2,108	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,567	2,710	59.3
Hispanic	33,159	20,271	61.1
White, non-Hispanic	36,701	30,201	82.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,970	2,674	26.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,483	2,391	28.2
Economically disadvantaged students	39,226	23,216	59.2
Migratory students	236	123	52.1
Male	41,477	28,408	68.5
Female	39,607	29,105	73.5
Comments:			

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

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
All students	81,098	56,735	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,258	2,270	53.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,403	2,026	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,567	2,859	62.6
Hispanic	33,161	19,390	58.5
White, non-Hispanic	36,709	30,190	82.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,971	2,658	26.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,481	1,591	18.8
Economically disadvantaged students	39,240	22,486	57.3
Migratory students	236	111	47.0
Male	41,485	26,968	65.0
Female	39,613	29,767	75.1
Comments:			

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
Grade 7			
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
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 8			
All students	80,788	49,543	61.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,433	1,866	42.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,263	1,833	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	4,606	2,222	48.2
Hispanic	32,824	16,204	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	36,662	27,418	74.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,578	1,834	19.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,962	1,414	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	37,933	18,099	47.7
Migratory students	263	114	43.3
Male	41,137	24,996	60.8
Female	39,651	24,547	61.9
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 8			
All students	80,813	53,957	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,440	2,128	47.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,263	1,837	81.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,610	2,724	59.1
Hispanic	32,835	17,776	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	36,665	29,492	80.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,582	2,195	22.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,968	1,117	14.0
Economically disadvantaged students	37,945	20,139	53.1
Migratory students	263	127	48.3
Male	41,145	25,964	63.1
Female	39,668	27,993	70.6
Comments:			

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

	# 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
Grade 8			
All students	76,704	38,354	50.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,098	1,067	26.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,196	1,521	69.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,332	1,637	37.8
Hispanic	31,080	10,358	33.3
White, non-Hispanic	34,998	23,771	67.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,251	1,173	14.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,419	399	5.4
Economically disadvantaged students	35,653	11,825	33.2
Migratory students	256	62	24.2
Male	38,893	19,280	49.6
Female	37,811	19,074	50.4
Comments:			

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

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
All students	74,242	50,518	68.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,246	1,975	46.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,036	1,724	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	4,272	2,394	56.0
Hispanic	28,069	15,758	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,619	28,667	80.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,499	1,679	22.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,296	1,185	22.4
Economically disadvantaged students	26,932	14,273	53.0
Migratory students	309	169	54.7
Male	37,383	24,976	66.8
Female	36,859	25,542	69.3
Comments:			

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

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
All students	75,298	55,359	73.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,343	2,307	53.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,039	1,736	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,318	2,898	67.1
Hispanic	28,619	17,294	60.4
White, non-Hispanic	35,979	31,124	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,713	2,347	30.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,437	838	15.4
Economically disadvantaged students	27,571	16,061	58.3
Migratory students	320	174	54.4
Male	37,951	27,022	71.2
Female	37,347	28,337	75.9
Comments:			

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

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
All students	43,934	14,261	32.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,737	389	14.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,146	513	44.8
Black, non-Hispanic	2,739	597	21.8
Hispanic	17,573	3,451	19.6
White, non-Hispanic	19,739	9,311	47.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,789	298	7.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,983	59	2.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,768	3,185	19.0
Migratory students	191	26	13.6
Male	21,799	7,421	34.0
Female	22,135	6,840	30.9
Comments:			

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	1,872	1,362	72.8
Districts	558	341	61.1
Comments:			

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	1,012	670	66.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	586	330	56.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	426	340	79.8
Comments:			

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
434	239	55.1
Comments:		

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))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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.

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

1.4.4.3 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	12
Extension of the school year or school day	7
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	12
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	7
Comments:	

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)	4
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	17
Comments:	

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.

