

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

CONNECTICUT



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

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

Address:
165 Capitol Ave
Hartford, CT

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jack Hasegawa

Telephone: 860-713-6769

Fax: 860-713-7018

e-mail: jack.hasegawa@ct.ogv

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

Friday, March 27, 2009, 2:40:46 PM

Signature

Date

Migratory student data in Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.3 were submitted to EdFacts on 3/7/08

**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 have been made to the State's academic content standards in mathematics reading/language arts or science. The content standards, approved by the Connecticut State Board of Education (mathematics 2005, language arts 2006 and science 2004) remain the same. During 2007 these content standards were further delineated as grade level expectations. The grade level expectations make each content standard more useful for instructional purposes.

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.

Connecticut is adding an alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards in reading and mathematics for grades 3 through 8 and 10 to its assessment system for a subgroup of students with disabilities. Pilot testing will take place in 2009 with full implementation in 2010.

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.

Connecticut implemented science assessments in grades five and eight in 2008, as part of the Connecticut mastery Test (CMT). A science test was already in place for the grade 10 Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT). The state submitted its Peer Review documentation for the October 2008 review. Preliminary conversations with USDE indicate that the evidence the state provided indicated that Connecticut met the law for each of the seven standards. A formal response is pending.

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	301,350	299,447	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,088	1,084	99.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,709	11,683	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	41,631	41,119	98.8
Hispanic	49,447	48,748	98.6
White, non-Hispanic	197,475	196,813	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	36,784	36,296	98.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,883	14,663	98.5
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male	154,793	153,697	99.3
Female	146,557	145,750	99.5

Comments: Data for Economically disadvantaged students will be entered through EdFacts, 3/16/09. Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,147	25.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	23,818	65.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0

Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,179	8.8
Total	36,144	

Comments: The number of all students tested (currently 36784) will not equal the sum of the all students who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned (as reported by grade level) in 1.3.1 (currently 36144). This is due to the method of calculating a participation rate where only absent students are deducted from the denominator (# of students enrolled) compared to a proficiency rate where absent students and invalid scores are deducted from the denominator (# of students who completed the

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	301,350	299,261	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,088	1,080	99.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	11,709	11,669	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	41,631	41,074	98.7
Hispanic	49,447	48,697	98.5
White, non-Hispanic	197,475	196,741	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	36,784	36,208	98.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,883	14,602	98.1
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male	154,793	153,589	99.2
Female	146,557	145,672	99.4

Comments: Could not manually enter data for Economically disadvantaged students. Data is on hand, and can be entered at any time. Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,983	25.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	23,818	66.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,179	8.8
Total	35,980	

Comments: The number of all students tested will not equal the sum of the all students who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned (as reported by grade level) in 1.3.1 (currently 35980). This is due to the method of calculating a participation rate where only absent students are deducted from the denominator (# of students enrolled) compared to a proficiency rate where absent students and invalid scores are deducted from the denominator (# of students who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned).

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	129,680	128,113	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	460	452	98.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,794	4,758	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18,279	17,625	96.4
Hispanic	20,896	20,040	95.9
White, non-Hispanic	85,937	82,238	95.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,925	15,280	95.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,897	5,604	95.0
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	66,755	65,421	98.0
Female	68,584	62,658	91.4

Comments: Science assessments were only given in Grades 5, 8 and 10 in 2008. Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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 (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	1,869	12.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,073	79.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,314	8.6
Total	15,256	

Comments: Science assessments were only given in Grades 5, 8 and 10 in 2008.

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	41,988	33,575	80.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	126	81.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,781	1,618	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,895	3,526	59.8
Hispanic	7,264	4,446	61.2
White, non-Hispanic	26,894	23,859	88.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,785	2,292	47.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,562	1,276	49.8
Economically disadvantaged students	13,745	8,312	60.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,566	17,145	79.5
Female	20,422	16,430	80.5

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	41,670	28,259	67.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	151	94	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,740	1,425	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,859	2,617	44.7
Hispanic	7,085	2,982	42.1
White, non-Hispanic	26,835	21,141	78.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,714	1,202	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,318	553	23.9
Economically disadvantaged students	13,538	5,806	42.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,379	13,625	63.7
Female	20,291	14,634	72.1

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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 (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Students in Grade 3 were not tested in Science. Only grades 5, 8 and 10, were tested in science.			

