

**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

CALIFORNIA



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 ED Facts 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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: California Department of Education		
Address: 1430 N Street Sacramento, CA 95814		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Justin Lane		
Telephone: 916-319-0495		
Fax: 916-319-0971		
e-mail: jlane@cde.ca.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Deb Sigman		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 2:23:30 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The California Department of Education (CDE) reviewed and revised the CAPA blueprints to bring them into alignment with the federal requirements that the CAPA be linked to grade-level content standards. The revised blueprints were adopted by the SBE in March 2006. Item development for the new assessments began in June 2006, items were field-tested in 2007, and operational testing took place in 2008. Currently the CAPA includes the following assessments: English-language arts Grades 2-11, Mathematics Grades 2-11.

The federal government has provided states flexibility under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 to develop an additional alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards for up to two percent of the state's pupils. The CDE is developing the CMA. This standards-based assessment will be administered to pupils with an IEP who meet the SBE approved participation criteria.

In November 2006, a pilot test was conducted for the CMA in grades four, five, and six to provide information about the population of pupils to be tested. Blueprints for the CMA for grades three through five in ELA and mathematics were adopted by the SBE in 2007.

The CMA was administered for the first time in 2008 to eligible pupils in grades three through five. A CMA writing test has been developed and will be administered in 2009 to eligible pupils in grades four and seven. Additionally, blueprints for grades six through eight in ELA, grades six and seven in mathematics were adopted by the SBE in September 2007. These tests were field-tested in the fall of 2008 and will be operational in the spring of 2009.

Currently, the CDE is in the developmental phases for inclusion of Algebra I as an end-of-course (EOC) CMA mathematics examination, and grades nine and ten ELA examinations in 2010. In 2011, it is anticipated that grade eleven ELA will be included in CMA.

California's eighth grade math assessments are not currently approved by the US Department of Education. The CDE is currently in discussion with the USDOE on this issue.

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.

State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved.

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	3,310,660	3,284,486	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	27,487	27,093	98.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	398,728	397,412	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	254,606	251,071	98.6
Hispanic	1,641,351	1,629,484	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	955,826	947,380	99.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	372,337	365,726	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,107,537	1,100,677	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	1,827,953	1,813,984	99.2
Migratory students	69,928	69,572	99.5
Male	1,697,315	1,682,404	99.1
Female	1,612,794	1,601,557	99.3
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	266,689	72.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	35,438	9.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	32,380	8.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	31,219	8.5
Total	365,726	
Comments: This count includes students that did not complete enough items to compute a performance level on the assessment.		

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	3,311,129	3,280,752	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	27,511	27,069	98.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	398,828	397,291	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	254,671	250,422	98.3
Hispanic	1,641,426	1,626,623	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	956,039	947,336	99.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	372,472	361,727	97.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,107,649	1,098,773	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	1,828,311	1,811,186	99.1
Migratory students	69,944	69,467	99.3
Male	1,698,011	1,680,059	98.9
Female	1,612,569	1,600,181	99.2
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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	267,706	74.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,184	7.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	38,217	10.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	28,620	7.9
Total	361,727	
Comments: This count includes students that did not complete enough items to compute a performance level on the assessment.		

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	1,449,295	1,414,102	97.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	12,307	11,805	95.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	177,006	175,041	98.9
Black, non-Hispanic	114,128	108,907	95.4
Hispanic	702,098	684,771	97.5
White, non-Hispanic	430,008	420,580	97.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	155,483	147,623	94.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	470,226	459,627	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	763,388	744,144	97.5
Migratory students	29,760	29,369	98.7
Male	743,022	723,278	97.3
Female	705,946	690,559	97.8

Comments: We missed the 95% level for Children with Disabilities by 9 students. California is developing new modified tests for students with disabilities.

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

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

1.2.6 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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	110,055	74.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,697	8.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	12,406	8.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	12,465	8.4
Total	147,623	

Comments: We missed the 95% level for Children with Disabilities by 9 students.

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

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

1.3 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	452,651	275,608	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,699	1,943	52.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,006	42,319	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	33,742	15,429	45.7
Hispanic	232,175	119,476	51.5
White, non-Hispanic	125,402	92,675	73.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	51,717	21,257	41.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	166,261	84,510	50.8
Economically disadvantaged students	265,277	134,344	50.6
Migratory students	9,689	4,124	42.6
Male	232,192	142,663	61.4
Female	220,406	132,923	60.3
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.

1.3.2.1 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	452,255	173,280	38.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,687	1,205	32.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,004	30,201	58.1
Black, non-Hispanic	33,701	9,612	28.5
Hispanic	231,968	58,007	25.0
White, non-Hispanic	125,267	71,446	57.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	51,213	14,260	27.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	166,111	36,580	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	265,034	65,816	24.8
Migratory students	9,673	1,453	15.0
Male	231,880	82,745	35.7
Female	220,322	90,517	41.1
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

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	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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: Science was not tested in this grade.			

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	456,485	277,243	60.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,756	1,868	49.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,827	43,211	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	34,672	15,766	45.5
Hispanic	232,657	120,099	51.6
White, non-Hispanic	127,824	93,099	72.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	56,413	22,317	39.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	165,051	85,220	51.6
Economically disadvantaged students	265,004	133,733	50.5
Migratory students	9,927	4,402	44.3
Male	234,055	140,347	60.0
Female	222,370	136,870	61.6
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.

