

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

LOUISIANA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008

PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

PART I

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

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

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

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

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

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

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

Address:
1201 N. Third Street
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Dr. Bonnie Boulton

Telephone: 225-342-3513

Fax: 225-219-7370

e-mail: Bonnie.Boulton@la.gov

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

Friday, March 13, 2009, 8:11:48 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.

Louisiana's content standards, benchmarks, and grade level expectations (GLEs) for grades K-12 are scheduled to be revised in 2009-2010 in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science. The revised standards are scheduled to be implemented in the fall of 2011.

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.

Development of revised assessment frameworks in mathematics and reading/language arts, grades 3-10, is scheduled for 2010. Development of assessment frameworks for Louisiana's alternate assessments will be contingent on the extent of the revision of the content standards. The revised assessment frameworks and assessment guides are scheduled for implementation in the fall of 2011. Field testing in mathematics and reading/language arts will occur in spring of 2011, and operational testing will be implemented in 2012.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Development of revised assessment frameworks in science, grades 3-11, is scheduled for 2010-2011. Development of science assessment frameworks for Louisiana's alternate assessments will be contingent on the extent of the revision of the content standards. The revised science assessment frameworks and assessment guides are scheduled for implementation in the fall of 2012. Field testing in science, grades 3-11, will occur in spring of 2012, and science assessments will become operational in 2013.

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	349,248	348,963	99.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,765	2,764	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,830	4,829	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	160,900	160,711	99.9
Hispanic	9,204	9,197	99.9
White, non-Hispanic	171,464	171,377	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	43,721	43,440	99.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,503	6,500	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	227,757	227,526	99.9
Migratory students	1,414	1,412	99.9
Male	178,181	177,968	99.9
Female	170,907	170,835	100.0
Comments: Louisiana requires that all students participate in statewide assessment. There are no allowances for exemptions. Though tested, students who have not been enrolled for the full academic year and those who are repeating testing at that grade level are not included in the state's accountability system and are thus not assigned a proficiency level.			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,691	8.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,645	73.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	4,867	11.2

Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,171	7.3
Total	43,374	
Comments: Louisiana does not offer an alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards as part of its statewide assessment program.		

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	349,275	349,019	99.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,765	2,764	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,832	4,831	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	160,921	160,757	99.9
Hispanic	9,201	9,195	99.9
White, non-Hispanic	171,468	171,384	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	43,731	43,476	99.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,497	6,495	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	227,775	227,569	99.9
Migratory students	1,413	1,411	99.9
Male	178,223	178,037	99.9
Female	170,892	170,822	100.0

Comments: Louisiana requires that all students participate in statewide assessment. There is no allowance for exemptions. Though tested, students who have not been enrolled for the full academic year and those who are repeating testing at that grade level are not included in the state's accountability system and are thus not assigned a proficiency level.

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,691	8.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,717	73.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	4,886	11.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,176	7.3
Total	43,470	

Comments: Louisiana does not offer an alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards as part of its statewide assessment system.

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	321,346	320,673	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,621	2,618	99.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,709	4,706	99.9
Black, non-Hispanic	143,036	142,511	99.6
Hispanic	8,518	8,506	99.9
White, non-Hispanic	162,390	162,262	99.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,413	33,271	99.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,080	6,075	99.9
Economically disadvantaged students	204,074	203,551	99.7
Migratory students	1,247	1,245	99.8
Male	161,548	161,148	99.8
Female	159,657	159,387	99.8

Comments: Louisiana requires that all students participate in statewide assessment. There are no provisions for exemptions. Though tested, students who have not been enrolled for the full academic year and those who are repeating testing at that grade level are not included in the state's accountability system and are thus not assigned a proficiency level.

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

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,992	9.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	26,467	79.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	1,411	4.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,401	7.2
Total	33,271	

Comments: Though tested, students who have not been enrolled for the full academic year and those who are repeating testing at that grade level are not included in the state's accountability system and are thus not assigned a proficiency level.

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	49,844	31,350	62.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	406	252	62.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	693	550	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	22,513	10,647	47.3
Hispanic	1,497	900	60.1
White, non-Hispanic	24,724	18,997	76.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,177	2,512	40.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,151	653	56.7
Economically disadvantaged students	34,223	18,717	54.7
Migratory students	208	114	54.8
Male	25,517	15,932	62.4
Female	24,304	15,406	63.4
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.