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	42,514	34,285	80.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	167	129	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,813	1,660	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,748	3,448	60.0
Hispanic	7,363	4,552	61.8
White, non-Hispanic	27,423	24,496	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,182	2,288	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,403	1,154	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,810	8,546	61.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,878	17,540	80.2
Female	20,636	16,745	81.1

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	42,240	29,173	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	166	105	63.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,760	1,432	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,721	2,554	44.6
Hispanic	7,222	3,080	42.7
White, non-Hispanic	27,371	22,002	80.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,130	1,293	25.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,170	380	17.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13,637	5,932	43.5
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,736	14,515	66.8
Female	20,504	14,658	71.5

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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 (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Students in Grade 4 were not tested in Science. Only grades 5, 8 and 10, were tested in science.			

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	42,133	34,679	82.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	127	79.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,694	1,564	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,897	3,746	63.5
Hispanic	7,073	4,541	64.2
White, non-Hispanic	27,310	24,701	90.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,212	2,302	44.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,354	1,098	46.6
Economically disadvantaged students	13,553	8,714	64.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,621	17,711	81.9
Female	20,512	16,968	82.7

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	41,900	30,777	73.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	115	71.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,654	1,404	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,877	2,971	50.6
Hispanic	6,937	3,337	48.1
White, non-Hispanic	27,272	22,950	84.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,186	1,563	30.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,131	457	21.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13,403	6,509	48.6
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,485	15,459	72.0
Female	20,415	15,318	75.0

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	42,180	33,828	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	160	126	78.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,690	1,490	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,931	3,413	57.5
Hispanic	7,068	4,077	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	27,331	24,722	90.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,215	2,509	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,346	845	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,560	7,493	55.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,633	17,331	80.1
Female	20,513	16,463	80.3

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

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	42,847	35,752	83.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	153	120	78.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,666	1,550	93.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,801	3,720	64.1
Hispanic	6,786	4,398	64.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,441	25,964	91.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,344	2,401	44.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,032	874	43.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,240	8,632	65.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	22,052	18,174	82.4
Female	20,795	17,578	84.5

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	42,623	32,827	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	152	113	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,629	1,404	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,771	3,169	54.9
Hispanic	6,662	3,423	51.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,409	24,718	87.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,316	1,866	35.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,834	356	19.4
Economically disadvantaged students	13,080	6,953	53.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,939	16,345	74.5
Female	20,684	16,482	79.7

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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 (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Students in Grade 6 were not tested in Science. Only grades 5, 8 and 10, were tested in science.			

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	42,927	35,050	81.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	152	120	79.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,636	1,496	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,754	3,471	60.3
Hispanic	6,882	4,124	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,503	25,839	90.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,263	2,089	39.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,880	634	33.7
Economically disadvantaged students	12,828	7,813	60.9
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	22,082	17,748	80.4
Female	20,845	17,302	83.0

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	42,642	33,700	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	152	117	77.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,604	1,419	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,723	3,368	58.9
Hispanic	6,706	3,637	54.2
White, non-Hispanic	28,457	25,159	88.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,225	1,907	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,636	373	22.8
Economically disadvantaged students	12,617	7,149	56.7
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,902	16,785	76.6
Female	20,740	16,915	81.6

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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 (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Students in Grade 7 were not tested in Science. Only grades 5, 8 and 10, were tested in science.			

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	43,516	34,978	80.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	156	111	71.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,544	1,422	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,941	3,385	57.0
Hispanic	6,865	3,968	57.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,010	26,092	89.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,314	2,058	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,754	587	33.5
Economically disadvantaged students	12,799	7,326	57.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	22,302	17,680	79.3
Female	21,214	17,298	81.5

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	43,303	33,065	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	155	110	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,524	1,348	88.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,905	3,143	53.2
Hispanic	6,726	3,349	49.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,993	25,115	86.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,283	1,767	33.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,569	287	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	12,649	6,463	51.1
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	22,193	16,305	73.5
Female	21,110	16,760	79.4

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	43,587	32,402	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	104	65.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,545	1,316	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,947	2,685	45.1
Hispanic	6,867	3,110	45.3
White, non-Hispanic	29,070	25,187	86.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,357	1,973	36.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,757	312	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	12,840	5,824	45.4
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	22,360	16,393	73.3
Female	21,227	16,009	75.4