Other major restructuring of the school governance included the following:

1. Implementation of turnaround principals/school leaders who were given the necessary decision-making authority, as well as the necessary budget and staffing, to impact instructional programs with the focus on improved student achievement. In these situations the principals were given the capacity to raise the professional expectations of the staff and focus on data-driven instructional practices.
2. Implementation of a systemic Response to Intervention (R t I) model, an academic intervention designed to provide early, effective assistance to children who are having difficulty learning. Response to intervention models employed by schools in restructure implemented this data-based process of diagnosing learning disabilities seeking to prevent academic failure through early intervention, frequent progress measurement, and increasingly intensive research-based instructional interventions for children who continue to have difficulty. Schools implementing the R t I model were being proactive in their approach to positive student gains, avoiding the so-called "wait-to-fail" method by providing intervention as soon as children exhibit difficulty.
3. Implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) with the intent of focusing on learning rather than on teaching, working collaboratively, and holding principals, teachers, and students accountable for results. In the process of implementation,

schools revised master schedules to create scientifically-based, school-embedded content for teacher engagement, job-embedded professional development, and other professional collaboration opportunities. Schools reorganized themselves to integrate two concepts: professionalism and community. The reorganization, via the PLC implementation, was intended to stress professionalism as a specialized knowledge and a focus on serving client needs. Community was being implemented based on caring, support, and mutual responsibility with in a group. The characteristics of the PLCs in the restructuring schools included collective team work in which leadership and responsibility for student learning are extensively shared, a focus on reflective inquiry, emphasis on improving student learning, and shared values and norms.

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.

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

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.

Accountability: ADE's LEA Resource Teams will visit each LEA in Year 2 of Title I LEA Improvement and provide feedback regarding the implementation of the LEAs' Improvement Plans.

YEAR THREE CORRECTIVE ACTION

PART ONE-Expectations of District
August -September
Same as Years 1 and 2

October

The LEA must use the Parent Notification Letter template from ADE, complete and mail that letter to parents of all children in the LEA with a copy sent to ADE. The LEA may submit the LEA Parent Notification Reimbursement Grant application. The LEA in Year 3 -Corrective Action will receive a site visit by ADE Improvement Specialist to discuss Self-Assessment and corrective action implementation.

November

Same as Year 1 and Year 2

December

Same as Years 1 and 2 including: LEAs in Year 3 -Corrective Action will incorporate in their LEA Improvement Plan the corrective action option, as per NCLB and AZ State Law that will be implemented by the LEA.

January -May

Same as Year 1 and Year 2

PART TWO-ADE Technical Support description:

August -September
Same as Year 1 and 2

Accountability: Same as Year 1 and 2

October

ADE provides a site visit by their LEA Improvement Specialist in addition to the technical support listed in Year 1 and Year 2.

Accountability: Same as Year 1 and 2 including an ADE specialist to monitor the LEA progress in implementing the corrective action option and the recommendations made by the LEA Resource Team during the Year 2 visit.

November

Same as Year 1 and Year 2

Accountability: Same as Year 1 and Year 2

December

Same as Year 1 and Year 2 including an ADE review of the LEA Improvement Plan, checking for Corrective Action selection by the LEA.

Accountability: Same as Year 1 and Year 2, including cross-unit evaluation and approval of LEA's Improvement Plan when the plan indicates, for the LEA in Year 3 -Corrective Action, which corrective action option, as per NCLB and AZ State Law.

January -May

Same as Year 1 and Year 2

Accountability: Same as Year 1 and Year 2

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	19
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
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
Comments:	

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	71	30
Schools	204	94
Comments:		

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	10/1/08
---	---------

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	118,384	123,210
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	56,628	55,296
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	47.8	44.9
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	56,129	53,380
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	47.4	43.3
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	268	
Comments:		

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	68
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	14
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	198
Comments:	

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

1.4.8.3 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
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		268	14	68	A	
Comments:						

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.
- 7 = Combination 2: 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

831.

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.

Schools and LEAs in improvement were assigned Title I School Improvement Education Specialists who made site visits to each district and school campus and worked with district and school leadership teams in assisting them with revisions and implementation of their school improvement plans. In September, a mandatory technical assistance workshop was conducted for all LEAs and schools in improvement. At the mandatory workshop, sessions were conducted in matters of compliance, data analysis, design of school improvement goals, grant writing, and individual school consultations as needed.

Additional sharing strategies:

- A. SEA sponsored Best Practices Institutes with focus on improving instruction, data driven instruction and leadership;
- B. Online access through Arizona State University's IDEAL for additional instruction and technical assistance in the area(s) school missed AYP; and
- C. Partnered with WestEd and Southwest Comprehensive Center (SWCC) to assist in delivering research-based technical assistance in the above-mentioned areas.

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 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

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.

