

**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

FLORIDA



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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Florida Department of Education		
Address: 325 W Gaines St, Suite 514 Tallahassee, Florida 32399		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Dr. Jan Morphew		
Telephone: (850)245-0657		
Fax: (850)245-5036		
e-mail: jan.morphew@fldoe.org		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Eric J. Smith		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 9:13:22 AM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Revised science content standards were adopted in February 2008.

In June 2008, new statutory requirements were enacted that requires a revision of the Reading and Language Arts content standards. The process for revising those standards started in November 2008, and the revisions are expected to be adopted by the Florida State Board of Education in September 2009.

The statute enacted in June 2008 also requires the State Board to establish, by rule, a schedule for the periodic review and revision of all content standards. This rule change is expected to be approved in January 2009.

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.

Florida has developed plans for the transition to new reading and mathematics assessments aligned to the revised Sunshine State Standards. These new assessments will be field-tested in the Spring of 2011.

Florida implemented a new alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards in 2007-08. This assessment is aligned to the new Sunshine State Standards Access Points in reading and mathematics. The assessment was field tested in Fall 2007 and changes were made based on feedback from teachers who administered the field test. The Florida Alternate Assessment became operational in Spring 2008.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

In 2007-08, the Florida Alternate Assessment included a science assessment based on the Sunshine State Standards. New Sunshine State Standards with Access Points were adopted by the State Board of Education in February, 2008. New item development began following the adoption, and a new science assessment was field tested in Fall, 2008. This revised science assessment will be operational in Spring, 2009.

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	1,624,273	1,581,515	97.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,807	4,677	97.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	38,589	37,851	98.1
Black, non-Hispanic	372,463	361,054	96.9
Hispanic	400,486	391,587	97.8
White, non-Hispanic	750,836	730,923	97.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	242,007	232,990	96.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	165,410	161,535	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	793,892	774,373	97.5
Migratory students	10,681	10,396	97.3
Male	833,400	809,750	97.2
Female	790,873	771,765	97.6
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	76,777	33.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	135,893	58.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	19,674	8.5
Total	232,344	
Comments: There is difference in the number of Students with Disabilities who participated on an assessment, as compared to the number of Students with Disabilities for whom a valid proficiency level was assigned because the tested population includes students who previously met FCAT graduation requirements and students who were enrolled in a private school; the proficiency population does not include these students.		

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

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

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	1,625,876	1,583,934	97.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,813	4,677	97.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	38,614	37,885	98.1
Black, non-Hispanic	372,863	361,752	97.0
Hispanic	401,172	392,414	97.8
White, non-Hispanic	751,305	731,737	97.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	242,208	233,468	96.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	165,627	161,858	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	794,730	775,736	97.6
Migratory students	10,695	10,422	97.4
Male	834,452	811,310	97.2
Female	791,424	772,624	97.6
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	74,218	32.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	137,350	59.4
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	19,574	8.5
Total	231,142	
Comments: There is difference in the number of Students with Disabilities who participated on an assessment, as compared to the number of Students with Disabilities for whom a valid proficiency level was assigned because the tested population includes students who previously met FCAT graduation requirements and students who were enrolled in a private school; the proficiency population does not include these students.		

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	592,699	526,527	88.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,760	1,557	88.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,713	13,040	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	132,595	115,954	87.4
Hispanic	141,225	124,417	88.1
White, non-Hispanic	283,555	254,766	89.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	80,039	63,448	79.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49,503	38,926	78.6
Economically disadvantaged students	262,153	231,318	88.2
Migratory students	2,294	2,042	89.0
Male	301,043	264,193	87.8
Female	291,656	262,334	89.9
Comments: These data are correct.			

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

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	0	0.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	0	

Comments: The USDE Maximized EDEN-CSPR crosswalk indicates that the data for CSPR 1.2.6 are identical with the data in N093 (Category Set A, Subject = Science). The guidance on page 4 of USDE EDEN file specification N093 states that Science data are "Optional": "Are data by science required? No, for SY 2007-08, data by science is optional." (Source: <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/eden/non-xml/n079-4-2.doc>) Since the Science data in USDE EDEN file N093 are optional and these are the exact same data as the data in CSPR 1.2.6 Florida will not be reporting them for SY 0708 to USDE in EDEN and CSPR.

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

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	205,249	156,812	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	556	465	83.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,714	4,225	89.6
Black, non-Hispanic	48,278	29,568	61.2
Hispanic	53,604	38,932	72.6
White, non-Hispanic	89,321	76,677	85.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33,797	18,734	55.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34,412	21,931	63.7
Economically disadvantaged students	114,829	77,516	67.5
Migratory students	1,581	993	62.8
Male	106,006	81,048	76.5
Female	99,243	75,764	76.3
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	205,335	148,399	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	558	434	77.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,717	3,982	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	48,291	27,275	56.5
Hispanic	53,631	35,080	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	89,352	74,791	83.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33,821	16,252	48.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34,430	18,622	54.1
Economically disadvantaged students	114,872	70,902	61.7
Migratory students	1,584	781	49.3
Male	106,057	75,098	70.8
Female	99,278	73,301	73.8
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is not assessed at this grade.			

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

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	194,043	137,008	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	598	458	76.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,624	4,025	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	43,206	23,380	54.1
Hispanic	49,545	32,947	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	87,719	70,108	79.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	31,307	14,865	47.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	26,122	14,565	55.8
Economically disadvantaged students	104,018	62,774	60.3
Migratory students	1,396	780	55.9
Male	99,558	70,500	70.8
Female	94,485	66,508	70.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.2 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	194,043	135,516	69.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	595	443	74.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,628	3,791	81.9
Black, non-Hispanic	43,198	22,623	52.4
Hispanic	49,543	31,376	63.3
White, non-Hispanic	87,733	71,032	81.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	31,295	13,309	42.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	26,128	12,671	48.5
Economically disadvantaged students	104,016	60,714	58.4
Migratory students	1,395	649	46.5
Male	99,555	68,015	68.3
Female	94,488	67,501	71.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is not assessed at this grade.			