1.3.2.1 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	49,841	32,066	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	406	260	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	693	524	75.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22,515	11,593	51.5
Hispanic	1,497	856	57.2
White, non-Hispanic	24,719	18,829	76.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,180	2,327	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,151	605	52.6
Economically disadvantaged students	34,223	19,359	56.6
Migratory students	208	104	50.0
Male	25,514	15,091	59.1
Female	24,305	16,966	69.8
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	51,660	28,773	55.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	418	242	57.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	699	454	64.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,655	8,516	36.0
Hispanic	1,535	798	52.0
White, non-Hispanic	25,303	18,977	75.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,391	2,574	40.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,182	508	43.0
Economically disadvantaged students	35,794	12,886	36.0
Migratory students	342	140	40.9
Male	26,495	15,367	58.0
Female	25,010	13,505	54.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	48,958	33,678	68.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	403	269	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	627	552	88.0
Black, non-Hispanic	22,405	12,232	54.6
Hispanic	1,316	941	71.5
White, non-Hispanic	24,201	19,680	81.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,289	2,585	41.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,004	686	68.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,462	20,335	60.8
Migratory students	200	116	58.0
Male	25,047	17,136	68.4
Female	23,902	16,538	69.2
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.2 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	48,922	34,724	71.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	403	297	73.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	627	521	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	22,377	13,555	60.6
Hispanic	1,318	894	67.8
White, non-Hispanic	24,191	19,454	80.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,283	2,260	36.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,006	605	60.1
Economically disadvantaged students	33,427	21,373	63.9
Migratory students	201	121	60.2
Male	25,030	16,480	65.8
Female	23,883	18,241	76.4
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	54,843	32,906	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	444	306	68.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	644	489	75.9
Black, non-Hispanic	26,537	10,880	41.0
Hispanic	1,435	847	59.0
White, non-Hispanic	25,768	20,357	79.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,362	2,945	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,117	570	51.0
Economically disadvantaged students	38,715	19,358	50.0
Migratory students	416	200	48.1
Male	28,311	17,270	61.0
Female	26,485	15,626	59.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.3 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	43,644	28,162	64.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	235	64.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	687	569	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,771	8,913	47.5
Hispanic	1,235	758	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	22,574	17,681	78.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,530	1,778	39.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,001	613	61.2
Economically disadvantaged students	28,355	15,733	55.5
Migratory students	221	133	60.2
Male	21,982	14,674	66.8
Female	21,636	13,477	62.3
Comments: Data for students with disabilities and LEP students were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	43,643	28,277	64.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	367	221	60.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	687	527	76.7
Black, non-Hispanic	18,775	9,714	51.7
Hispanic	1,235	710	57.5
White, non-Hispanic	22,569	17,100	75.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,531	1,423	31.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,001	546	54.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,353	15,830	55.8
Migratory students	221	117	52.9
Male	21,984	13,217	60.1
Female	21,634	15,048	69.6
Comments: Data for students with disabilities and LEP students were verified and found to be accurate.			

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	44,047	25,547	58.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	382	241	63.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	687	495	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,943	7,198	38.0
Hispanic	1,244	659	53.0
White, non-Hispanic	22,753	16,837	74.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,982	1,593	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,008	494	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	28,617	13,450	47.0
Migratory students	267	142	53.2
Male	22,148	13,510	61.0
Female	21,772	11,975	55.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	48,801	29,483	60.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	434	272	62.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	693	607	87.6
Black, non-Hispanic	22,265	9,675	43.5
Hispanic	1,276	755	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	24,119	18,169	75.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,124	1,759	28.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	972	557	57.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,346	16,396	50.7
Migratory students	195	105	53.8
Male	25,015	15,175	60.7
Female	23,758	14,293	60.2
Comments:			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	48,808	30,083	61.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	434	280	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	693	561	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	22,274	10,473	47.0
Hispanic	1,275	680	53.3
White, non-Hispanic	24,118	18,084	75.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,134	1,530	24.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	971	466	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32,352	16,928	52.3
Migratory students	195	97	49.7
Male	25,022	13,880	55.5
Female	23,758	16,191	68.1
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	49,946	28,969	58.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	443	279	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	698	544	77.9
Black, non-Hispanic	22,853	9,141	40.0
Hispanic	1,321	766	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	24,575	17,940	73.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,614	1,684	30.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,000	490	49.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,166	15,920	48.0

Migratory students	272	139	51.1
Male	25,684	14,897	58.0
Female	24,110	14,225	59.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	47,735	26,527	55.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	366	205	56.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	651	524	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	21,792	8,355	38.3
Hispanic	1,201	688	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	23,709	16,748	70.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,418	1,290	23.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	815	420	51.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30,533	13,848	45.4
Migratory students	174	85	48.9
Male	24,234	13,600	56.1
Female	23,474	12,917	55.0
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.