PART ONE -EVALUATION

The SEA reviewed schools using the following criteria:

1. Did the plan address the school's AYP determination and the results of the self assessment on the Standards and Rubric for School Improvement? The ADE looked for a relationship among goals/strategies/activities, funding resources, timelines and professional development activities.
2. Were a diverse group of stakeholders involved in the development of the improvement plan? The ADE reviewed how the stakeholders were involved and looked to see the extent of their projected future involvement.
3. What was the effectiveness of the previous year's strategies?
4. What, if any, revisions have been made to this year's plan as a result of school's self evaluation?

The Department of Education used this process to assess progress as schools moved towards Meeting or Exceeding the Standard. It was our intent that an LEA viewed this process as a necessity in establishing goals for changes in instructional practice that would be supported by professional development for all staff.

The ultimate goal was that the schools would meet AYP targets and exit from school improvement status.

The success of implementation was determined and evaluated through schools showing annual adequate progress relative to past and present program goals, performance measures, and gains in student achievement as measured by both norm referenced and AIMS tests. Progress toward implementation continues to be demonstrated and the above conditions considered in the renewal determination of the grant for subsequent years. NOTE: The 1003a funds were granted to the SEA in January and distributed to the Restructuring Schools in February. This shortened timeline was considered in the renewal determinations for the 2009-10 school year.

PART TWO -TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE Schools that were in restructuring were assigned Title I School Improvement Education Specialists who made site visits to school campuses and worked with building leadership teams to assist them with revisions and implementation of their school improvement plans. A mandatory technical assistance workshop was conducted for all schools in improvement. At the workshop, sessions were conducted in matters of compliance, data analysis, design of school improvement goals, grant writing, and individual school consultations, as needed.

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.

The SEA

-sponsored Best Practices Institutes focusing on improving instruction, data driven instruction and leadership

-enabled online access through Arizona State University's IDEAL for additional instruction and technical assistance in the area(s) school missed AYP

-partnered with WestEd and Southwest Comprehensive Center (SWCC) to assist in delivering research-based technical assistance in the above-mentioned areas.

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

831.

1.4.9 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	160,347
Applied to transfer	819
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	472

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:	

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	\$ 464,411
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	61
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³

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

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

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	79,593
Applied for supplemental educational services	7,512
Received supplemental educational services	5,723
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	\$ 5,196,278
Comments:	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of 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	266,824	248,456	93.1	18,368	6.9
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	47,855	43,554	91.0	4,301	9.0
Low-poverty schools	56,278	54,607	97.0	1,671	3.0
All elementary schools	209,455	195,165	93.2	14,290	6.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	7,556	6,917	91.5	639	8.5
Low-poverty schools	18,675	17,954	96.1	721	3.9
All secondary schools	57,369	53,291	92.9	4,078	7.1
Comments:					

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.

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	53.0
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	19.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
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)	47.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	24.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	29.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
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	80.9	34.8
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	68.6	15.5
Poverty metric used	Student Accountability Information System (SAIS)	
Comments:		

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
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual	
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Navajo
No	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
No	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"OTHER" Explanation:

INDIVIDUAL LANGUAGE LEARNER PLAN. Schools with 20 or fewer ELLs within a three grade span (including kindergarten), may provide instruction through the development of Individual Language Learner Plans (ILLPs) created for each ELL.

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	166,572
Comments:	

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.	161,783
Comments:	

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	156,537
Navajo	4,739
Other non-Indian	2,773
Vietnamese	1,719
Arabic	1,094

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	166,572
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	166,572
Comments:	

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	39,897
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	24.0
Comments:	

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	161,783
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	161,783
Comments:	

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	97,016	60.0
ELP attainment	32,854	20.0
Comments:		

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
Comments:	

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)
Comments:

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

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
10,185	5,269	15,454
Comments:		

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
20,896	16,385	78.4	4,511
Comments:			

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.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
20,897	15,998	76.6	4,899
Comments:			

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
0	0	0.0	0
Comments:			

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	217
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	70
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	206
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	117
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	155
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)	127
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	163
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	34
Comments:	

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>
Comments:	

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.	
Comments:	

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
15,503	5,514	12

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.	7,771
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,029

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.**

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	217	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	217	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	217	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	217	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	217	12,622
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	217	4,675
PD provided to principals	217	727
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	217	102
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	217	339
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	217	18,465

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/07	9/14/07	74
Comments:		

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.