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

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	196,954	121,486	61.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	586	391	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,904	4,001	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	43,991	18,212	41.4
Hispanic	49,796	28,754	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	89,976	65,085	72.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	30,842	11,604	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,507	9,206	42.8
Economically disadvantaged students	103,399	51,186	49.5
Migratory students	1,375	629	45.7
Male	100,889	62,992	62.4
Female	96,065	58,494	60.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.3 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	196,948	132,683	67.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	585	409	69.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,901	3,929	80.2
Black, non-Hispanic	43,985	22,055	50.1
Hispanic	49,767	30,519	61.3
White, non-Hispanic	89,999	70,098	77.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	30,818	12,109	39.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,477	9,096	42.4
Economically disadvantaged students	103,378	57,681	55.8
Migratory students	1,376	600	43.6
Male	100,891	64,384	63.8
Female	96,057	68,299	71.1
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.3 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	194,428	84,272	43.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	585	276	47.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,848	2,942	60.7
Black, non-Hispanic	43,244	9,516	22.0
Hispanic	49,090	17,726	36.1
White, non-Hispanic	89,051	50,187	56.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	28,533	6,769	23.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,361	3,887	21.2
Economically disadvantaged students	96,861	28,642	29.6
Migratory students	1,308	271	20.7
Male	99,263	45,147	45.5
Female	95,165	39,125	41.1
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	195,133	103,372	53.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	589	337	57.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,677	3,640	77.8
Black, non-Hispanic	44,151	14,318	32.4
Hispanic	48,859	22,983	47.0
White, non-Hispanic	89,766	57,947	64.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	29,349	7,357	25.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,474	5,423	29.4
Economically disadvantaged students	100,678	39,227	39.0
Migratory students	1,314	460	35.0
Male	100,005	53,320	53.3
Female	95,128	50,052	52.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.4 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	195,237	123,854	63.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	592	405	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,677	3,762	80.4
Black, non-Hispanic	44,190	20,427	46.2
Hispanic	48,864	27,673	56.6
White, non-Hispanic	89,807	66,572	74.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	29,390	9,704	33.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,482	6,457	34.9
Economically disadvantaged students	100,752	50,790	50.4
Migratory students	1,315	516	39.2
Male	100,082	61,576	61.5
Female	95,155	62,278	65.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is not assessed at this grade.			

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

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	198,637	121,029	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	582	370	63.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,756	3,950	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	45,327	19,186	42.3
Hispanic	49,148	27,541	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	92,049	65,515	71.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	29,226	8,826	30.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,552	6,090	36.8
Economically disadvantaged students	99,064	47,639	48.1
Migratory students	1,336	602	45.1
Male	101,988	61,159	60.0
Female	96,649	59,870	61.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.5 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	198,869	129,143	64.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	583	412	70.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,754	3,786	79.6
Black, non-Hispanic	45,413	21,897	48.2
Hispanic	49,197	28,832	58.6
White, non-Hispanic	92,140	69,289	75.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	29,294	10,149	34.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,559	5,419	32.7
Economically disadvantaged students	99,225	52,062	52.5
Migratory students	1,338	510	38.1
Male	102,128	63,562	62.2
Female	96,741	65,581	67.8
Comments: Reading/LA data reported for 6th grade in 2006-07 totaled 29,628 Children With Disabilities(CWD) completing the assessments. This is consistent with the 29,294 CWD reported in grade 7 in 2007-08.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science is not assessed at this grade.			

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

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	188,422	125,749	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	585	418	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,502	3,828	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	41,190	18,834	45.7
Hispanic	45,369	27,649	60.9
White, non-Hispanic	90,743	70,742	78.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,752	8,034	33.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,365	5,277	36.7
Economically disadvantaged students	87,659	46,927	53.5
Migratory students	1,050	472	45.0
Male	96,153	64,167	66.7
Female	92,269	61,582	66.7
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	188,651	100,567	53.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	583	335	57.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,501	3,153	70.1
Black, non-Hispanic	41,257	14,070	34.1
Hispanic	45,440	20,527	45.2
White, non-Hispanic	90,831	58,846	64.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	23,859	5,894	24.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	14,393	2,575	17.9
Economically disadvantaged students	87,829	33,979	38.7
Migratory students	1,057	269	25.4
Male	96,289	48,730	50.6
Female	92,362	51,837	56.1
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.6 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	184,228	73,990	40.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	565	248	43.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,450	2,628	59.1
Black, non-Hispanic	39,710	7,485	18.8
Hispanic	44,556	13,912	31.2
White, non-Hispanic	89,023	47,053	52.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,528	3,042	14.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,517	1,339	11.6
Economically disadvantaged students	80,846	20,483	25.3
Migratory students	947	132	13.9
Male	93,450	40,449	43.3
Female	90,777	33,540	36.9
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	397,799	263,911	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,161	827	71.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,621	8,198	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	92,990	42,299	45.5
Hispanic	94,049	56,921	60.5
White, non-Hispanic	189,443	148,013	78.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	52,719	17,208	32.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,589	11,045	37.3
Economically disadvantaged students	161,469	85,926	53.2
Migratory students	2,318	1,110	47.9
Male	201,679	134,383	66.6
Female	196,120	129,528	66.0
Comments:			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	400,559	169,017	42.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,170	540	46.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,659	5,600	58.0
Black, non-Hispanic	93,834	20,976	22.4
Hispanic	94,994	31,988	33.7
White, non-Hispanic	190,321	104,629	55.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	53,287	10,164	19.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,907	3,301	11.0
Economically disadvantaged students	162,945	44,901	27.6
Migratory students	2,336	363	15.5
Male	203,496	83,397	41.0
Female	197,063	85,620	43.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.7 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	164,853	62,126	37.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	455	202	44.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,548	2,482	54.6
Black, non-Hispanic	36,209	5,792	16.0
Hispanic	37,980	10,887	28.7
White, non-Hispanic	81,878	41,071	50.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	15,897	2,235	14.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,289	822	8.8
Economically disadvantaged students	53,909	12,144	22.5
Migratory students	707	118	16.7
Male	80,363	34,537	43.0
Female	84,488	27,589	32.7
Comments:			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	3,299	792	24.0
Districts	72	2	2.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,335	227	17.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,301	218	16.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	34	9	26.5
Comments: Based on guidance from EDEN Partner Support, Florida reported schools with too few students to calculate AYP as AYP Status = NOT REQUIRED. There were 30 such schools: 4 TA and 26 SW schools. As a result the count of Title I schools shown in row 1, column 1 in Section 1.4.2 (above) shows 30 less Title I schools than there actually are in Florida. The total number of Title I schools in Florida is 1,365: 1327 SW and 38 TA.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
72	2	2.8
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	66
Extension of the school year or school day	28
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	10
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	97
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	52
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	200
Comments: Replacement of principal is reported with staff; it is not collected independently.	