1.3.2.2 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	456,907	250,534	54.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,762	1,785	47.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	52,873	39,710	75.1
Black, non-Hispanic	34,700	14,791	42.6
Hispanic	232,755	97,479	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	128,045	93,609	73.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	56,171	19,788	35.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	165,075	63,256	38.3
Economically disadvantaged students	265,161	108,357	40.9
Migratory students	9,935	2,861	28.8
Male	234,200	120,420	51.4
Female	222,645	130,091	58.4
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.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: Science was not tested in this grade.			

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

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
All students	460,935	236,319	51.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,768	1,620	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,933	40,967	74.6
Black, non-Hispanic	35,166	12,640	35.9
Hispanic	232,693	94,870	40.8
White, non-Hispanic	130,009	83,719	64.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	57,327	17,874	31.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	167,857	67,478	40.2
Economically disadvantaged students	265,961	106,855	40.2
Migratory students	10,088	3,365	33.4
Male	236,080	119,751	50.7
Female	224,799	116,549	51.8
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.

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

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
All students	460,649	223,182	48.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,764	1,619	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,935	37,972	69.1
Black, non-Hispanic	35,100	12,446	35.5
Hispanic	232,529	81,547	35.1
White, non-Hispanic	129,963	86,994	66.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	56,898	16,712	29.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	167,723	51,717	30.8
Economically disadvantaged students	265,719	91,124	34.3
Migratory students	10,097	2,402	23.8
Male	235,818	106,789	45.3
Female	224,775	116,371	51.8
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.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

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
All students	464,617	216,907	46.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,739	1,667	44.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,218	36,831	65.5
Black, non-Hispanic	35,034	11,337	32.4
Hispanic	235,297	76,977	32.7
White, non-Hispanic	129,936	87,552	67.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	57,024	18,857	33.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	167,468	48,623	29.0
Economically disadvantaged students	268,568	86,917	32.4
Migratory students	10,059	2,072	20.6
Male	237,930	115,760	48.7
Female	226,629	101,128	44.6
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 831.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

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
All students	466,690	204,778	43.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,851	1,357	35.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,706	38,816	69.7
Black, non-Hispanic	35,691	9,329	26.1
Hispanic	232,660	72,952	31.4
White, non-Hispanic	134,511	80,181	59.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	54,291	9,692	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	166,139	49,216	29.6
Economically disadvantaged students	264,560	81,905	31.0
Migratory students	10,022	2,601	26.0
Male	239,044	106,632	44.6
Female	227,561	98,122	43.1
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

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
All students	466,160	222,178	47.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,855	1,619	42.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,675	38,686	69.5
Black, non-Hispanic	35,620	12,101	34.0
Hispanic	232,269	78,529	33.8
White, non-Hispanic	134,470	88,750	66.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	53,524	10,944	20.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	165,804	47,670	28.8
Economically disadvantaged students	264,116	87,288	33.0
Migratory students	10,004	2,485	24.8
Male	238,647	105,999	44.4
Female	227,427	116,146	51.1
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

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
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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: Science was not tested in this grade.			

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	474,475	202,832	42.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,027	1,377	34.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,597	38,905	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	37,073	9,030	24.4
Hispanic	233,079	71,492	30.7
White, non-Hispanic	139,142	79,886	57.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	51,719	8,272	16.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	154,944	42,452	27.4
Economically disadvantaged students	260,059	78,885	30.3
Migratory students	9,863	2,658	26.9
Male	243,098	104,927	43.2
Female	231,303	97,882	42.3
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.

1.3.2.5 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	475,557	234,364	49.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,059	1,746	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	56,668	40,422	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	37,253	13,141	35.3
Hispanic	233,342	82,450	35.3
White, non-Hispanic	139,653	94,003	67.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	51,491	9,795	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	154,947	42,898	27.7
Economically disadvantaged students	260,526	90,183	34.6
Migratory students	9,867	2,524	25.6
Male	243,701	108,848	44.7
Female	231,781	125,492	54.1
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.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - 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	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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: Science was not tested in this grade.			

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

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
All students	478,517	184,012	38.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,977	1,210	30.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,029	37,398	65.6
Black, non-Hispanic	38,381	8,439	22.0
Hispanic	232,844	62,257	26.7
White, non-Hispanic	142,306	73,140	51.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,540	7,870	15.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	151,625	36,324	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	256,344	69,121	27.0
Migratory students	10,066	2,626	26.1
Male	245,037	93,856	38.3
Female	233,387	90,134	38.6
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.

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

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
All students	479,369	219,722	45.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,998	1,590	39.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,048	38,287	67.1
Black, non-Hispanic	38,589	12,321	31.9
Hispanic	233,088	74,571	32.0
White, non-Hispanic	142,638	90,848	63.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,579	8,707	17.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	151,628	34,090	22.5
Economically disadvantaged students	256,758	80,779	31.5
Migratory students	10,048	2,423	24.1
Male	245,553	101,550	41.4
Female	233,721	118,152	50.6
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.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

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
All students	480,520	249,747	52.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,942	1,789	45.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	58,034	43,117	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	38,165	13,489	35.3
Hispanic	234,367	90,424	38.6
White, non-Hispanic	142,019	98,712	69.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	49,286	10,696	21.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	150,952	48,851	32.4
Economically disadvantaged students	257,696	98,712	38.3
Migratory students	9,964	3,168	31.8
Male	245,949	131,933	53.6
Female	234,481	117,792	50.2
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 831.