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,847	33,266	79.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	128	93	72.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,517	1,351	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,636	2,790	49.5
Hispanic	6,001	3,258	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,565	25,774	90.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,169	1,811	43.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,477	518	35.1
Economically disadvantaged students	10,409	5,534	53.2
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,095	16,980	80.5
Female	20,752	16,286	78.5

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	41,806	34,545	82.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	125	88	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,485	1,332	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,677	3,459	60.9
Hispanic	5,939	3,656	61.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,580	26,010	91.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,207	1,990	47.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,255	472	37.6
Economically disadvantaged students	10,369	6,257	60.3
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,087	16,698	79.2
Female	20,719	17,847	86.1

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

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	42,346	33,679	79.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	134	98	73.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,523	1,331	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,747	3,001	52.2
Hispanic	6,105	3,190	52.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,837	26,059	90.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,708	2,035	43.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,501	361	24.1
Economically disadvantaged students	10,626	5,527	52.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	21,428	17,007	79.4
Female	20,918	16,670	79.7

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In fall 2008, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self report migrant students in the individual student data base (Public School Information System) based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes beginning in 2009. Economically disadvantaged students are not included as a group in 2007-2008 assessment data.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	988	572	57.9
Districts	175	45	25.7
Comments: Fewer Title I schools made AYP in SY 2007-08 due to the increase in Proficiency Targets. Targets increased an average of 10 percentage-points on both the CMT and CAPT.			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	456	209	45.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	145	32	22.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	311	177	56.9
Comments: Fewer Title I schools made AYP in SY 2007-08 due to the increase in Proficiency Targets. Targets increased an average of 10 percentage-points on both the CMT and CAPT.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
142	95	66.9
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- 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	4
Extension of the school year or school day	5
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	2
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	2
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	3
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has developed and implemented the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) to accelerate the learning of all students, with special emphasis placed on 48 districts with Title I schools that have been identified as "in need of improvement," according to No Child Left Behind (NCLB). This initiative is based on the findings of nationally recognized researchers including Reeves, Schmoker, Marzano, Elmore, Simpson and others. Their work provides evidence that schools with student populations including high rates of poverty and high percentages of ethnic minorities can achieve high academic performance.

The goal of the CALI is twofold: to develop and implement a systemic and sustainable initiative of district and school improvement that focuses on accountability for student learning to accelerate the closing of Connecticut's achievement gap through district-level reform; and to meet state requirements of Part A, Section 1116, "Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency School Improvement" and Section 1117, "School Support and Recognition" of NCLB. Through this partnership, CSDE is providing district-and school-level support and technical assistance in key areas, which research has shown is essential to implement a results-based district accountability system. Our work focuses on Data-Driven Decision-Making/Data Teams (DDDM/DT), Making Standards Work (MSW), Effective Teaching Strategies (ETS), Common Formative Assessments(CFA), Scientific Research Based Interventions(SRBI, Climate and Leadership. Identified schools and districts are given access to the trainings in these areas as well as to onsite technical assistance.

Executive Coaches and/or Data Team Facilitators provide onsite technical assistance to 20 Title I schools in 12 districts that have been

identified in need of improvement.

Executive Coach-Duties and Responsibilities:

1. Provide school leaders and leadership teams with on-site support and technical assistance three times monthly;
2. Collaborate with school leaders to monitor, measure, and revise school improvement plans;
3. Collaborate with school leaders to identify areas of focus for coaching, the norms and expectations in the coaching relationship, and indicators of success;
4. Collaborate with school leaders to complete a work plan that includes targeted professional development; and
5. Collaborate with school leaders and the data team facilitator to ensure alignment of all initiatives.

Data Team Facilitator-Duties and Responsibilities:

1. Provide twice monthly support to assist with the implementation of the school data teams;
2. Facilitate the work of the grade level and school-wide data teams;
3. Conduct an initial assessment of grade level and school-wide data teams; and
4. Collaborate with school leaders and the executive coach to ensure alignment of all initiatives.

Additionally, a CSDE team is assigned to the superintendent and his/her management/leadership team in the 12 neediest districts. The CSDE team consists of two co-team leaders: one from the Bureau of Accountability and one from the Bureau of School and District Improvement as well as a retired superintendent. The foundation for the CSDE team interventions is based on district and school instructional assessments conducted by Cambridge Education. The Cambridge district assessment is based on both a bottom-up and top-down analysis of the district organizational systems, particularly those having the greatest impact on teaching and learning. An additional component is a financial audit.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has developed and implemented the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) to accelerate the learning of all students, with special emphasis placed on 48 districts with Title I schools that have been identified as "in need of improvement," according to No Child Left Behind (NCLB). This initiative is based on the findings of nationally recognized researchers including Reeves, Schmoker, Marzano, Elmore, Simpson and others. Their work provides evidence that schools with student populations including high rates of poverty and high percentages of ethnic minorities can achieve high academic performance.