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)	2
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	25
Comments: 2006-2007, CSPR asked for the restructuring option being implemented. 2007-2008 data asks for restructuring actions that were implemented. 2007-2008. 27 schools are in restructuring.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other major restructuring of the school governance action(s) implemented includes (1) establish smaller learning communities that reorganize the school by narrowing or expanding gradespans (2) close the school (3) diminish site based management, and (4) consolidated schools.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Among the features that set Florida apart from other states is its district structuring. Florida's school districts are contiguous with the 67 counties, placing three of Florida's districts in the "top 10" largest districts in the country. In part, 65 of these 67 districts are currently in "corrective action" under NCLB because of their size.

The Department has chosen to sanction these districts by requiring them to reallocate a percentage of their administrative funds based on the percentage of AYP indicators missed. These funds must be re-directed to specific, student-level interventions. These funds are separately granted, and the approval process is rigorous.

The Department provides these districts with specific support through a template developed for district improvement plans. These plans are reviewed and feedback is provided to districts. Districts have access to a series of services and professional development opportunities, including:

Student Progression Guide. The purpose of the guide is to assist districts in revising and developing policies and procedures related to promotion and retention. District student progression plans help ensure that the required program of study, placement, promotion, reporting, retention, and assessment procedures are equitable and comprehensive, thereby providing accountability for all students.

Student Progression Plan. Current law requires each district school board to establish a comprehensive process for student progression, as well as standards for evaluating each student's performance. The student progression plan must be reviewed and revised periodically to ensure that it complies with any changes that may have been made to state law or school board policy and to ensure that the required programs of study, placement, promotion, reporting, retention, and assessment procedures are equitable and comprehensive, thereby providing accountability for all students.

Comprehensive School Reform Information. FDOE provides a comprehensive database of comprehensive school reform models in use across the U.S., as well as within Florida. It also includes the research base for each model, the 11 components of comprehensive school reform, and links to national databases on CSR.

Statewide School Improvement Workshops. These workshops cover a variety of topics including data-driven decision making and are open to up to three school improvement contacts within each district. Many of these workshops focus on Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM), a Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle. This analytical process was designed to identify strengths and weaknesses in student performance as it relates to the summative assessment, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Plan - helps school leaders to facilitate an entire staff focus on targeted instructional intervention; Do - Study of FCAT data should lead to defined, focused activities designed to improve student achievement. Check - Periodically, school staff reviews student progress and re-teaches concepts or provides enrichment activities. Act - This data should assist staff in determining if modifications to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) are necessary.

Information Specialists. The Department maintains extensive databases of school reform topics, as well as in-state and out-of-state experts who can be contacted to provide specific guidance or training. (See <http://www.bsi.fsu.edu/newsdesk/waveseries/resref12.htm> as an example.)

Sunshine State Lighting Best Practices. Lighting Best Practices are user-friendly information summaries on hot topics that are being addressed by school improvement teams. The research has been condensed to assist school communities in their search for ideas and strategies to support educational goals and objectives. In addition to the information provided, resources and references often are included for more in-depth information about each topic.

e-Library. The Department's electronic library provides links to educational research, teaching strategies and best practices to assist with school reform. (See <http://www.bsi.fsu.edu/elibrary/index.htm>).

Statewide BSI Electronic Newsletter. This periodic newsletter provides deadline reminders, new resources, and announces workshops. BSI and BSA collaborate on the newsletter to further integrate Title I and school improvement.

FCAT Explorer/Florida Achieves-FOCUS. FCAT explorer is a practice program for skills tested on the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test. The FCAT Explorer/FOCUS Support Services Team is available to provide training to teachers and staff across the state. Support Services Staff can train any teacher, media specialist, school administrator, or other school staff in using the FCAT Explorer and FOCUS Teacher's Desk features.

D.A.R.T. Model (Data Disaggregation Tool). The DART model is a proven process for engaging the entire school staff in the vital steps important to the implementation of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). This data should assist staff in determining if modifications to the School Improvement Plan (SIP) are necessary. Schools will also gain insight into the comparative performance of student subgroups as defined by NCLB.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	67
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	0
Schools	51	9
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	09/29/08
---	----------

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	90,640	0
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	40,074	0
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	44.2	0.0
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	37,270	0
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	41.1	0.0
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	2,460	
Comments: No 1003a funds were withheld in 2007-2008 due to reduction in State Title I allocation. 2003g funds were allocated for the first time in 07-08.		

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

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

1.4.8.2 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	18
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	3
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	226
Comments: N/A	

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

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		119	0	14	A	NA
2		2	0	0	A	NA
5	Extend the school day for tutorials	38	0	0	A	NA
6 = Combo 1	1 and 2	10	0	0	A	NA
7 = Combo 2	1 and 5	77	0	0	A	NA
		0	0	0		NA
		0	0	0		NA
		0	0	0		NA

Comments: Data are provided for 1003(g) funds only, as Florida was unable to reserve 1003(a) funds in 2007-08. Data for Column 4 cannot be provided. No 1003(a) funds were disbursed during the 2007-08 school year; 2007-08 was the first year schools implemented strategies using 1003(g) funds.

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

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

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

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As of the submission date of CSPR Part I, the Department was in the process of developing a website specifically pertaining to successful strategies for school improvement. The website will be ready by mid-March, and will include information about the strategies implemented with Sections 1003(a) and (g) funds and data from CSPR and other sources that show the success of schools receiving such grants. The LEAs will be notified of this website and asked to review the information contained therein when developing future applications for these funds.