Arizona relies on the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS) to determine LEP counts used for allocation purposes. All data entered for 2007-2008 was input by the districts and charters. In order to count all eligible students, districts and charters were allowed to correct counts after the deadline of June 30. This delayed the allocation for the 2007-2008 school year.

For the 2008-2009 school year, districts will not be allowed to change data entered after the June 30 deadline. For future years, Arizona is making changes in the collection of LEP data and taking steps to ensure the integrity of the data entered so that the allocation process may be shortened.

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
Comments:	

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	73.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	55.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	72.0
Hispanic	65.0
White, non-Hispanic	81.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	63.0
Limited English proficient	46.0
Economically disadvantaged	65.0
Migratory students	74.0
Male	69.0
Female	78.0
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	5.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	7.2
White, non-Hispanic	4.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.8
Limited English proficient	8.0
Economically disadvantaged	6.2
Migratory students	3.7
Male	6.4
Female	5.1
Comments:	

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	173	173
LEAs with subgrants	18	18
Total	191	191
Comments:		

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)	100	62
K	1,440	598
1	1,333	602
2	1,304	512
3	1,175	503
4	1,121	461
5	1,040	459
6	1,053	458
7	1,050	353
8	1,064	349
9	1,620	364
10	1,230	264
11	1,121	202
12	1,273	266
Ungraded	0	N<10
Total	15,924	5,456
Comments:		

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	4,565	1,043
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	10,448	3,814
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	330	129
Hotels/Motels	581	470
Total	15,924	5,456
Comments:		

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)	79
K	561
1	514
2	450
3	451
4	401
5	409
6	377
7	315
8	304
9	250
10	233
11	172
12	277
Ungraded	0
Total	4,793
Comments:	

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	408
Migratory children/youth	25
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	705
Limited English proficient students	753
Comments:	

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	14
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	13
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	14
Transportation	14
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	14
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	14
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	12
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	15
Counseling	12
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	8
Clothing to meet a school requirement	16
School supplies	17
Referral to other programs and services	16
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	13
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	6
School Selection	3
Transportation	7
School records	2
Immunizations	3
Other medical records	
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	1,132	591
4	1,038	521
5	994	453
6	1,020	465
7	932	450
8	915	395
High School	951	462
Comments:		

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	1,135	651
4	1,041	594
5	994	487
6	1,019	448
7	931	471
8	914	338
High School	917	396
Comments:		

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).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	968
K	624
1	652
2	664
3	576
4	655
5	675
6	657
7	646
8	701
9	848
10	721
11	686
12	724
Ungraded	51
Out-of-school	64
Total	9,912
Comments:	

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.

The 12% decrease from 2006-07 to 2007-08 is a direct result of three factors. First, the establishment of roadside checkpoints by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and other increased enforcement of immigration have caused many migrant families to remain in their current location. When these families reduce mobility, the students lose eligibility for the migrant program. Another factor is reduced agricultural work in the state, a migrant employer. Many agricultural fields are now housing and industrial developments. The third factor is Arizona's adoption of an employer sanction law that penalizes employers who knowingly hire workers who are not legal residents of the United States. Migrant families who are not legal residents in Arizona have now moved out of the state.

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)	36
K	97
1	105
2	90
3	107
4	96
5	91
6	71
7	70
8	50
9	64
10	59
11	61
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	1,012
Comments:	

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.

The State of Arizona, for the first time, has seen a large decrease in the numbers of MEP students served through MEP funded summer school. The reason for this decrease is the result of our families leaving the state due to Arizona Employer Sanction Laws as well as the fact that we have seen an increase in districts that are opting to include the MEP students in their Title I summer school programs rather than running a separate MEP funded summer school program.

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.

COEstar, Yes

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.

Data collected relevant to the child count includes (1) the COE, (2) school or program enrollment including the school term, school year, enrollment and withdrawal date from the program, (3) LEP assessment, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination data, (4) Instructional and Supportive Services program data including type of program and funding source.

Clerks or liaisons at each school site conduct home visits with each migrant family who may be eligible for the Migrant Education Program. Once the interview is conducted and eligibility is determined, the migrant clerk collects all information needed to report in COEstar. COEstar is an integrated component of our data collection system and data is collected during the entire year. Information is collected on the student's classes of attendance, start date, end date, and days of attendance. The student must be present in order for that information to be entered into COEstar. The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by having the Migrant Student Information Center personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered and provides technical assistance for them to enter into COEstar.