1.3.2.5 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	47,745	29,119	61.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	366	240	65.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	651	505	77.6
Black, non-Hispanic	21,807	10,125	46.4
Hispanic	1,200	663	55.3
White, non-Hispanic	23,705	17,577	74.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,424	1,231	22.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	814	369	45.3
Economically disadvantaged students	30,547	15,648	51.2
Migratory students	174	87	50.0
Male	24,246	13,278	54.8
Female	23,472	15,827	67.4
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.

1.3.3.5 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	49,185	26,068	53.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	371	219	59.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	660	475	72.0
Black, non-Hispanic	22,588	7,680	34.0
Hispanic	1,255	678	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	24,253	16,735	69.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,852	1,067	22.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	843	362	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	31,631	13,285	42.0
Migratory students	264	103	39.0
Male	25,087	13,296	53.0
Female	23,953	12,456	52.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

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	46,367	27,471	59.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	343	211	61.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	630	532	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	21,126	8,928	42.3
Hispanic	1,172	683	58.3
White, non-Hispanic	23,086	17,117	74.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,873	1,087	22.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	666	341	51.2
Economically disadvantaged students	28,844	14,086	48.8
Migratory students	177	105	59.3
Male	23,323	14,116	60.5
Female	23,032	13,353	58.0
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.

1.3.2.6 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	46,331	27,324	59.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	343	223	65.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	630	497	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	21,089	9,246	43.8
Hispanic	1,172	701	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	23,087	16,657	72.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,873	828	17.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	665	317	47.7
Economically disadvantaged students	28,812	13,993	48.6
Migratory students	176	100	56.8
Male	23,312	12,447	53.4
Female	23,007	14,875	64.7
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.

1.3.3.6 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	49,315	26,137	53.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	380	236	62.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	652	469	71.9
Black, non-Hispanic	23,239	7,204	31.0
Hispanic	1,278	652	51.0
White, non-Hispanic	23,750	17,575	74.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,337	911	21.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	754	279	37.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31,123	12,760	41.0
Migratory students	261	131	50.2
Male	24,659	13,316	54.0
Female	24,595	12,543	51.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.7 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	42,195	27,117	64.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	279	179	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	730	634	86.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,058	8,575	47.5
Hispanic	1,038	633	61.0
White, non-Hispanic	22,074	17,091	77.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,823	631	22.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	515	283	55.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,855	11,765	53.8
Migratory students	113	66	58.4
Male	20,112	13,303	66.1
Female	22,055	13,805	62.6
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.

1.3.2.7 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	42,181	24,735	58.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	278	153	55.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	733	510	69.6
Black, non-Hispanic	18,029	8,081	44.8
Hispanic	1,035	546	52.8
White, non-Hispanic	22,091	15,436	69.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,825	395	14.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	511	167	32.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21,851	10,466	47.9
Migratory students	112	54	48.2
Male	20,131	10,615	52.7
Female	22,020	14,109	64.1
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.

1.3.3.7 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	37,362	20,923	56.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	298	191	64.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	720	490	68.1
Black, non-Hispanic	15,063	5,121	34.0
Hispanic	775	403	52.0
White, non-Hispanic	20,478	14,949	73.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,886	390	20.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	390	117	30.0
Economically disadvantaged students	17,550	7,547	43.0
Migratory students	91	37	40.7
Male	17,441	10,988	63.0
Female	19,826	10,111	51.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,261	1,025	81.3
Districts			
Comments: District level AYP data are not available at this time			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,038	833	80.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	834	670	80.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	204	163	79.9
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
92	0	0.0
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	40
Extension of the school year or school day	26
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	22
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	13
Replacement of the principal	15
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	13
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	38
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	7
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	1
Other major restructuring of the school governance	5
Comments:	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A Memorandum of Understanding was initiated by the State Department of Education and Bethune Middle Academy in Caddo Parish School System.

The East Baton Rouge Parish School System and Louisiana State University entered into a partnership to oversee Glen Oaks Middle School. The following innovative, research-based strategies were implemented at the school including but not limited to: new leadership, highly-qualified certified staff, student and teacher schedules arranged around content areas, lead teachers in each discipline, literacy and numeracy coaches, LSU liaisons in ELA and Math, extra personnel to lower pupil-teacher ratios, extended day and year, addition of parent liaison, teacher pay for performance, monthly technical assistance meetings directly related to the implementation of SIP and Reconstitution Plan.