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*: 0.0 %

Comments: There were no funds set-aside in FY 2007 for Section 1003(a). Florida normally reserves 4% of the Title I, Part Allocation for School Improvement under Section 1003(a), which for 2007-08 would have equaled \$23,566,285. However, as a result of USDE data recalculations, significant reductions in funding to the State for Fiscal Year 2007-08 and the hold harmless provision for calculating allocations to LEAs, Florida was not able to set aside any funds for School Improvement activities under Section 1003(a).

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.

The Florida Department of Education retained 5 percent, or \$286,493, of its total 2007-08 allocation of \$5.7 million for state level activities. These funds were consolidated, consistent with provisions of P.L. 107-110, Section 9201 and Florida's approved consolidated application. Florida is fully cognizant of its responsibilities with respect to meeting the requirements of P.L. 107-110, Section 1003(g), and the applicable requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, Sections 1116 and 1117.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the 2007-08 school year, the Florida Department of Education used state funds, Title II, Part A and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act funds for statewide support to low-performing schools. Title I schools planning for or in restructuring were provided services including identifying and implementing evidence-based school improvement processes and continuous improvement models. In addition, funds were used to provide statewide trainings on data disaggregation by the Center for Data Driven Reform in Education.

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

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	694,846
Applied to transfer	19,140
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	7,041

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments: Per the guidance from EDEN Partner Support, for school year 2007-08, Florida reported only students who transferred during school year 2007-08 under the provisions for public school choice in accordance with Title I, Part A, Section 1116. For school year 2006-07 Florida's interpretation of the guidance for these data was to report any student who transferred to a school under the provisions for public school choice in accordance with Title I, Part A, Section 1116 and had not matriculated to a new school. As a result, the number of students who transferred to a school under the provisions for public school choice in accordance with Title I, Part A, Section 1116 for school year 2007-08 was less than the number of students for school year 2006-07.	

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 10,481,155
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	9
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	522,043
Applied for supplemental educational services	98,672
Received supplemental educational services	66,259
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 76,771,712
Comments:	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	958,124	875,560	91.4	82,564	8.6
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	120,863	112,286	92.9	8,577	7.1
Low-poverty schools	123,294	115,097	93.4	8,197	6.6
All elementary schools	522,306	490,678	93.9	31,628	6.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	84,692	71,895	84.9	12,797	15.1
Low-poverty schools	92,876	84,890	91.4	7,986	8.6
All secondary schools	435,818	384,882	88.3	50,936	11.7
Comments:					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Florida uses a departmentalized approach.

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	44.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	7.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	19.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	29.3
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: "Other" represents a variety of reasons elementary and secondary teachers are not highly qualified.

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)	52.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	12.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	35.4
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	74.9	31.8
Poverty metric used	Percent Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	59.8	21.9
Poverty metric used	Percent Free and Reduced Lunch	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.1 These are the Instructional Models used in Florida to provide ELLs comprehensible instruction:

Sheltered - English

Sheltered - Core/Basic Subject Areas

Mainstream/Inclusion - English

Mainstream/Inclusion - Core/Basic Subject Areas

One-Way Developmental Bilingual Education

Dual Language (Two-way Developmental Bilingual Education)

Because our labels are different, it is unclear how Florida should answer this question.

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	268,207
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	161,445
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	194,091
Haitian Creole	28,776
Portuguese	3,739
Vietnamese	3,007
Arabic	2,065

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Chinese = 1996 French = 1965

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	216,688
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	37,454
Total	254,142
<p>Comments: One reason for the high number of students not tested is that Florida only counts a student as tested if he/she was tested on all CELLA domains. Also, Survey 3 is used as the base file for tested. It is possible students moved between survey 3 and the time of testing. In this case the students would have different schools and possible districts during testing than they had during survey 3. This would lead to fewer matches.</p> <p>Next year Florida plans to go through a verification process with the districts in order to increase our matches.</p>	

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

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

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	51,373
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	20.2
<p>Comments: Students are considered proficient if and only if they are take all three LEP Assessments, are in LEP program for more than three years and are proficient on all three LEP Assessments. Otherwise they are not considered proficient.</p>	

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

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

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	117,771
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	19,954
Total	137,725
<p>Comments: One reason for the high number of students not tested is that Florida only counts a student as tested if he/she was tested on all CELLA domains. Also, Survey 3 is used as the base file for tested. It is possible students moved between survey 3 and the time of testing. In this case the students would have different schools and possible districts during testing than they had during survey 3. This would lead to fewer matches.</p> <p>Next year Florida plans to go through a verification process with the districts in order to increase our matches.</p>	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 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	24,290	20.6
ELP attainment	4,939	4.2
<p>Comments: Students are considered making progress if and only if they take all three LEP Assessments for two years in a row and move up a level or maintain proficiency in all three assessments. Otherwise the student is not considered as making progress.</p> <p>Students are considered proficient if and only if they are take all three LEP Assessments, are in LEP program for more than three years and are proficient on all three LEP Assessments. Otherwise they are not considered proficient.</p> <p>Students who are proficient in all three LEP Assessment content areas are considered proficient (i.e., ELP attainment). And students who both make progress and attain proficiency are reported as having both made progress and as proficient.</p>		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

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

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

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: No native language assessments are given in Florida.

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)
None
Comments: No native language assessments are given in Florida.

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)
None
Comments: No native language assessments are given in Florida.

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

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

1.6.3.6 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
67,721	9,084	76,805
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
55,399	34,651	62.5	20,748
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
55,500	30,691	55.3	24,809
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
0	0	0.0	0
Comments: Per the guidance from EDEN Partner Support, Florida is not required to report Former LEP Science assessment data because Science is not included in Florida's AYP calculation.			

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

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

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	48
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	43
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	33
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	48
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	48
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
Comments: A zero was reported for the final row, i.e., "Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)", but "Not Applicable" is the appropriate value because four consecutive years of data are not available.	

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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: Florida does not collect these data.	

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
142,333	7,278	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.	710
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	0

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.

Florida's Consent Decree requires ESOL content area teachers to be ESOL endorsed or certified. To utilize Title III funds for certified/licensed teachers would be considered as supplanting instead of supplementing. Therefore, there are no data to collect.

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	0	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	0	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	0	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	0	0
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	0	0
PD provided to principals	0	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	0	0
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	0	0
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	0	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Florida's Consent Decree requires ESOL content area teachers to be ESOL endorsed or certified. To utilize Title III funds for certified/licensed teachers would be considered as supplanting instead of supplementing. Therefore, there are no data to collect.