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	470,204	240,358	51.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,126	1,830	44.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	59,698	45,546	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	37,385	11,278	30.2
Hispanic	215,975	80,206	37.1
White, non-Hispanic	148,643	99,226	66.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	44,167	7,890	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	132,052	41,731	31.6
Economically disadvantaged students	218,645	81,940	37.5
Migratory students	8,623	2,934	34.0
Male	240,123	124,930	52.0
Female	229,978	115,400	50.2
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	465,035	246,601	53.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,052	2,017	49.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	59,495	41,143	69.2
Black, non-Hispanic	36,444	13,806	37.9
Hispanic	213,083	81,881	38.4
White, non-Hispanic	147,704	105,283	71.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	42,183	7,909	18.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	130,619	33,616	25.7
Economically disadvantaged students	215,545	79,566	36.9
Migratory students	8,558	2,353	27.5
Male	237,322	114,954	48.4
Female	227,628	131,620	57.8
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.

1.3.3.7 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	464,256	184,962	39.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,059	1,468	36.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	60,534	36,249	59.9
Black, non-Hispanic	35,079	8,260	23.5
Hispanic	212,646	53,782	25.3
White, non-Hispanic	147,399	83,293	56.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	40,125	5,961	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	135,497	23,558	17.4
Economically disadvantaged students	215,050	54,441	25.3
Migratory students	8,190	1,535	18.7
Male	236,632	97,253	41.1
Female	227,510	87,682	38.5
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 831.

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	9,794	5,104	52.1
Districts	1,029	416	40.4
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of 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	5,739	2,460	42.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4,061	1,493	36.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,678	967	57.6
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
946	349	36.9
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* 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	158
Extension of the school year or school day	38
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	35
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	59
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	61
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	125
Comments: Some school implemented more than one Corrective Action. "Replacement of the principal" would be included in "Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance."	

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)	44
Reopening the school as a public charter school	2
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	77
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	517
Comments: Some schools implemented more than one Restructuring Action. California does not use "take over the school by the State" as a Restructuring Action.	

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.

--

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 Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list 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.

California has taken a triage approach to district level intervention in local educational agencies subject to intervention under Title I, Part A. In this context, local educational agencies (LEAs) can be either districts or county offices of education. Beginning in 2003, the state legislature appropriated a portion of the Title I, Part A set-aside for LEAs at-risk of School Improvement, in School Improvement, or in School Improvement Corrective Action to use to improve student achievement.

As documented elsewhere in the CSPR, LEAs must make annual yearly progress (AYP), defined in California as consisting of four indicators, including: participation rate; percent proficiency in mathematics and English language arts; the district's aggregated academic performance index of growth; and graduation rates. District level AYP is aggregated at the district level and disaggregated by numerically significant student groups. Typically, districts in California are advancing in school improvement status based upon the performance of English learners and students with disabilities.

LEAs at risk of School Improvement: California Education Code Section 52055.57 (a) requires the SEA to identify and notice LEAs that are in danger of being identified for school improvement within two years of that status, providing them with research-based criteria to conduct a voluntary self assessment. Available state assessment tools include: academic program surveys of nine essential program components, elicited from the research on school effectiveness, as improving student achievement; a district assistance survey designed to assess district support for school level implementation of the essential program components; and surveys to assess district programs for English learners and students with disabilities. These are available at the CDE Program Improvement Website at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. LEAs are provided with technical assistance on the use of these tools, development and implementation of plans and access to professional development during annual Title I Achieving Schools Conference, Annual "On the Right Track" Conference for high achieving Title I schools and districts, and through the Regional System of District and School Support component of the Statewide System of School Support.

LEAs in School Improvement Year 1: When an LEA is identified for School Improvement, they must notify parents, conduct comprehensive self assessments using tools identified above, and write an addendum to their LEA plan identifying key action steps for improvement. If fiscal resources are available, the district must contract with an external entity to verify the results of the self assessment and support and monitor the implementation of the LEA plan addendum. Again, LEAs are provided with technical assistance via the Statewide System of School Support, the On the Right Track Symposium, the Title I Achievement Schools Conference and through ongoing telephone support. Districts are directed to reserve no less than 10% of their Title I, Part A allocation for high quality professional development, which is an ongoing requirement in any year that the LEA remains in School Improvement.

LEAs in School Improvement Years 2 and 3: In Year 2, LEAs continue to receive technical assistance via the Statewide System of School Support. In year 3, LEAs are identified for corrective action. They are given the opportunity, as in prior years, to appeal their scores and upon the assignment of a corrective action by the SEA, are able to appeal the corrective action.

As of November 2008, 145 LEAs have advanced to School Improvement Year 3 and have been assigned Corrective Action F to "institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including participation in professional development for relevant staff, with special attention to the needs of high priority students" (English learners, students with disabilities and other underperforming students).

California state law at Education Code Section 512055.57(c) provides for the development of objective criteria to index the pervasiveness and severity of district achievement problems. This index is used primarily to assign differentiated technical assistance to LEAs. In 2007, 44 LEAs with the most severe performance problems were required to work with district assistance and intervention teams (DAIT) although they were not funded to do so until 2008.