The East Baton Rouge Parish School System and Southern University entered into a partnership to oversee Prescott Middle School. Similar activities were instituted. The Timbuktu Institute was made available to selected Prescott MS students along with the implementation of a comprehensive homework policy.

The Franklin Parish School System included additional Kindergarten teacher and counselor, and consultants from JBHM in grades 3 -5 ELA and Math, installed security cameras in office and classrooms, low teacher pupil ratio, in-school suspension, after school tutoring,

book studies and college credit, Praxis prep with tutoring.

In Tangipahoa Parish School System; Northwood High implemented a "Boot Camp" approach. Read 180 and Acellus Math programs were also implemented. Crystal Academy implemented an Option III program with "Two Tracks." Track 1 -students reading below the 7th grade level. Track 2 -students reading at or above the 7th grade level attend the Technical College.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: These data are not available at this time; they will be reported in March when they become available.		

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	00/00/00
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

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	29,605	31,429
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	5,191	5,286
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	17.5	16.8
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	5,325	5,385
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	18.0	17.1
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	69	
Comments: Data submitted have been verified and 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.

1.4.8.2 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	11
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	12
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	56
Comments: The Louisiana Department of Education has schools that may make exit improvement status and, at the same time, not make adequate yearly progress in either mathematics or English/language arts. In Louisiana, a school may fail a subgroup in English Language Arts for two years, and take another two years to get out of improvement. In this case, they would not make Adequate Yearly Progress. The same school could fail a subgroup in mathematics for the first time in year four and still exit school improvement. Also, Louisiana's Accountability System accounts for whether the school is above the School Performance Score "bar." This school might make Adequate Yearly Progress, but stay in improvement because its School Performance Score is below the "bar."	

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		155	17	27	A	A=8
2					B	B=18
3					C	C=11
4					D	D=3 Create a positive school culture
5		54				Summer reading program for students in grades 6-8 and extended school day for high school
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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

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

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

comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State provided regular training opportunities for LEAs through the Regional Education Service Centers. Each region participates in intensive training that helps school support teams monitor and evaluate data derived from a comprehensive needs assessment and analysis system; that assists schools in creating and evaluating effective school improvement planning process; and that guides the LEAs with monitoring the implementation of the strategies outlined in the school's school improvement plan.

The State has entered into an agreement with each district. They have agreed to focus funding on the Louisiana Literacy Program and its professional development activities and consulting services for developing awareness, gaining buy-in, implementation, follow-up and follow-along, and evaluation; to direct spending to the School Improvement Plan, determined by the School Improvement Team, and based on individual school needs; to collect, enter, and analyze data through the existing web-based needs assessment tool; and collect data on the total number and percentage of students who are proficient in English/language arts and mathematics and report whether the number and percentage of students who are proficient has increased from the prior year as measured by LEAP, iLEAP, and GEE.

The State also provided professional development to administrators, school support team members, coaches, and teachers in the current research on the five essentials components of reading and the assessment of these areas. This built capacity within the LEAs to redeliver the information to their remaining schools. State and LEAs worked closely on professional development that focused on the importance of data driven instruction.

The State provided regular, component-specific professional development activities for participating Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) schools.

Technical assistance was given to districts by the state with follow-up visits based on targeted assistance.

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: 3.3 %

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) has created school improvement tools and structures to expand resources and support schools and districts in need. The LDE Liaison continues to conduct on-site visits and use periodic surveys to gather information regarding the implementation of the school improvement activities. The LDE's Regional Education Service Center staff provides ongoing Literacy and Numeracy support. The LDE staff and Regional Service Centers provide technical assistance to LEAs and schools on developing an agreement (Memorandum of Understanding) that prescribes the needs of each school and highlights the roles and responsibilities of the State, LEA and school. The LDE provides on-going technical assistance in the development and implementation of the budget to address the literacy and numeracy deficiencies in the school.