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
07/01/07	07/01/07	101
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.

The following are the steps Florida has taken to speed up the distribution process:

- shortened the review process
- moved to an online application system
- provided technical assistance to districts/LEAs

Note: Final distribution depends on when the districts/LEAs submit corrections to their application for final approval.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	69.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	82.4
Black, non-Hispanic	54.6
Hispanic	63.6
White, non-Hispanic	78.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	38.0
Limited English proficient	48.2
Economically disadvantaged	56.0
Migratory students	48.2
Male	65.8
Female	73.9
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online 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	3.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5.8
Hispanic	4.5
White, non-Hispanic	2.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5.5
Limited English proficient	6.8
Economically disadvantaged	3.9
Migratory students	3.3
Male	4.3
Female	3.2
Comments: These Dropout Rate data were calculated using 0607 data that were reported to EDEN. Florida had 433 dropouts who were multi-racial but EDEN/USDE does not collect dropout data for Multi-racial students. Since EDEN requires that Race & Sex are combined for dropouts (N032), there will be 433 less total dropouts in the Sex totals and the Race totals than in the Total Dropout.	

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	34	34
LEAs with subgrants	33	33
Total	67	67
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)	91	612
K	333	3,187
1	304	3,127
2	315	2,947
3	293	2,960
4	244	2,499
5	229	2,442
6	182	2,439
7	159	2,448
8	160	2,128
9	142	2,466
10	103	1,706
11	105	1,208
12	94	1,070
Ungraded	0	0
Total	2,754	31,239
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	629	8,164
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,815	18,818
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	122	962
Hotels/Motels	187	2,974
Total	2,753	30,918

Comments: Unknown primary night time residency - 1 child/youth in LEAs without subgrants, 321 children/youths in LEAs with subgrants are not included in table above. Totals will not match other tables.

*** Comment added during CSPR I edit window: In response to 1.9.1.2, Florida is in the process of changing data elements to conform to EDEN specs; however the changes were not made by the 07-08 reporting deadline. In 2007-2008, 322 homeless students were reported to FLDOE by LEAs with unknown primary nighttime residence codes. For 2008-2009, the unknown primary night time residence code has been removed.

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)	0
K	3,187
1	3,127
2	2,947
3	2,960
4	2,499
5	2,442
6	2,439
7	2,448
8	2,128
9	2,466
10	1,706
11	1,208
12	1,070
Ungraded	0
Total	30,627
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	4,298
Migratory children/youth	777
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,468
Limited English proficient students	3,134
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	31
Expedited evaluations	21
Staff professional development and awareness	31
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	30
Transportation	27
Early childhood programs	17
Assistance with participation in school programs	29
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	28
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	27
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	30
Coordination between schools and agencies	29
Counseling	21
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	23
Clothing to meet a school requirement	29
School supplies	32
Referral to other programs and services	28
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	31
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	4
School Selection	3
Transportation	9
School records	8
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	7
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,915	1,084
4	1,616	851
5	1,655	793
6	1,536	643
7	1,515	651
8	1,222	398
High School	2,027	465
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,911	1,179
4	1,613	802
5	1,658	634
6	1,533	399
7	1,498	545
8	1,215	511
High School	1,984	870
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)	4,130
K	2,310
1	2,209
2	1,945
3	1,929
4	1,633
5	1,653
6	1,618
7	1,680
8	1,360
9	1,797
10	1,611
11	1,368
12	1,556
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	6,792
Total	33,591

Comments:

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The significant changes reflected in the numbers being reported for both Category I and Category II can be attributed to the following factors:

- the loss of significant farmland - for example, since 2000, the total citrus acreage in the state has decreased from 832,000 to 576,000;
- a decrease in agricultural products in 2007. The FL Department of Agriculture indicates that a combination of the devastating 2005 hurricane season followed by a 2006 drought season affected agricultural production in 2007. Reports from the field suggested that less acres were planted in major crops (oranges, tomatoes) requiring less workforce;
- the end of eligibility for a number of families;
- the impact of immigration reform issues on migrant families - due to fear of being caught and/or detained, undocumented migrant families are reluctant to travel in search of qualifying work;
- a decrease in the number of school-aged migrant children - almost 15% less school-aged migrant children were enrolled in the state during 2007-08 school year; and
- an over-all reduction in the number of students enrolling in schools for the 2007-08 school year.

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)	1,048
K	717
1	760
2	712
3	643
4	520
5	536
6	496
7	517
8	400
9	529
10	468
11	387
12	209
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	555
Total	8,497
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The significant changes reflected in the numbers being reported for both Category I and Category II can be attributed to the following factors:

- the loss of significant farmland - for example, since 2000, the total citrus acreage in the state has decreased from 832,000 to 576,000;
- a decrease in agricultural products in 2007. The FL Department of Agriculture indicates that a combination of the devastating 2005 hurricane season followed by a 2006 drought season affected agricultural production in 2007. Reports from the field suggested that less acres were planted in major crops (oranges, tomatoes) requiring less workforce;
- the end of eligibility for a number of families;
- the impact of immigration reform issues on migrant families - due to fear of being caught and/or detained, undocumented migrant families are reluctant to travel in search of qualifying work;
- a decrease in the number of school aged migrant students enrolled during the summer; and
- an over-all reduction in the number of students enrolling in schools for the 2007-08 school year.

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.

All local student data are transmitted to the State via an automated Management Information System (MIS), the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System. The data are collected by the school districts through their local systems and submitted to the state at pre-set times throughout the year, with a nine-month window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. The districts use this same system to transmit the data that are used to calculate the migrant count. This year's count was obtained using the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System using data submitted by the districts in August, 2008 via Survey 5, with updates and corrections up to October 30, 2008. Survey 5 differs from all other surveys in that it is a cumulative count of all students served in all programs during the preceding school year, and therefore captures all migrant students.

Last year's child counts were generated using the same system. In 2002, a data element was added to the Florida Student Information Data Base system: the Migrant Status Term, Student Demographic Reporting Format. This data element uses a coding system to indicate whether the migrant child was served in the regular term, summer term, or both.