Anticipating the needs of district assistance and intervention teams, the SEA developed standards and criteria for their work in 2006, conducted a procurement and trained providers to application of these standards in helping districts: conduct a comprehensive needs assessment, revise their LEA plans to document steps to implement the corrective actions, and support implementation and monitoring of these plans. LEAs must adopt DAIT recommendations unless exempted by the State Board of Education (SBE). Once sanctions are assigned by the SEA, the LEAs must notify parents of the corrective action.

State law provides that LEAs continue to implement their approved LEA plan. The SEA may review their work at any time and any LEA that fails to exit School Improvement within three years must appear before the SBE to review the LEA's progress. The SBE, upon hearing testimony, may assign an alternative sanction.

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
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	12	5
Schools	72	18
Comments: The appeals reported above reflect the appeals processed by March 9, 2009. However, each time AYP data is updated, the appeals window is reopened.		

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	3/09/09
---	---------

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 2007-08. 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	260,588	254,240
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	121,344	110,152
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	46.6	43.3
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	102,708	93,392
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	39.4	36.7
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	712	
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	231
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	15
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	480
Comments: Of the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a), one of them did not have valid adequate yearly progress data and therefore, this school is not reflected in the count above.	

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.
Comments: California did not implement NCLB Section 1003(g) in 2007-08, to which the above improvement strategies apply, and the State does not collect information on other improvement strategies that Title I schools may be implementing.						

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 83I.

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.

Not Applicable. See Comments for 1.4.8.3.

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*: 2.0 %

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.

Not applicable. California did not implement Section 1003(g) in 2007-08.

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

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

1.4.8.6 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.

Title I schools supported by State-funded programs--including but not limited to the High Priority Schools Grant Program, the Quality Education Investment Act, and State-monitored Immediate Intervention/Underperforming School Program--are implementing the nine Essential Program Components endorsed by the State Board of Education:

1. Instructional Program: Standards-aligned English-language arts and mathematics textbooks and SBE - adopted Pre-Algebra and Algebra I textbooks
2. Student Access to High School Standards-aligned Core Courses (master schedule and pacing schedule)
3. Principals' Instructional Leadership Training
4. Teachers' Professional Development Opportunities
5. Student Achievement Monitoring System
6. Ongoing Instructional Assistance and Support
7. Teacher/Department and Subject Matter Collaboration
8. Intervention Programs for Students Performing Below Grade Level Standards
9. Fiscal Support

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

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

1.4.9 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	1,621,910
Applied to transfer	
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	88,740

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	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: **Students applying to transfer data are not collected** Cost of 19,500 students who transferred under NCLB was paid by Title I funds and cost of 69,240 students was paid by State and local funds.	
Source: Page 44 (School FRPM) from Part II of the 2007-08 Consolidated Application.	

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 22,234,876
Comments: Title I monies are 13,671,274 and State and Local monies are 8,563,602.	
Source: Year-to-Date Expenditure Report for Selected Federal Programs page 22 of the 2008-09 Consolidated Application, part I.	

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	161
Comments: Source: Page 6 2007-08 Consolidated Application, Part I and 15 of the 2008-09 Consolidated Application, Part I.	

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	1,249,736
Applied for supplemental educational services	
Received supplemental educational services	98,779
Comments: **Students applying for services data are not collected.**	
Source: Program Improvement Activities page 15 of the 2008-09 Consolidated Application, part I.	
Additional source: EDEN file N128	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 287,223,977
Comments: Title I monies are 267,686,543 and State and local monies is 19,537,434.	
Source: Year-to-Date Expenditure Report page 22 of the 2008-09 Consolidated Application, part I.	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	682,300	624,362	91.5	57,938	8.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	110,965	106,114	95.6	4,851	4.4
Low-poverty schools	49,099	48,065	97.9	1,034	2.1
All elementary schools	160,064	154,179	96.3	5,885	3.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	321,394	281,538	87.6	39,856	12.4
Low-poverty schools	200,842	188,645	93.9	12,197	6.1
All secondary schools	522,236	470,183	90.0	52,053	10.0
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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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.

Yes, California counts elementary as one class
--

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)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	
Other (please explain in comment box below)	100.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We collect data on teachers who are not HQ, we do not collect data on who holds an elementary credential but has not taken a state level content test. Therefore we can determine that the teacher is not HQ but not if they hold a provisional intern permit or a short term staff permit or are a fully credentialed teacher who did not pass an examination.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In California a candidate must have demonstrated subject matter competency to earn a single subject credential; therefore if the teacher is not HQ they are teaching special education or are teaching using a provisional intern permit or a short term staff permit. We do not differentiate special education teacher at the secondary level from regular education teachers for the purposed of HQ. We do not know how many of the non-HQ secondary teachers are special education or regular education.

The other issue would be our alternative education credentialing flexibility which allows elementary credentialed teachers to teach secondary classes in an alternative education setting. These teachers may hold a credential but not have demonstrated subject matter competency at the secondary level.

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	33.0	16.0
Poverty metric used	Percent of enrolled students in the federal free or reduced price meals program.	
Secondary schools	32.0	17.0
Poverty metric used	Percent of enrolled students in the federal free or reduced price meals program.	
Comments: The data is determined using the 3408 secondary programs and the 5377 elementary programs that reported poverty data on the October 2007 California Basic Educational data System (CBEDS) - Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF).		