The goal of the CALI is twofold: to develop and implement a systemic and sustainable initiative of district and school improvement that focuses on accountability for student learning to accelerate the closing of Connecticut's achievement gap through district-level reform; and to meet state requirements of Part A, Section 1116, "Academic Assessment and Local Educational Agency School Improvement" and Section 1117, "School Support and Recognition" of NCLB. Through this partnership, the Department is providing district-and school-level support and technical assistance in key areas, which research has shown is essential to implement a results-based district accountability system. Our work focuses on Data-Driven Decision-Making/Data Teams (DDDM/DT), Making Standards Work (MSW), Effective Teaching Strategies (ETS), Common Formative Assessments(CFA), Scientific Research Based Interventions(SRBI, Climate and Leadership. Identified schools and districts are given access to the trainings in these areas as well as to onsite technical assistance.

Executive Coaches and/or Data Team Facilitators provide onsite technical assistance to 20 Title I schools in 12 districts that have been identified in need of improvement.

Executive Coach-Duties and Responsibilities

- Provide school leaders and leadership teams with on-site support and technical assistance three times monthly;
- Collaborate with school leaders to monitor, measure, and revise school improvement plans;
- Collaborate with school leaders to identify areas of focus for coaching, the norms and expectations in the coaching relationship, and indicators of success;
- Collaborate with school leaders to complete a work plan that includes targeted professional development; and
- Collaborate with school leaders and the data team facilitator to ensure alignment of all initiatives.

Data Team Facilitator-Duties and Responsibilities

- Provide twice monthly support to assist with the implementation of the school data teams;
- Facilitate the work of the grade level and school-wide data teams;
- Conduct an initial assessment of grade level and school-wide data teams; and
- Collaborate with school leaders and the executive coach to ensure alignment of all initiatives.

Additionally, a CSDE team is assigned to the superintendent and his/her management/leadership team of the 12 neediest districts. The CSDE Team consists of two co-team leaders: one from the Bureau of Accountability and one from the Bureau of School and District Improvement as well as a former superintendent assigned to work with the teams. The foundation for the CSDE team interventions is based on district and school instructional assessments conducted by Cambridge Education. The Cambridge district assessment is based on both a bottom-up and top-down analysis of the district organizational systems, particularly those having the greatest impact on teaching and learning. An additional component is a financial audit.

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	9
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	1	1
Schools	2	2
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	8/8/08
---	--------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 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	30,504	31,025
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	14,633	15,481
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	48.0	49.9
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	11,312	11,696
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	37.1	37.7
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	92	
Comments: Data was corrected 3/27/09		

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

1.4.8.2 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	17
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	1
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	82
Comments:	

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	N/A	93	1	17	A	N/A
2	N/A	93	1	17	A	N/A
3	N/A	93	1	17	A	N/A
4	N/A	93	1	17	A	N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
Comments: Column 1 contains only four entries.						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

831.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The CSDE has done outreach regarding the strategies that support CALI. The web site www.sdecali.net contains information regarding all of the effective strategies including information on registration for trainings. A School Improvement newsletter is e-mailed to all district personnel who have attended CALI trainings. A DVD depicting the data team process as well as desktop reference guides for data teams, effective teaching strategies and making standards work have been distributed to all school districts. All school districts with identified Title I schools have access to trainings at no cost Data Teams, Effective Teaching Strategies, Making Standards Work, Common Formative Assessments and Scientific Research Based Intervention. School staff may become certified trainers in these modules and in turn may train others in their district in these effective strategies.

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

An external evaluation was conducted of the executive coach and demonstration schools projects which is administered in partnership with the Connecticut Association of Schools. The evaluation was conducted by the University of Connecticut.

Districts with Title I identified schools have access to training in data teams, making standards work, effective teaching strategies and common formative assessment. Additionally, these districts have access to onsite technical assistance provided through the CSDE and outside providers.