In Migrant Status Term, a separate code (Code X) is used to identify students who qualified as migrants, but received no services (neither academic nor support services in the regular or summer term). In 2006, the coding used to indicate that the migrant child was served in the regular term (3) was revised to reflect that the migrant child was enrolled/served--with services provided during the regular school day--(D) or that the migrant child was enrolled/served --with some or all services provided during extended day/week--(E). Extensive technical assistance was provided to school districts to ensure the accuracy of this coding system, including regional workshops and presentations at Florida's annual Information Database Workshop held in June each year and at the State Migrant Education Conference usually held in the fall of each year.

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.

District Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff (recruiters/advocates/liaisons) identify eligible migrant children through face-to-face interviews and document their eligibility using a state approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. This form captures all the necessary data for identification and reporting: student name, parent names, Qualifying Arrival Date, TO/FROM city and state, date of birth, gender, race/ethnicity, country of birth, current school enrollment, etc.

Florida's guidelines require district MEPs to generate a new COE each time a migrant child makes a new qualifying move. In addition, district MEP staff is required to contact the child or the child's parent/guardian annually in order to update the child's COE. Documentation of this process is maintained at the district-level. District MEP staff is trained to verify the information on the COE, and enter it into the local Management Information Services (MIS) data bases. Districts transmit the student-level data from their local systems to Florida's Automated Student Data Base System in Survey 5. A complete description of the system used, along with a complete layout of the data elements, may be found at: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/student_0708.asp

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) staff conducts annual on-site reviews that include re-interviewing selected families, to ensure that the information on the COEs is accurate and that the children on the COE are eligible to receive Migrant Education Program services.

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

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data from the COEs are entered locally, either at the school or the district-level, aggregated for the whole district and transmitted electronically during the required survey periods through Florida's Automated Student Information Data Base System. The Student Demographic Format collects student-level data on all students in Florida, including but not limited to, date of birth, qualifying arrival date, country of birth, and other information about services provided to qualified students. To obtain a student count, the database is queried for all students meeting the criteria for current migrant status in regular and summer categories.

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.

Same process was used to collect and maintain the State's Category 2 count.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The database is queried for all children between the ages of 3 and 22 (Dates of Birth range from 9/2/85 through 8/31/05, inclusive, which captures those who were 2 and turned 3 and those who were 21 and turned 22), whose Qualifying Arrival Date is greater than 8/31/04, with a valid Migrant Status Term Code, and an appropriate service for Summer Session. This process is applied to all migrant child cases that are identified as migrant in the state student database and then the cases are sorted by Category I or II using the Migrant Status Term data element. Edit checks for Category I and Category II are performed on the data file generated by this query to delete children who may be included in error. The student counts are then shared with district MEP and Management Information Services (MIS) Departments to verify their data. Districts are provided a reasonable time to make corrections as needed before the revised data is extracted once more. With regard to verifying that those children whose 3rd birthday occurs during the eligibility period are still resident in the State before including them in the child count; on-site monitoring (conducted by State MEP staff) of basic district level quality control procedures being implemented documents a standard practice among district MEPs. It is a standard procedure that children who will turn 3 during the eligibility period are flagged by the data clerk (whose responsibility it is to input student data into district data base) at the beginning of each school year or at the time of interview or re-interview of a family. Before data are submitted for the reporting period (Survey 5), data clerks confer with recruiters to ensure that these children/families are still in the district.

The query used finds all migrant children identified within the eligibility reporting period. Since Survey 5 data are cumulative for the entire school year, all those children meeting the eligibility requirements are captured, regardless of their length of stay. Recruiters are in constant contact with their families so that when a child turns three during the reporting period, district MEP staff will then identify that child as migrant on the student data base. The data element Migrant Status Term identifies which term(s) a migratory child was served and/or identified. Further, migratory children selected for inclusion in the count from the State Student Data Base had to have had a Qualifying Arrival Date greater than 8/31/04. State Student Data Base reporting procedures require that any migrant child, who had graduated at the end of the regular school year, would not have a record in the student data base. FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "continuation of services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations.

In addition to the Migrant Status Term data element contained in the Student Demographic Format, data elements in the Federal/State Compensatory Evaluation Format, also transmitted in Survey 5, provide information regarding summer services to migrant students. The summer school code (Category II) cannot be entered on a student without a link to a code for summer services. Each year, a comprehensive presentation is made at the State Data Base Workshop. This presentation targets migrant staff, data clerks, and MIS staff and covers all reporting requirements for migrant students and migrant program data. When the specific Migrant Status Term data element was created, very explicit definitions were developed and disseminated to MEP/MIS staff. Two of the codes were created to identify students who received services during the summer. The codes are "B"--students who were served in both the regular 180 day school year AND the summer term and "S"--students that were served only in the summer term. The definition for summer services state that a student must be served in a Federally Funded (partially or fully) program designed (in whole or part) especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Students enrolled in a conventional summer school must, additionally or concurrently, be provided services that are fully or partially federally funded and designed especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Summer programs and services that are funded partially or fully by migrant program funds are clearly highlighted in district Migrant Education Program Project applications and are corroborated by district logs and reviewed during on-site district MEP monitoring visits. Districts have been provided guidance clarifying those children who receive instructional packets as a one-time act of providing instructional or support services cannot be included in their "summer count".

All students in Florida are assigned a unique, ten-digit Student Number Identifier, Florida (SID) number, consisting of the student's Social Security number followed by an 'X'. Those without Social Security numbers are assigned a SID by the local school district using a state defined methodology, which then becomes the student's State SID. Should a student move, the receiving district is required to search the State's Student Locator system to determine if the student has prior enrollment history in any of Florida's public schools. If so, the SID which was originally assigned as the student's SID, is to be assigned to the student in the receiving district. Please refer to: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0809/st262_1.pdf. Because the SID is unique to each student, further matching is not performed at the State level.