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	Mandarin, Spanish, Japanese, Koren, German, Cantonese
Yes	Two-way immersion	Mandarin Spanish, Japanese, Korean. German. Cantonese
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish, Cantonese
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish, Cantonese, Filipino
Yes	Heritage language	Armenian, Spanish. Hmong, Lao, Khmer, Vietnamese, Japanese
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In California Dual language programs are also known as two-way immersion. We have entered the same information in both cells. Other Instructional Educational Programs reported by LEAs were: a 90/10 dual immersion language model in Spanish and English where students also receive Chinese and Nahuatl language instruction; a program that makes use of culturally responsive methods, instructional approaches and relationship building to close the achievement gap; an intensive intervention English Language Development (ELD) model for newcomers in grades 3-8 that provides instruction in Spanish for a very small part of the year while the students receive intensive ELD instruction.

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	1,553,091
Comments: Source: Dataquest	

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 83I.

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.	1,526,036
Comments: Source: EDEN file N116	

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	1,320,981
Vietnamese	34,712
Filipino	22,389
Cantonese	21,551
Hmong	19,715

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source: Dataquest

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	1,334,786
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	1,334,786
Comments: "Tested on State annual ELP" include only those students who were previously identified as LEP and took the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) during the 2007-08 annual assessment window (July 1 2007- October 31 2007). The annual assessment window is a four-month period to allow ample opportunity for every LEP student to be assessed. The students who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes are not included in the "Tested on State annual ELP." Data on the number not tested on the CELDT is not collected. CELDT results are only one criterion for LEP determination and local educational agencies have discretion in determining LEP status. Therefore, California does not have data regarding how many of the initial CELDT takers were ultimately determined to be LEP.	

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 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	438,265
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	32.8
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 83I.

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	1,321,013
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	1,321,013

Comments: Source: 2007 CELDT Annual Administration for Title III funded LEAs.
 "Tested on State annual ELP" include only those students who were previously identified as LEP and took the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) during the 2007-08 annual assessment window (July 1 2007- October 31 2007). The annual assessment window is a four-month period to allow ample opportunity for every LEP student to be assessed. The students who took the CELDT for initial identification purposes are not included in the "Tested on State annual ELP." Data on the number not tested on the CELDT is not collected. CELDT results are only one criterion for LEP determination and local educational agencies have discretion in determining LEP status. Therefore, California does not have data regarding how many of the initial CELDT takers were ultimately determined to be LEP.

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	705,345	55.8
ELP attainment	239,466	35.4

Comments: Cohort for AMAO 1=1,262,852.
 Cohort for AMAO 2= 676,722.
 Source:
 February 2009 Title III Accountability Reports.

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
113,366	115,440	228,806
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
190,653	110,451	57.9	80,202
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
190,680	109,908	57.6	80,772
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
79,075	41,030	51.9	38,045
Comments: Source: CST grades 5,8 and 10.			

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 83I.

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	628
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	195
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	513
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	482
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	241
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	70
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	83
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	11
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	151
<p>Comments: The 11 subgrantees implementing an improvement plan were identified in 2006-07 based on not meeting AMAOs in 2005-06 and 2006-07. There was an additional LEA identified as not meeting AMAOs in 2006-07 and that LEA refused Title III funding after being identified and did not submit an improvement plan.</p> <p>The improvement plans for the 83 subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years will be due in either January or March 2009 depending upon the subgrantees status on Title I Program Improvement.</p> <p>Ninety-two of the subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for four consecutive years were initially identified as not meeting AMAOs for the four consecutive years of 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07.</p> <p>AMAOs 1 and 2 are based on CELDT administration in fall 2007 and AMAO 3 is based on spring 2008 academic achievement assessments.</p> <p>Source: February 2009 Title III Accountability Report update.</p>	

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: The State did not meet the percent proficient in English/language arts for AMAO 3.	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> 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
241,108	135,460	256

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.

The California Department of Education does not gather student level data that would provide the number of unduplicated number of immigrant students i.e., those who are:
 1) participating in Title III instructional educational programs under Section 3114(d); and
 2) are not receiving services in Title III instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(b).
 This data is anticipated to be available for reporting during the fall of 2009.

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.	118,782
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	16,106

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.

Some LEAs estimated that they will have no need for additional certified /licensed teachers in the next five years for the following reasons: The most common reason listed was due to declining enrollment. Some LEAs reported that the number of English learners has been declining due to increased reclassification rates. Other LEAs explained that the enrollment has been in decline for the past few years and English learner numbers remain relatively small and constant. Consequently, teaching staff is also stable. Along with the declining enrollment, the reduction of bilingual programs was listed as another reason due to a decrease in the number of district referrals.

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	512	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	478	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	484	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	450	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	443	
Other (Explain in comment box)	119	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	508	94,804
PD provided to principals	480	6,331
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	432	4,610
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	414	11,316
PD provided to community based organization personnel	192	9,612
Total	2,026	126,673

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

California does not separate content teachers from LEP teachers. Both, content and LEP teachers, were reported in the second cell: (PD provided to LEP classroom teachers).

Other Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees related to the teaching and learning of LEP students were provided in the following areas: (1) Program Training: Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) strategies; Advanced Via Individual Determination (AVID) training; Guided Language Acquisition and Design (GLAD); Explicit Direct Instruction Grammar (EDIG); Title III Year 4 Pilot Program Training; Principal's Leadership Academy (2) Culturally Responsive Instruction: Culturally responsive methodology, instructional approaches and relationship building to assist in the closing of the achievement gap; Generating Expectations for Student Achievement (GESA), (3) Secondary Teachers: Professional Development in differentiated instruction to make core classes such as algebra/geometry accessible to all students; SIOP training, (4) Bilingual Programs: Professional Development for Two- Way Immersion Programs; bilingual paraprofessional training, (5) Parent/Community: Seminars for LEP parents and other community members about Title III programs and services for students; Community involvement opportunities for LEPs.