DIBELS Benchmark and Progress Monitoring along with DRA were used to evaluate students reading levels throughout the state. The LDE also contracts with an external evaluator, the Cecil Picard Center at the University of LA at Lafayette. Districts are provided technical assistance from LDE staff such as Regional Literacy Coordinators and Educational Program Consultants. Technical assistance consist of but is not limited to the following, data examination, small group instruction, core program support, coach support, as well as numerous professional development in areas such as classroom management, DIBELS testing, and LETRS Foundations.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reading First funds along with State Literacy & Numeracy funds were used to provide professional development for administrators, school support staff, coaches, and teachers in areas such as literacy, numeracy, data driven instruction, classroom management, small group instruction and differentiated instruction. These funds were also used to provide technical assistance to schools by regional literacy coordinators as well as state staff members. The LDE offers a Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). The ultimate goal of the TAP is to strengthen teacher instructional capacity and increase student achievement. TAP is unique in that it is comprehensive in nature combining 4 key elements (multiple career paths, ongoing job-embedded professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance based compensation). All four elements implemented at the same time provide the right combination of high expectations, opportunity for growth, accountability and support for schools to do what is necessary to improve. When implemented according to the model, TAP counters many of the traditional drawbacks that plague the teaching profession: ineffective professional development, teacher isolation, lack of career advancement, unsupported accountability demands, and low, undifferentiated compensation.

Districts re-allocate existing district, state and Federal dollars: Title I (Part A, Section 1114 School-Wide Program), (Part A Set Aside), (Financial Incentives & Rewards); Title II (Part A Teacher Quality State Grant); Title V (Innovative Program); IDEA Part B (Early Intervening Services); K-3 Reading & Math Initiative (Allowable Expenses); Education Excellence Fund (EEF); business partnerships, donations, line item appropriations. In 2008-2009, participating districts will receive an allocation of state 8(g) money for TAP.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	32,289
Applied to transfer	2,677
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,382

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 1,564,380
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	17
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	21,982
Applied for supplemental educational services	7,214
Received supplemental educational services	4,439
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 5,028,395
Comments:	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	181,234	149,387	82.4	31,847	17.6
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	21,201	17,438	82.3	3,763	17.7
Low-poverty schools	21,020	19,797	94.2	1,223	5.8
All elementary schools	85,506	75,615	88.4	9,891	11.6
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	24,551	16,438	67.0	8,113	33.0
Low-poverty schools	23,777	20,977	88.2	2,800	11.8
All secondary schools	95,728	73,772	77.1	21,956	22.9
Comments:					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State uses a departmentalized approach for elementary classes.

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	39.3
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	10.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	49.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	47.7
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	6.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	46.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	84.5	52.1
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	71.1	39.6
Poverty metric used	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

- 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.*
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One LEA uses a push-in (mainstreaming with support as needed by ESL teacher in classrooms) program.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	12,534
Comments:	

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	12,534
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	7,645
Vietnamese	2,034
Arabic	636
Chinese	342
French	212

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

Urdu 139

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	12,139
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	135
Total	12,274
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	673
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	5.5
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	11,120
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	124
Total	11,244
Comments: 12,534 represents an end-of-year (2008) count, which was over a month after test (ELDA) administration, and the LEP population grew in that time.	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	2,076	18.4
ELP attainment	587	5.2
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
None
Comments:

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:

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:

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
256	411	667
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
583	451	77.4	132
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
581	426	73.3	155
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
473	335	70.8	138
Comments:			

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	24
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	24
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	24
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
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:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2,583	1,465	13

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.	210
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	185

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	23	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	20	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	17	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	11	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	10	
Other (Explain in comment box)	3	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	19	1,507
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	18	396
PD provided to principals	14	399
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	11	126

PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	14	423
PD provided to community based organization personnel	8	154
Total	84	3,005

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) and registration of LEP students

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	07/01/07	0
Comments: Date Funds Available to Subgrantees: Upon submission of approved application after 7/1/2007		

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.

Beginning with Fiscal Year 2008-2009, process changes were made to the Louisiana Department of Education Electronic Grants Management System (eGMS), which is the vehicle for approval of funding sub-grantees of Title III and other federal programs.

Tentative allocations based on a percentage (90%) of the prior year final allocations are now released to the sub-recipients via the Electronic Grants Management System (eGMS) during the month of April. During the time period of April -June of each year, the sub-grantees are required to submit their budgets for each of the programs for which funding is received to obtain "substantial approval" status. Sub-grantees, through communications with program and finance staff, continue to work on their budgets until such time that full approval of the budget application is obtained. Upon full approval, the sub-grantees are allowed to submit request for reimbursement and utilize the funding. Final allocations are made available to the sub-grantees when the Louisiana Department of Education receives the Grant Award Notifications from the USDOE indicating the actual funding for that given fiscal year. These final allocations are made available to the sub-grantees in July.

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	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0.0
Hispanic	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0.0
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	0.0
Female	0.0
Comments: These data are not available at this time.	

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: These data are not available at this time.	

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	90	84
LEAs with subgrants	13	13
Total	103	97
Comments: All LEAs operating during the reporting period reported data. Because of the emergence of new charter schools (considered in Louisiana as LEAs based on their application for funds), during the reporting period, there were 6 LEAs out of 90 LEAs that had no data to report.		