For this year's count, the following process was used: A master file containing all the students in the state was generated and the students that met the federal criteria were coded as 'Migrant'. A separate data file containing only migrant students served in Regular and Summer Sessions was generated. All records were matched and (unduplicated) by data element fields: Migrant Status Term, SID, District Number and School Number. Because of the uniqueness of each students' SID, there is an assurance that data are unique for each student based upon the Migrant Status Term data element and the Florida Student Number Identifier. By using the SID and Migrant Status Term and matching for duplicate SID's, this methodology insures the data tables produce an unduplicated count for each session. When students are initially enrolled by district data staff, THEY must ensure that if a pre-existing SID is selected for a student, it must match on all variables, i.e.; name, DOB, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, home language, and parent names at a

minimum before assigning a new SID.

An additional measure to ensure that districts do not generate a new SID for a student with an existing SID will be to disseminate extensive guidance to district MEP and district data staff on the nuances of Hispanic names and strongly encourage an in-depth probe of the State Student Locator system to identify such students before a new SID is issued.

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.

Same process was used to generate State's Category 2 count.

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.

In 2006, FLDOE established a Florida Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Office. The ID&R office includes a state ID&R Coordinator, a trainer and an administrative assistant. The ID&R office is responsible for providing technical assistance and training to district MEPs on procedures and guidelines for eligibility, identification and recruitment; updating the procedures and forms (COEs) used by recruiters to meet accepted practices; and resolving questionable eligibility information on the COE forms with district MEP staff and other credible sources. The ID&R office also has updated the Florida ID&R Manual, developed a quality control document (which includes a COE checklist), modified the COE, provided new instructions for appropriate COE completion, and met with stakeholders and practitioners to develop and recommend eligibility policy to be accepted by the state.

The district MEPs have the responsibility of following the procedures and practices contained in the Florida ID&R Manual, developing a local Quality Control Plan, ensuring that staff is aware of the local Quality Control Plan, as well as the procedures and guidelines for ID&R in Florida, and participating in workshops and/or conferences conducted or sponsored by the SEA and/or the ID&R Office.

A new COE is generated for any new migrant child and existing COEs are updated annually for continued residency and age eligibility. Technical assistance is provided by the staff in the Florida Migrant Education Program Office or the ID&R Office, specializing in identification and recruitment procedures and practices to district and school-level migrant staff. Selected district MEPs are visited to ensure that the COEs are properly completed, reflect valid eligibility determinations and are submitted to local MIS offices for transmission to the State in a timely manner. This practice has been incorporated in annual, prescheduled monitoring activities for all federal programs, but remains a stand alone activity for MEP Programs (at the discretion of the State) in districts that may not be targeted for monitoring. The following Quality Control Procedures incorporate the steps the State will take to ensure the integrity of the eligibility determinations made by district MEPs and the accuracy of migrant child data collected and submitted as well as to address the outcomes of the Re-Interviewing Initiative:

- a. The initial eligibility determination of a student is made through face-to-face interviews with a parent, guardian, other responsible adult or an out of school youth traveling on his/her own.
- b. The SEA provides state-wide Identification and Recruitment training at least once a year, more frequently to individual districts by request or by triggers that may surface during the annual district COE review. During these trainings, MEP definitions, interviewing skills, COE completion and quality control training are provided to enhance the level of knowledge of both veteran and new staff. In 2008, five regional training events were conducted throughout the state to discuss the basic core of eligibility requirements, implementation of a recruiter's code of ethics, update on migrant policy from the state, and review of the ID&R handbook. In addition, training and guidance was provided at the State Migrant Education Conference in October 2008. During the state conference, recruitment staff was trained on the basics of eligibility determinations, interview skills, quality control and other ID&R related topics that included a review of the new federal regulations and the potential impact on current ID&R procedures. Training was provided at the conference by staff from the ID&R office, the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) and the OME.
- c. Florida utilizes a Policy Work Group comprised of state and local MEP administrators, recruiters, advocates and other stakeholders, to assist in drafting guidance/policy regarding program implementation procedures and practices with particular emphasis on researching and collecting data to address Florida-specific grey issues on eligibility and qualifying activities.
- d. Florida, in collaboration with the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT) and the ID&R Office, has revised their Identification and Recruitment Handbook. The SEA distributed a final copy to districts and stakeholders in March 2008. In the interim of the release of the ID&R Recruitment handbook, the Florida MEP ensured that every MEP staff person had in their possession a copy of the current Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance and other pertinent documents. MEP staff was expected to follow the guidelines of the draft NRG along with all other guidance as disseminated by the Florida MEP.
- e. The COE was modified to facilitate the collection of information by recruiters and to align the items with similar forms used in other states. The form includes items and instructions related to issues such as "to seek", FERPA and Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL). Based on the federal program regulations from 2008, the ID&R office provided guidance to districts regarding how to accurately complete the COE and document "economic necessity" and "temporary employment." The Policy Group will convene in early 2009 to review the latest form and to begin modifications to the COE that reflect changes required by the program regulations (effective August 2008).
- f. The proper chain of command for resolving eligibility issues is that the recruiter brings the issue to local MEP staff and the Coordinator; if the issue is still unclear, the Coordinator can refer the issue to the state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. The state ID&R coordinator will research for similar situations and prior determinations that may facilitate a decision. Also, the ID&R coordinator will contact other districts as well as practitioners in other states who, in a confidential manner, will provide feedback. If a clear determination cannot be made, the issue is submitted to the Office of Migrant Education (OME). When possible, the FL-MEP will include the state's position or recommendation in the issue. The consensus of OME is shared with all local MEP staff.
- g. It is a standard operating procedure to verify the migrant child data extracted from the State student database with the migrant student data submitted at the district level. Files of these data are provided to districts for that purpose. Windows of opportunities to correct/revise/delete migrant child records are given to district MEPs to ensure that all students captured for state funding purposes are eligible migrant children.

h. A monthly e-newsletter is sent to recruitment staff across the state. Through the newsletter, recruiters and other migrant staff are kept informed of eligibility and policy guidance affecting the state. Also, the newsletter provides information on upcoming training events, and has a monthly "Question of the Month" for recruiters regarding key eligibility issues. Currently, there are over 225 migrant personnel registered to receive the newsletter.

i. The Florida ID&R Office developed a code of ethics for recruiters and recruitment staff. The purpose of the code is to provide recruiters with the minimum expectations and responsibilities associated with the MEP. The code is to be reviewed every year to incorporate changes based in current issues affecting recruiters.