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	10/22/07	111
Comments: Although the federal letter was dated on July 1, 2007, it was not received until July 9, 2007. Therefore in actuality, the number of days per distribution is 103.		

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.

To minimize the time elapsed between receipt of funds and disbursement to the LEAs, the California Department of Education (CDE) is developing a Web-based system for subgrantees to report federal cash balances, as well as interest earned, on a quarterly basis. Additionally, CDE is planning to disburse federal funds on a quarterly schedule and to implement a new fiscal monitoring process that is specific to cash management.

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	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	75.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	66.4
Hispanic	73.1
White, non-Hispanic	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	73.1
Limited English proficient	74.3
Economically disadvantaged	74.8
Migratory students	76.1
Male	77.6
Female	83.4
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 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	5.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	7.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9.8
Hispanic	6.7
White, non-Hispanic	3.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7.2
Limited English proficient	5.7
Economically disadvantaged	6.3
Migratory students	4.6
Male	6.2
Female	4.7
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	1,314	1,314
LEAs with subgrants	91	91
Total	1,405	1,405
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)	3,392	3,160
K	10,227	9,156
1	10,831	8,454
2	11,286	9,176
3	10,836	9,020
4	10,466	8,916
5	9,976	8,319
6	9,555	7,993
7	8,013	6,746
8	7,867	6,812
9	8,590	8,016
10	7,255	6,249
11	6,423	5,322
12	5,560	4,680
Ungraded	959	994
Total	121,236	103,013
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	16,064	13,926
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	88,959	73,673
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	6,624	5,777
Hotels/Motels	9,589	9,637
Total	121,236	103,013
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)	5,278
K	12,434
1	12,161
2	12,837
3	12,528
4	12,144
5	11,533
6	10,839
7	9,016
8	8,916
9	10,114
10	8,024
11	6,825
12	6,083
Ungraded	1,223
Total	139,955

Comments: The total of homeless children/youths served by subgrants is substantially larger than the prior year due to the definition of "served." Services include both direct services and indirect services for this year, whereas the prior year, it only included direct services.

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	3,256
Migratory children/youth	2,692
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,533
Limited English proficient students	28,901
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	70
Expedited evaluations	49
Staff professional development and awareness	87
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	81
Transportation	85
Early childhood programs	43
Assistance with participation in school programs	87
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	68
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	77
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	86
Coordination between schools and agencies	88
Counseling	56
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	64
Clothing to meet a school requirement	79
School supplies	90
Referral to other programs and services	89
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	72
Other (optional – in comment box below)	32
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Organization for donation collections; Coordination between parent and school; Participate in County Task Force; Regional Collaboration; Purchase of phone cards; Assistance with California High School Proficiency Exam; Coordination with JOBS Program; Purchase of hygiene kits; Coordination with other tutoring programs; Collaborate with community colleges; Participated in Operation Snack Attack

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	36
School Selection	43
Transportation	54
School records	34
Immunizations	25
Other medical records	15
Other Barriers – in comment box below	28

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Culture of the front office at school sites (3); Family transiency; Lack of family follow-through; Staff mobility; Partial credit reluctance; Medical staff need more training; Housing assistance (3); Impacted schools (6); Parents not wanting to be identified;

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	5,866	1,413
4	5,816	1,853
5	5,563	1,702
6	5,185	1,565
7	4,476	1,279
8	4,307	1,109
High School	11,133	2,992
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	5,849	2,438
4	5,839	2,580
5	5,598	1,886
6	5,160	1,482
7	4,387	1,080
8	4,244	988
High School	10,468	1,717
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)	21,592
K	9,725
1	8,549
2	13,460
3	12,698
4	12,510
5	12,471
6	12,189
7	12,377
8	12,434
9	12,079
10	11,786
11	11,717
12	14,265
Ungraded	451
Out-of-school	38,149
Total	216,452

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 decrease in the 12 month count is due to several factors. Migrant families are not moving as often as they have in previous years. This is most noticeable in the decrease in the moves to Mexico. The depressed economy has also resulted in fewer opportunities for employment in the state, resulting in a decrease in the arrival of new families.

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)	11,189
K	4,514
1	7,420
2	7,940
3	7,571
4	7,453
5	7,466
6	7,059
7	6,889
8	5,764
9	6,531
10	5,982
11	5,740
12	2,515
Ungraded	131
Out-of-school	8,579
Total	102,743
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* 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 15% decrease in the number of students reported in Category 2 is due the decrease in the overall recruitment of migrant families due to the poor economy and a decrease in moves. Additionally, the State is continuing to emphasize the quality and intensity of services, concentrating services to students with a priority for services.

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.