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)	1,061	1,059
K	1,260	1,659
1	1,328	1,660
2	1,256	1,594
3	1,135	1,280
4	1,175	1,399
5	909	1,045
6	951	1,177
7	966	1,049
8	835	982
9	726	1,066
10	603	795
11	412	693
12	360	506
Ungraded	N<10	284
Total	12,986	16,248
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	679	1,578
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,620	12,284
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	5,023	2,080
Hotels/Motels	664	306
Total	12,986	16,248
Comments:		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,059
K	1,659
1	1,660
2	1,594
3	1,280
4	1,399
5	1,045
6	1,177
7	1,049
8	982
9	1,066
10	795
11	693
12	506
Ungraded	284
Total	16,248
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	188
Migratory children/youth	171
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,390
Limited English proficient students	284
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	13
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	13
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	11
Transportation	10
Early childhood programs	12
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	12
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	13
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	12
Clothing to meet a school requirement	13
School supplies	13
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	10
Other (optional – in comment box below)	4
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other educational support services included case management and public transportation for families to accompany children ages 3-5 to school and to access other services.

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	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	2
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Bus driver shortages made the transportation of students to school of origin challenging.

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	1,265	721
4	1,399	865
5	957	465
6	1,018	459
7	916	419
8	839	430
High School	1,472	834
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	1,265	601
4	1,399	764
5	957	466
6	1,017	423
7	911	363
8	840	372
High School	1,794	788
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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)	322
K	205
1	308
2	273
3	230
4	285
5	225
6	225
7	232
8	196
9	200
10	107
11	133
12	107
Ungraded	105
Out-of-school	96
Total	3,249
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 SY 2006-07 child count was 3,592. The 2007-08 child count is 3,249. This represents a difference of 343 students, a 9.5% decrease in the Category 1 Child Count. The table below indicates the most significant decreases over one year by age/grade.

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)	91
K	63
1	52
2	57
3	49
4	72
5	41
6	39
7	27
8	38
9	12
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	0
Ungraded	13
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	576
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The FY 2006-2007 Category 2 Child Count was 1,056. The FY 2007-2008 Category 2 Child Count is 576. This represents a difference of 480 students, a 45% decrease in the Category 2 Child Count Summer Intersession. The table below indicates the most significant decreases over one year by Age/Grade.

SY2006-2007 SY2007-2008 Difference Percentage

Ages 3-6	126	91	n=35	28% decrease
Grade 1	100	52	n=48	48% decrease
Grade 3	88	49	n=39	44% decrease
Grade 6	76	39	n=37	49% decrease
Grade 7	84	27	n=57	68% decrease
Grade 8	79	38	n=41	52% decrease
Grade 9	55	12	n=43	78% decrease
Grade 10	43	8	n=35	81% decrease
Grade 11	32	9	n=23	72% decrease
Out of School	48	5	n=43	90% decrease
Ungraded 2	13		n=11	

Louisiana's MEP provided a variety of services to many eligible migrant students in the summer of 2008. However, only the number of students served in summer programs that met the required minimum number of hours/days/weeks is reflected in the Category 2 child count. Discussions with MEP local operating agencies revealed the following factors that may have contributed to the significant decrease in the Category 2 Child Count figures when compared to Summer 2007:

Although Migrant funds can pay for transportation, some eligible families declined participation in offered summer programs due to the record high gas prices reached during the summer.

Several factors noted in the 2006 -2007 Category 2 Child Count are still influencing the number of migrant students in Louisiana. They include:

- ? Significant increase in post-hurricane construction in South Louisiana that offers employment to migrant families at a higher wage;
- ? Farms have permanently closed or downsized due to unfavorable economic conditions;
- ? The record high cost of fuel made it difficult for families to make interstate moves to areas where work is available;
- ? Contamination scares across the country (i.e. spinach and tomatoes) may have affected decisions by migrant workers to seek summer work in Louisiana.

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.

Louisiana used the MIS 2000 student information system to generate its Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts. We refer to our system as MERIL-2 (Migrant Education Records in Louisiana -Version 2). This system was used to calculate the 2006-2007 child count and the 2007-2008 child count.

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.

When children are first recruited, all of their Certificate Of Eligibility (COE) data are entered in MERIL-2. This information includes not only parent/guardian information and qualifying work activities, but also key dates, such as each child's birth date, the qualifying arrival date (also known as the last qualifying move date) and the residency date. In addition, if the child is enrolled in school, the data specialist enters the actual school enrollment date. All of these dates are used in the calculation process. In addition to COE data, school histories are maintained on all migrant children entered. This is done continuously throughout the year.