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.

Upon submission of the 2006 Re-Interview Initiative Report, the FLDOE began the process of implementing the corrective actions described therein. The state has conducted statewide and regional training activities with recruitment staff regarding making proper eligibility determinations. In addition, LEAs were trained on how to corroborate information provided by families on the COEs. A state ID&R manual has been completed and disseminated, additionally; a quality control document has been developed and disseminated. An ID&R Office was established and staff was hired to specifically manage recruitment issues throughout the state. Significant changes to the COE were implemented, and key stakeholders were involved in recommending policy and guidance regarding eligibility to the state.

At the local level, key corrective actions have been implemented as well. Many LEAs have initiated local re-interview processes using the protocols and forms developed by the state. The districts conduct re-interviews on an ongoing basis to validate eligibility determinations, particularly in situations where there is recently hired staff and unusual eligibility circumstances. The districts make sure that recruitment staff participates in all ID&R-related training provided by the state. In addition, the LEAs are compiling and updating a list of the major qualifying activities in their area.

The districts also communicate, on a regular basis, with the ID&R office to discuss eligibility questions and review particular cases. Based on the number of questions received and the content of such questions, the ID&R Office provides guidance, through the e-newsletter, to clarify any ongoing issues related to eligibility determinations. In addition, the ID&R Office continuously schedules training with new staff at the districts.

The ID&R office conducted a pilot study to ascertain the effectiveness of rolling re-interviews in the state. Nine districts, from different locations throughout the state, were selected to participate in the pilot. The study lasted from March to October, 2008. The purpose of the study was to determine the feasibility of conducting rolling re-interviews at the local level. A secondary purpose was to validate the re-interview form and protocols, as well as to familiarize local districts with the process. Initial findings and lessons learned suggest that, in order to conduct re-interviews effectively in the state, the district's size, the time of the year when re-interviews are conducted and the uniform training of re-interviewers needs to be considered. The ID&R office will expand the re-interview process to additional LEAs in 2009.

*** Clarifying statements added during CSPR Part I Data Verification:

What was the design of the pilot re-interviewing process?

- The process for the re-interview pilot was as follows: pilot districts sent the number of migrant children identified within the previous month to the ID&R office. For each district, the ID&R office calculated the number of re-interviews that needed to be conducted and randomly selected the names of the students to be re-interviewed. The names of the students were entered into a database (FileMaker Pro) and an individualized re-interview form was prepared for each student in the sample. The forms for the selected students were then sent to the appropriate district and re-interviews were conducted.

How were districts selected?

- The districts were selected by convenience, taking into consideration their geographical location, the number of migrant children in the districts [small, medium, large, and consortia (multiple districts)] and the district's availability to send and receive password protected lists of students electronically

How were COEs selected?

- Students were randomly selected by listing the students and then using <http://random.org/> to generate random numbers within a specified range. Ten percent (10%) of the names were selected.

Were all students in the districts re-interviewed or a sample?

- A sampling of the students was re-interviewed.

What were the accuracy rates of the districts?

- Within the five month period, more than a 95% accuracy rate was identified. However, not all the children in the sample were re-interviewed. Often, children would move within the 30 days and districts were unable to re-interview the students. Because of the "rolling re-interview" nature of the process, new names were selected for the next 30 days and "replacements" were not selected. As a result of the pilot, the following recommendations are made:

- Encourage districts to continue conducting local re-interview efforts in an ongoing manner independently, but using the state approved re-interview form and protocol.
- Conduct state re-interviews twice a year using lists of students obtained from Surveys 2 and 3. Local migrant personnel from the targeted district will not be used to conduct these re-interviews.

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The revised data element allows FDOE to produce preliminary reports and distribute these to school districts for further verification. Also, each District Migrant Coordinator is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the electronic records match the information on the COEs before the records are transmitted electronically to the State.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following verification process was used: A file broken down by LEA/district level containing student counts of all students reported in the data element Migrant Status Term code was sent to both MEP and MIS staff in each district on August 05, 2008. Districts had until October 30, 2008, to verify these data and submit any corrections to the SEA.

Districts were to use the file to verify the accuracy of data coded into the state student data base system. Both the district Migrant Coordinator and district MIS Directors were provided with these data files. FLDOE advised all district MEP and MIS staff to work collaboratively to ensure that the student counts were accurate, unduplicated and that each student record met the No Child Left Behind Act definition of a migrant student. School districts were allowed to make updates to their data up to the last possible moment to ensure the greatest degree of accuracy possible. Analysts in the Department then produced the final migrant student count using the data set/file containing all corrections made by school districts during the verification phase.

*** Clarifying statements added during CSPR Part I Data Verification:

What role does the State director play in certifying that child counts are accurate?

- Through the ID&R office, the State Director ensures that all the staff completing COEs is suitably trained to make proper and timely eligibility determinations and can accurately document their determination on the state approved form (COE).

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.

Based on the results from the prospective re-interview pilot, the FLDOE and the ID&R Office will expand their re-interview effort to include additional districts in 2009. The pilot's findings suggest that re-interviews are conducted at times when the families are in the area and take into consideration the size of the district and the number of children enrolled in the local program.

Customized training will be provided to districts based on the findings of the re-interview. Corrective actions will include:

- Increased visits by FLDOE/ID&R Office staff to specific districts;
- Accompany recruiters during ID&R efforts to identify errors, mistakes in interviewing techniques;
- Review of additional COEs to identify error patterns;
- Provide specific training to districts with high defect rates; and
- Conduct e-interviews with non-LEA personnel.

The ID&R Office will develop and implement a detailed plan for conducting random prospective re-interviews of migrant families throughout the state during 2009.

*** Clarifying statements added during CSPR Part I Data Verification:

Please explain "e-interviews" with "non-LEA" personnel. What are e-interviews?

- This was a typo - it should read "re-interviewers."

Why are they interviewed? What do they do?

- "Re-interviewing" is the process of interviewing a family or migrant youth to corroborate the eligibility determination. Conducting re-interviews with persons other than local migrant personnel is a way to ensure objectivity and limit bias in the interview process.

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.

The FLDOE Migrant Education Program is assured of the accuracy of the migrant child counts reported for Fiscal Year 2007-2008.

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