Migrant Education Regional Offices entered Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar (software program) by TROMIK. The Migrant Education Regions then used COEstar to transmit records electronically to the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) server at WestEd. The same systems were used to generate child counts for the last reporting period.
--

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.

a. Data Collected: The regional offices entered Certificates of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar. COEstar assigns a regional "COEstar number to track records. The COEDATA table contains Certificate of Eligibility (COE) information; the I.D. tables contains student information such as school of enrollment birth date and grade level; the SH tables contains school history information such as date of enrollment withdrawal date and the school year and the SUPPROGS table contains support services information. All data are collected from the local Migrant Regional Office. To differentiate between a summer/intersession service and a regular term service a summer service is coded with an "S" and an Intersession service is coded as "I".

b. Activities Conducted to Collect the Data: The data collection begins at the Regional level or in the case of directly funded districts at the school district level. Recruiters assigned to the Migrant Regional Offices are community based. District recruiters can be school based or they can perform community based identification and recruitment. In conducting the eligibility interviews all recruiters begin by using the Basic Interview Pattern (BIP) a tool for standardizing the interview process. A state developed COE is used to record the migrant family's eligibility for the MEP. Community based recruiters search out eligible migrant families through a variety of means.

Community based recruiters use a paper COE or an electronic version using the Tablet PC. All COE data including signatures are captured on the electronic form. In the conventional method using the paper COE when the form has been completed the recruiter the reviewer assess the form for accuracy and completeness and signs the COE. The COE is submitted to the data entry section for input into the local database (COEstar). Before the COE information is permanently applied to the local database a final quality review is conducted; the data entry operator is also instructed to perform a search of the database to see if a qualifying COE already exists for the same qualifying move that is to be recorded.

The process for collecting COE data on the Tablet PC has been modified to take advantage of the benefits of the technology. Because the host system and the Tablet PC are synchronized almost daily the recruiter conducts the search for a potential duplicate in the field and thus reduces the possibility of creating a duplicate record. At the end of the day the mobile unit (Tablet PC) is connected to the district or regional network and the data is transferred to a QA machine for review before the COE is verified and applied to the database.

I&R supervisors generate monthly End of Eligibility (EOE) Reports that are used by recruiters to contact families whose eligibility is about to expire to see if they have had a new qualifying move. Student lists are also produced and distributed to school districts to determine if previously enrolled students are still present at the start of every regular term before a new enrollment is entered into COEstar. To collect Summer/Intersession service information the districts/regions utilize standard enrollment lists that are available through COEstar to record the types of services that provided to the students. The completed service roster/lists are submitted to the data entry staff for input. The data files containing all the data mentioned can be submitted daily to the MSIN (statewide system) if needed.

c. When Were Data Collected: I&R is a year-round activity. Regional offices have been instructed by CDE to submit data via COEstar as existing records are updated or new COEs are created. During peak migration periods district/regional data transfers can occur daily.

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.

Migrant Education Regional Offices enter and transmit the student data files containing all added updated and deleted COE data via COEstar. Transmittal of the records is done electronically (via FTP or the Global Data Transfer System (GDTS) an alternate secure internet connection to the MSIN server at WestEd. Records are updated for every term regular and summer/intersession terms. Students are withdrawn and then re-enrolled with current information at the beginning of each session. WestEd used automated procedures to detect new files that were received from the regional offices. WestEd has software that compares data fields with existing records to detect a match. Fields such as name birth date and parents' names are compared for a match. If a child received summer/intersession services the type of service and service date/s were entered into the local system. This information is also sent electronically to the statewide database. These files were then decompressed and decrypted. The student records were then updated with the academic or support service information.

The records were then imported into a master database where eligibility for category 1 and 2 were determined according to the decision rules established via CDE and vendors and based on Federal law/rules which establishes student eligibility enrollment and services. These rules are used to train all identification and recruitment staff as well as the data entry staff. The COE Instructions Identification and Recruitment Manual and Data Entry Instructions contain all of the procedures that are followed with respect to recruitment as well as verifying information for eligibility.

An additional quality check was the validation of critical fields. COEstar did key field validation at input. This check ensures that all of the fields required to determine eligibility have been collected and recorded.

Management and QA reports are produced and shared with the regional offices to confirm receipt of the records to confirm eligibility and as tools to assist with improving data quality. Additional reports are available on the Migrant Student Locator a web-based tool that allows

regional offices to monitor the status of all records in the statewide database and view student histories. This allows the regional offices to view the records and submit updates or corrections if necessary.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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.

The COEstar system is the software used to collect all of the student data pertaining to program eligibility and other student information. The Performance Reporter is designed to produce reports specifically requested by the Federal government pertaining to all migrant program information. WestEd receives all of the data collected with COEstar and checks for duplicates as well as compiles reports of different data elements as requested by regions as well as the federal government.

Migrant Education staff was trained to complete accurate COEs based on Federal Program eligibility criteria. The COEs were checked via regional process before entering COEs via COEstar on a COE screen. Since COEstar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility (COE) all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time 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. 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 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. Each year information is updated via personal interviews with families. This allows student information to be updated yearly if not more frequently. Once a student graduates from high school that student's information is updated and the student is then flagged as no longer eligible. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered into databases multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). The additional checks involve the use of a WestEd internet-based application that allows regional staff to check data fields such as name birth date place of birth and parents' names as well as make direct comparisons of electronic versions of the source documents to further eliminate duplicates.

Students who were resident in your state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1-8/31).

Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are 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 Assessments and Graduation/Termination dates Special Services dates and Health record dates performed in the 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. The State does assume that the inputted data with respect to COE information is correct. There are quality control checks that exist prior to entering information into the database. When a recruiter gathers information from a family and records it on a COE another staff person reviews the COE for completeness and accuracy.