School enrollments are entered in MERIL-2 after the advocates have verified each child's presence in school, his/her school enrollment date and his/her grade level. This is referred to as "mass enrollment" and is done on or after September 1 each year. A list of the children who were in each service area the previous year is provided to all advocates. The advocates check on each child on the list, either with school or home visits, to verify data. This list is used to record either the school enrollment (including grade level and any school changes), or to record that the children have moved or were unable to be located. We use this process instead of securing new COEs or updating COEs on each family because it accomplishes the requirement to verify and document the presence of each child with a minimized paperwork burden. In addition to the mass enrollment process at the beginning of the school year, a mass withdrawal process is done much the same way at the end of the school year. When the advocates have collected all the data, they sign, date and return the COEs to the data specialists, who enter and file the signed COEs for documentation of each student's residence.

The advocates also update school histories throughout the year by completing movement notification forms and submitting them to the data specialist. The data specialists enter the movement dates as the withdrawal date and termination date in MERIL-2. The movement notification forms are filed in the students' folders. Summer school enrollment is noted on the individual child's needs assessment form. These forms are submitted to the data specialists, who enter the summer school line and service provided and file the form in each student's folder.

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.

All of the MEP student data are run entirely from the MERIL-2 data system. Data specialists from each of the eight regions (LOAs) enter all of the pertinent migrant data into the MERIL-2 system. The data are uploaded to the state server where the state staff reviews all COEs and other migrant data as appropriate. If corrections are to be made to any of the migrant student data, data specialists are notified by state staff, and corrections are duly made and uploaded on a weekly basis.

At present, the MERIL-2 data system houses all the appropriate migrant data on migrant students in the state.

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.

NA

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 first step in ensuring only eligible students are counted is our ongoing quality control check of COEs. A statewide network of recruiters is the cornerstone for the entire process. Working regionally to ensure that every geographic region of the state is canvassed, recruiters ascertain and document the eligibility of every child to be enrolled in the Migrant Education Program. A Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for each qualifying family, recording the name, birth date, and other significant data for each child. The COE serves a double purpose; not only does it document the eligibility for each child determined to qualify for the MEP in Louisiana, but it also provides the source for relevant data to be entered into the MERIL-2 database system. The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the COEs are verified through a quality control process that has been in place since 1989. This process began with thorough training of recruiters, who are provided technical assistance and periodic updates on statutory or regulatory changes. Every COE is checked by state level staff, assuring that all required information has been provided. Any child determined to be ineligible for the Migrant Education Program is removed from the database.

In calculating the count of eligible students for the reporting period, only students who meet the program eligibility guidelines are counted, using several mathematical checks that are utilized to ensure that children are within the eligible age range and had a documented residency during the period. MERIL-2 calculates fields of LQM3 (last qualifying move date plus three years), twenty-second birth date (birth date plus twenty-two years), and third birth date (birth date plus three years). The counting program selects only children who resided in the state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1/07-8/31/08), whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 9/1/07 whose third birth date is less than or equal to 8/31/08, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date. The residency determination is made by selecting only children whose funding date (school enrollment date or generated date of residency date for students not in school) is between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08, residency date is between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08, withdrawal date is between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08, or termination date is between 9/1/07 and 8/31/08.

The summer report selects children who received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term and whose LQM3 is greater than or equal to 5/25/08, whose twenty-second birth date is greater than or equal to 5/26/08, whose third birth date is less than or equal to 8/13/08, whose third birth date is less than or equal to termination date or termination is null, whose third birth date is less than or equal to the withdrawal date or the withdrawal date is null, whose enrollment date was between 5/26/08 and 8/13/08, and whose enrollment type was S (summer). The earliest began on 5/26/08, and the latest ended 8/13/08. If the service was not entered, the data specialist enters it. If the enrollment was entered in error, it is removed.

MERIL-2 assures that students are counted only once per child count category by assigning each child a student sequence number. If a child has multiple school history lines that fit the funding criteria, MERIL-2 only counts the student sequence number once.

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.

NA

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.

Louisiana ensures that students qualify before they are entered into the MERIL-2 system. The quality control process for checking Certificate Of Eligibility (COE) takes place within a period of 48 hours or as soon as possible thereafter. If a COE is determined ineligible, the child's preliminary records are deleted from the system.