Each district has a CSDE team assigned to the superintendent and his/her management/leadership team. The CSDE Team consists of two co-team leaders: one from the Bureau of Accountability and one from the Bureau of School and District Improvement. Additional team members are added based on the identified needs of the district and the mutually developed intervention plans. The CSDE has two retired superintendents who are assigned to work with the CSDE teams in the 12 districts.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) Accountability and School Improvement Initiative is intended to establish new levels of statewide accountability and support to bring all of Connecticut's school districts to higher levels of student achievement. It also provides a robust accountability model and support system for intervening in persistently underachieving schools and districts. It adds to the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) in two major ways: in its attention to ALL schools and districts, not just No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Title 1 schools and districts and in its provision of significant technical assistance beyond CALI including model curriculum and benchmark assessments. The impetus for these actions comes from NEW state legislation, Section 32 of P.A. 07-3 of the June Special Session, an Act Implementing the Provisions of the Budget Concerning Education, which gives the CSDE broad authority to work more proactively with districts in a partnership to accomplish these objectives.

The CSDE Accountability and School Improvement Initiative is specifically designed to provide a wider range of technical assistance and professional development activities to ALL districts to allow them to continue to make sufficient progress in achieving the NCLB targets and prevent them from being identified as schools or districts in need of improvement. State accountability funds support this technical assistance for Title I districts that do not have any identified Title I schools.

A portion of the neediest school district's state funds were used to conduct Cambridge Assessments on the school and district level. The Cambridge district assessment is based on both a bottom-up and top-down analysis of the district organizational systems, particularly those having the greatest impact on teaching and learning.

Executive coaches were provided to 8 schools in 8 of the neediest districts using state accountability funds.

Executive Coach-Duties and Responsibilities

1. Provide school leaders and leadership teams with on-site support and technical assistance three times monthly;
2. Collaborate with school leaders to monitor, measure, and revise school improvement plans;
3. Collaborate with school leaders to identify areas of focus for coaching, the norms and expectations in the coaching relationship, and indicators of success;
4. Collaborate with school leaders to complete a work plan that includes targeted professional development; and
5. Collaborate with school leaders and the data team facilitator to ensure alignment of all initiatives.

Training and support in literacy coaching was also provided to staff from each school in 16 of the neediest districts identified as priority school districts, under the priority school district state grant. This training supports the CALI program.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	88,522
Applied to transfer	907
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	363

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 981,000
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	16
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school³ that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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	56,438
Applied for supplemental educational services	17,150
Received supplemental educational services	6,291
Comments: The number of students who applied in 2007-08 is higher for a number of reasons. The primary one is that districts got more students to sign up. The other reason is that one district reported that each student who was eligible also applied and this made the count higher.	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 7,375,918
Comments:	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	133,519	131,460	98.5	2,059	1.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	10,389	10,105	97.3	284	2.7
Low-poverty schools	10,755	10,686	99.4	69	0.6
All elementary schools	38,851	38,368	98.8	483	1.2
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	14,534	14,077	96.9	457	3.1
Low-poverty schools	24,433	24,201	99.1	232	0.9
All secondary schools	91,758	90,288	98.4	1,470	1.6
Comments: Sum of core academic classes in all elementary schools and all secondary school (130609) does not equal the total number of core academic classes in all schools (133519 because there are teachers who are classified as neither elementary nor secondary because they work out of the school district's central office or in specialized programs.					

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.

A self-contained, full-day elementary classroom is counted 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	53.2
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	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	46.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	49.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	50.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	46.1	5.7
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for the free and reduced-price lunch program was used for this calculation.	
Secondary schools	45.6	5.7
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for the free and reduced-price lunch program was used for this calculation.	
Comments: This is one of the rare cases when the low poverty cut point for elementary and secondary is the same. The numbers have been triple checked!		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish, Portuguese, Polish, Japanese, Chinese, Creole-Haitian
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	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.

Language Transition Support Services, Co-teaching, Tutoring, New Arrival Centers, Before and After School Support.

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	30,713
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	30,006
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	29,805
Portuguese	1,189
Chinese	690
Polish	639
Creole-Haitian	636

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

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	29,805
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	908
Total	30,713
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	11,270
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	36.7
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	28,608
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	840
Total	29,448
Comments:	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	19,424	97.1
ELP attainment	10,740	37.5
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: Connecticut does not assess LEP students in Native Language.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
n/a
Comments: Connecticut does not assess LEP students in Native Language.

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
n/a
Comments: Connecticut does not assess LEP students in Native Language.