Category 2 data is collected in the same manner. The main difference is that Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are enrolled in a specific summer school line in COEstar and receive a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, they receive a unique "I" code enrollment type which corresponds with Intersession.

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.

Student data is collected locally by the LEA's participating in the Migrant Education Program and entered into COEstar by the districts directly, if they have the capacity to do so, or by the staff from our data center at Statewide Services, if districts are unable to enter data directly. At the beginning of each school year, Migrant Clerks are responsible for checking with each school's registrar to determine if enrollment is the same. Regardless of enrollment status, it is the Clerk's responsibility to attempt to contact each Migrant family in their district. This is done by either phone call or home visit. Once contact has been made, the clerk re-interviews the parents/guardians to determine if there has been any change in eligibility. Updates to student records are made by the LEA staff upon receipt of the information, which is validated, from parents, students or school records. COEstar conducts data checks to ensure integrity of the data on the system. Exception reports are produced by the system, which in turn generates a review by staff at our Statewide Services office. The review by staff may generate changes or updates to the information. The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by having the Migrant Student Information Center personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered and technical assistance for them to enter into COEstar.

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.

Student data is collected locally by the LEAs participating in the Migrant Education Program and entered into COEstar by the districts directly, if they have the capacity to do so, or by the staff from our data center at Statewide Services, if districts are unable to enter data directly. Migrant clerks collect information for the students enrolled in summer school or intersession through their districts computer data base. Information collected is the student's classes of attendance, start date, end date, and days of attendance. The student needs to be present in order for that information to be entered in COEstar. The migrant clerk has access to this information for reporting purposes. The state ensures that summer/intersessions are reported by having Migrant Student Information Center personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered, and the technical assistance for them to enter data into COEstar.

Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are enrolled in a specific summer school line in COEstar and receive a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, they receive a unique "I" code enrollment type which

corresponds with Intersession.

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

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.

Since COEstar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source.

Since COEstar keeps a copy of the actual COE, calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulation, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted. COEstar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track, but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.

TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, Residency dates, Enrollment dates, Withdrawal dates, Departure dates, LEP, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate they left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began.

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Entry of this data means that the State served the child during the summer/intersession term. Additional services information can be added to indicate the nature of services but the summer/intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service began.

COEstar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state, region, county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level, eligible children are counted only once, statewide, in each eligible category.

Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in School wide programs and TAS programs funded by MEP, in both regular and summer/intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Migrant Recruiters and Liaisons at the LEA's receive information directly from parents or guardians regarding eligibility for MEP services. Questionable data is reviewed and parents or guardians are asked to produce information to validate eligibility data provided. For example, the Liaison or Recruiter may ask for proof of qualifying employment, proof of a qualifying move and school records. Recruiters and Liaisons may query school records directly to verify information.

Eligibility verification is done at the LEA level. Districts are required by the State Agency to make annual contact with the families and verify eligibility information. Residency is verified during these annual contact meetings. The State provides Identification and Recruitment trainings for both Migrant Recruiters and Migrant Clerks several times during the year. The State Recruitment Specialist does Migrant Program Orientation and Training for migrant staff as soon as a district hires their migrant personnel. Recruiter/Liaisons receive complete training on the rules, regulations, and guidelines for eligibility of Migrant students. Recruiters also receive basic training on COEstar and data entry requirements. Migrant clerks receive complete COEstar data input training and hands on training on the processing of Certificates of Eligibility. Migrant clerks also receive training on Migrant program regulations to ensure they are aware of the eligibility requirements of the program. This type of training ensures Migrant Recruiters/Liaisons and Clerks are cross trained in order that everyone is aware of the validity of the information they input and recruiters/liaisons are oriented in data input so they are able to enter COEstar and retrieve information on former and or current Migrant students. All LEA MEP staff members are provided with the state of Arizona's Identification and Recruitment manual, copies of OME guidance, and copies of federal regulations.