Students who in the case of category 2--received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment and service in a summer or intersession term in order to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Descriptions of services indicate the nature of services. In addition summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still with in the 3-year eligibility period when service began.

Students once per child count category.

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 once statewide in each eligible category.

WestEd checks each incoming ID record against the statewide database to determine if the same student is already in the system (e.g. to identify a potential match with an already existing student record). Possible outcomes include: a. exact matches on all matching criteria b. no match (less than 5 criteria match) c. possible match (5 or more criteria match). The criterion includes student name school of enrollment and parents' names. When possible matches are identified they are flagged and sent back to the region to determine if there is a match or if the student is new.

WestEd assigns a unique statewide identification number (MSD) to each unique record. Possible matches are assigned the same MSD number. Unique numbers are reserved for half of a potential pair of duplicates.

The regions view data records containing possible matches on-line. Regions research the information to determine if possible matched records represent the same or unique children. Regions use the Duplicate Resolution screen on the Migrant Student Information Network locator site (developed by WestEd) to research and resolve potential duplicates. Regions that share the potential duplicates can research independently while seeing what the other region has determined. Students who are in fact unique are immediately reassigned new MSD

numbers in the central database. The changes/updates are returned electronically to the regions to keep the local database synchronized with the local COEstar database.

WestEd prepares the statewide count based on the unique MSD number and the "decision rules" used for regional level reports. Any intra-regional or inter-regional duplicated are thereby eliminated from the statewide performance report counts.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The CA MEP has developed a web based I & R Issues Clarification Center to assure consistency in the interpretation of eligibility guidance and uniform application of eligibility criteria statewide. The purpose of this center is to provide policy and procedure information for I&R topics which are unclear or not specifically addressed in the I&R Manual. Regional staff first address their questions to their I&R Supervisor/Advisory Committee member. Committee members are encouraged to post questions directly into this site. Questioners who prefer anonymity can send questions to CDE by email and their questions appear anonymously. The State I&R Support Team after deliberation and consultation post a discussion and answer to each question. Every effort is made to respond in a timely manner. All Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) members (there are currently over 1000 active account members representing the 23 Migrant Regional Offices School Districts Migrant Programs and State Staff members) can view all the postings. Once the answer has received final approval by the CDE Migrant Office it is effective immediately. Issues that generate an update to the I&R Manual will be addressed in periodic "Updates to the I&R Manual" posted in the MSIN Intranet Documents section.

The California Department of Education (CDE) has instructed the subgrantees (regions) to perform "Quality Control" checks on all COEs via each regional office's internal procedures. CDE has developed the following quality control documents to guide the regions in establishing effective and efficient procedures and staff training:

- Identification and Recruitment Manual
- California Quality Assurance Guidelines for Collecting and Entering Data
- COE Instructions (incorporated into the I&R Manual)

"Second person" checks of COEs are part of the process. If information of a COE is in question a follow-up visit/interview is conducted. In addition the CDE I&R manual contains a Certificate of Eligibility Monitoring Checklist and instructions on how to use this checklist. CDE consultants are assigned regions/subgrantees to monitor on an ongoing basis. The process includes the I&R component. The state Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM) process includes random sampling and review of COEs. Also each region has established a quality control process prior to the entry of information from the COE into the COEstar database.

Migrant Education staffs responsible for interviewing migrant families and completing COEs receive ongoing training at the regional level and also statewide training is provided. Statewide training is provided annually at the Migrant Student Identification and Recruitment and Data Training. At the regional level it is common practice for staff to meet once a month for training.

At the collection/electronic-input stage COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Each COE can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA requires the regional offices to implement ongoing quality control procedures to ensure accurate eligibility determinations throughout the year. In addition the SEA requires the regions to maintain these records on file for audit purposes. If children are found to be ineligible the SEA requires the regional office to delete these children from their database.

The SEA did not conduct a re-interview process in 2007-08 and was awaiting publication of the final regulations relating to child eligibility. These were published in July 2008 and there was insufficient time to conduct retrospective re-interviews before the submission of the 200708 child counts. The SEA is currently finalizing the process that will be used to conduct prospective re-interviews for 2008-09. If necessary, the SEA will all conduct retrospective re-interviews for 2007-08.

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.

The vendors provide reports to CDE and the Regional offices on an ongoing basis. The reports include student information with respect to eligibility. It provides regional directors current information with respect to their current recruitment efforts. If the child counts in a region(s) is much lower or higher than the year before vendors and CDE consultants work with the regions to insure that the data is correct. Data are checked for completeness throughout the year.

In addition 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 like enrollment and services data is thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

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 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.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Department of Education Migrant Indian and International Education Office has a consultant assigned to review the sub-reports submitted by the vendors. The consultant checks these reports against the sub-reports before the information is entered on to the Annual Performance Report form and submitted to the Federal Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The report is checked against the last report (in terms of large increases and/or decreases) it is checked by sections in terms of federal requirements it is checked for possible math and/or content errors. It should be noted that these final steps taken by CDE have been preceded by the electronic check via COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter; 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.

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.

Although the SEA did not conduct re-interviews in 2007-08, it continues to improve accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations through the following activities: 1) annual statewide training for identification and recruitment (I&R) staff; 2) posting responses to eligibility questions on the Issues Clarification web page; 3) I&R Coordinators' Meetings; and 4) updates to the State I&R Handbook.

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

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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