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
n/a
Comments: Connecticut does not assess LEP students in Native Language.

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.

Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
1,854	2,013	3,867
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
3,867	3,246	83.9	621
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
3,867	2,834	73.3	1,033
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
1,610	1,194	74.2	416
Comments:			

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	54
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	17
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	37
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	37
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	14
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	33
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	15
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<p>Comments: There are two zeros in Table 1.6.4.1: 1) Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3: Seventeen subgrantees met AMAO 3 and these same 17 also made AMAO 1 and 2 and were therefore reported in the cell for the "Number of Subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs. I did this and reported 0 for the "Number of subgrantees that met AMAO 3" based upon a November 18, 2008 email from Richard Smith at the EDEN Support Center. He directed that subgrantees who made all three AMAOs should be reported only once (i.e. in the cell for the Number of subgrantees that made all three AMAOs). According to Mr. Smith and a subsequent call to the Support Center, these subgrantees (17 in CT) should not be double counted in the rows below. These rows should just report those subgrantees who did not meet all 3 AMAOs. This year, no districts in Connecticut made AMAO 3 without also meeting AMAO 1 and AMAO 2. Therefore, "0" was entered into the cell for "Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3." 2) Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAO: This row is zero because all Title III subgrantees met at least one AMAO.</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:	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	0

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
13,571	1,899	22

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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.	831
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	10

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	55	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	49	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	44	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	39	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	19	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	54	8,525
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	43	2,397
PD provided to principals	40	459
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	37	282
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	40	809
PD provided to community based organization personnel	21	1,203
Total	235	13,675

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/07	9/1/07	60
Comments:		

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

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Meetings have been held with the Bureau of Grants Processing and the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation to set a timeline for all data to be ready by mid-July. This should cut down the number of days for distribution. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has also developed a system that allows subgrantees to input their budget electronically directly to the state. The award letter will be processed electronically more expediently. Training has been provided throughout the state and at the CSDE. This should cut down the turn around time by at least 10 days.

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: The number of persistently dangerous schools continues, based on currently accepted criteria, to be zero.	

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	92.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	95.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	87.6
Hispanic	79.8
White, non-Hispanic	95.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0.0
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	91.3
Female	93.5

Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In 2008-09, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self-report migrant students in the individual student data base(Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposesin 2009. No graduation data for IDEA, LEP, Economically disadvantaged students.

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

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	1.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.9
Black, non-Hispanic	2.9
Hispanic	3.8
White, non-Hispanic	1.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.8
Limited English proficient	3.3
Economically disadvantaged	3.2
Migratory students	0.0
Male	1.9
Female	1.5
Comments: Connecticut ceased running MEP programs as of June 30, 2007. In 2008-09, Connecticut restored the element allowing districts to self-report migrant students in the individual student data base(Public School Information System)based on the definition of "migrant" provided in Section 1309(2) of NCLB. This data will be used solely for NCLB reporting purposes in 2009.	

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	184	184
LEAs with subgrants	13	13
Total	197	197
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)	16	65
K	71	134
1	93	132
2	101	110
3	82	128
4	77	109
5	57	79
6	57	79
7	63	65
8	51	52
9	76	78
10	58	41
11	43	29
12	38	33
Ungraded	0	0
Total	883	1,134
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	239	667
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	550	404
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	N<20	24
Hotels/Motels	91	39
Total	883	1,134
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)	24
K	85
1	115
2	101
3	104
4	98
5	72
6	68
7	57
8	53
9	76
10	45
11	42
12	33
Ungraded	0
Total	973
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	23
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	148
Limited English proficient students	163
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	10
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	11
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	9
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	10
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	9
School supplies	9
Referral to other programs and services	11
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	4
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	2
Transportation	3
School records	2
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for NCLB.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	75	N<20
4	69	N<20
5	51	24
6	42	N<20
7	42	N<20
8	25	N<20
High School	N<20	N<20
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	85	33
4	68	33
5	53	29
6	43	N<20
7	44	N<20
8	24	N<20
High School	N<20	N<20
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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.	

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.	

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

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

There was no child count data collection for 2007-2008. No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

There was no child count data collection for 2007-2008. No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

There was no child count data collection for 2007-2008. No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

There was no child count data collection for 2007-2008. No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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.

No new recruitment activity for the migrant program was conducted between September 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007, as Connecticut phased out its migrant programs. The Connecticut Migrant Program was officially closed on June 30, 2007.

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