If an eligibility question does arise that a Migrant clerk is not able to resolve themselves, the State has the following process in place to resolve eligibility questions: LEA staff contacts the State Identification and Recruitment specialist with questions regarding eligibility. If the question is not answered, the ID&R Specialist will contact the Migrant State Department of Education (ADE) Education Program Specialist for assistance. If the eligibility question is not resolved by ADE Ed. Specialist, the ADE Ed. Specialist will consult with the State Migrant Program Director for guidance. If the eligibility question is not resolved by the State Director, the State Director will contact the Office of Migrant Education (OME) in Washington, DC for assistance.

COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods, Each COE can be marked as verified and locked, and invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

Our Migrant Student Information Data Center staff will conduct Data Verification. The data centers produce and send to each LEA a list of eligible students on a monthly basis and request the districts to confirm the accuracy of their district counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff. In addition, Data Centers will conduct a yearly COE review. One year it will be on-site and the next year will be a paper review. Through this process they are also checking for eligibility, QAD, qualifying activity, dates and locations.

Our data is also verified and validated at the State level. An ADE Ed. Specialist reviews all data from the Statewide Services office prior to submission of the data via the CSPR. The Specialist reviews each individual student and checks against students with similar information to determine if there are duplicates that have not been identified in any of the other checks in place. Once this process has been completed, all possible duplicates are sent back to Statewide Services for staff to review. Any errors and corrected, the report is run again, and the process is repeated until the State and Statewide Services has agreed that all data is in fact unduplicated.

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.

There was no re-interview process during this reporting period.

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.

COEstar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data.

Since all COEstar data originates with the collection of the COE, COEstar is included in the overall Quality control process. Additional data,

COEstar does not merge data. All data kept by COEstar databases is relational based on internal keys and all information for a child is related. The system does support data synchronization between multiple stand-alone systems using a very accurate and proprietary technology developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation. This method relies on record stamping using keys and data signatures to determine how data is exchanged and consolidated. The process is similar to other database synchronization methods but is much more refined and precise. COEstar documentation provides more information about data partners and the synchronization process.

Staff at State Wide Services reviews COE data inputted at local terminals to ensure accuracy of the COE. Staff also verifies data inputted by the LEA regarding services provided to ensure the LEA has accurately categorized the type of service. Data verifications are done by sampling LEA COE's. The amount sampled is directly correlated to the number of students in each program. This year, the Arizona Department of Education implemented a process for further testing and verification of the COEstar data. This process is designed to validate the information in COEstar by district, school, and student name to identify any errors that COEstar may not have picked up.

Throughout the year, Statewide Services staff and staff from the Arizona Department of Education conduct staff development sessions where Recruiters, Liaisons and clerks are trained in the requirements of the Migrant Program including eligibility data input and validation. The two data centers in Yuma, Arizona and Littleton, Arizona synchronize three times a week to ensure accuracy of the student data. Staff review error reports produced by COEstar, validate the data and generate necessary data inputs to correct these errors. The Data Centers produce and send to each LEA a list of eligible students on a monthly basis and request the districts to confirm the accuracy of their district counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff.

A similar process is also conducted by the ADE Ed. Specialists during the on-site monitoring of LEA MEPs. The Ed. Specialist reviews a random set of COEs and student files in the same process of Statewide Services.

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.

COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and dependable. All numbers are double and triple checked against other sources to insure accuracy. In addition, reports are run throughout the year to monitor child counts as part of the quality control process.

We have specific data verification procedures in place at the State MEP Office. The State MEP Office requests student information from the Data Centers in the form of a table with information including student name, ID number, district, and school information. Identical matches and near matches are identified. Near matches are investigated by hand and a determination made as to whether they are the same child. Any near matches that are found to be duplicates are sent back to the data center for corrections to be made prior to the submission of the child count report. This process continues until all students have been individually looked at and no further changes are requested. Once corrections have been made and a new count generated this information is then compared to previous year's numbers. Once all verification has been done, a final count is submitted to the Migrant Director for review.

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.

Improve technical assistance and training to ID&R specialists and clerks to ensure they are regularly trained on Title I Part C student eligibility laws, regulations, policies and procedures. The state will implement re-interview requirements of the federal law when they become effective. When onsite visits are made by SEA Migrant Staff to the LEA's they will review a random sample of COE's to determine accuracy of eligibility determination and accurate documentation.

The state will explore the possibilities of automating some of the manual data verification processes at the state level. Thus, becoming more efficient in the validation of data and further minimize the possibility of human error.

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.