Throughout the year, checks are taken by staff to ensure that no duplications exist with student records. On the LOA level, the data specialist begins the process of entering COEs by conducting a search of the state data base to determine whether the child is already in the system, thereby, avoiding duplicate entries. When similar names are encountered, the data specialist reviews birth dates, parent's names, other data to determine whether the name is new, or a duplicate. If the data specialist determines that the name matches an existing student, the record is downloaded into the regional database and updated with whatever information from the COE is new, such as a more recent qualifying move or a residency in a new school district. If there is no match for the name or names on the COE, the data specialist creates a new record. At the end of each working day, all information is uploaded to the state database so that it exists in both sites. There is a further check at the state level to ensure that duplicate entries are avoided. When review of COEs for eligibility and accuracy is completed, state staff will again search the database for possible duplicates, double-checking the initial search at the regional level. If duplicates are identified, state staff will merge the two records into one and then contact the regional office to download the merged record.

Final steps that are taken by state staff to verify child counts before they are submitted, include identifying: 1) Students with matching social security numbers; 2) Students with matching date of birth, and last names (excluding students marked as multiple births); 3) Students with the same first name and date of birth -but totally different last names (possibly adopted or married); 4) Students with same last names, and similar date of birth.

All LOAs were instructed to verify that summer enrollments were based on programs and services provided during the actual period of summer vacation in the relevant school district. (School schedules vary from district to district.) The LOAs were also instructed to keep documentation of summer services.

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.

During the 2007-2008 school year, an independent contractor conducted the external child eligibility re-interview process to contribute to the protection and integrity of the Migrant Education Program during a nine-month period. A random selection of 200 families was sent to our contractor. Of these, 93 migrant families were located and re-interviewed. The results of this re-interview process revealed that all of the families that were re-interviewed were still eligible for the migrant program.

In July 2008, training on identification, recruitment and re-interviewing was provided to SEA and LOA MEP staff by MERC (Migrant Education Resource Center) during the annual ABC (Achievement Beyond The Classroom) summer conference. Additionally, each MEP LOA conducted a voluntary re-interview procedure, using their own staff during the 2007-2008 school year. Each region identified a minimum of 15 families to re-interview by using a random sampling of COEs from the MERIL-2 data system for this purpose. A total of 323 migrant families were re-interviewed during this process. The COEs were reviewed with the families, and a questionnaire was used as a testing pattern. Results of the LOA-initiated re-interview process revealed that all 323 migrant families were still eligible for the Migrant Education Program.

Thus, during the 2007-2008 reporting period, Louisiana conducted concurrent re-interview procedures, those conducted internally by each LOA and those conducted by an external contractor. The external re-interview was conducted in accordance with re-interview procedures developed by the ConQIR consortium

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.

Throughout the year, regional MEP staff meet for a minimum of one day each month to review all COEs for accuracy and to ensure the timely input of data into the MERIL-2 data system. Data specialists enter COE information into the data system on a daily basis after receiving the COE from the recruiters. The COEs are sent to the state office via fax, then reviewed and compared with the electronic. The state office is solely responsible for the merging of duplicate migrant student records. As duplicate records are discovered, data specialists provide the state with a list of migrant student records that should be merged. State staff performs the merge of records, then checks within the data system to ensure that records have been merged successfully. The regional data specialists are informed of the merge. Data specialists are diligent in their work to consistently review and perform the data check that is required for the continuous, correct, and timely input of COE information into the MERIL-2 system.

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.

Before the submission of the Category 1 and Category 2 child count data for federal reporting, state staff runs several reports of both of the child counts, as well as compares the reports to a list of the students for each child count. Staff reviews each report for accuracy to promote error-free reporting. The Category 1 and Category 2 child counts are reviewed by the MEP State Director to further provide an additional review of the data that will be submitted.

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.

The results of the 2007-2008 voluntary re-interview process revealed a 0% defect rate. Therefore, Louisiana did not implement any corrective actions. However, the state will continue to provide recruiter/advocate training with additional updates on the regulations in the area of the identification and recruitment of eligible migrant students.

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.

In light of the impact of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in August 2005 and Hurricanes Gustav and Ike in September 2008, on the fluctuating

migrant population of the state, the Louisiana Department of Education has taken many steps to evaluate its data management system. The southern half of the state continues to experience a higher than normal mobility in its population, including enrollments of children during the regular school year and in summer programs. The state's migrant population, already noteworthy for its mobility, is even more challenging to count and track.

During the next three years, planned future analysis of multi-year trend data will enable the Department to draw more conclusions regarding variance in its annual child count.

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