

# 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**

**MASSACHUSETTS**



**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:  
Massachusetts

Address:  
75 Pleasant St.  
Malden, MA 02148

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Robert Curtin

Telephone: 781-338-3582

Fax: 781-338-6850

e-mail: rcurtin@doe.mass.edu

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Mitchell D. Chester

Friday, March 13, 2009, 5:25:32 PM

Signature

Date

Per Rob Curtin via Ross Santy, PSC is certifying this report.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



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

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) currently has academic content standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. These can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html>.

The Massachusetts Board of Education (the Board) is in the process of revising/refining the frameworks. For English Language Arts the review process began in fall 2007 and consideration of proposed amendments is planned for spring 2009. For Mathematics the review process began in winter 2008 and the consideration of proposed amendments is planned for fall 2009. For Science and Technology/Engineering the review process will begin in winter 2009 and the consideration of proposed amendments is planned for spring 2010.

The article discussing Board action related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/news.asp?id=3600>. Additional information can be found at the Board's homepage at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe>.

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

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The ESE will determine whether changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards are necessary after the revision of the frameworks is completed.

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.

Massachusetts Science assessments in grades 5 and 8 have been fully operational since spring 2003. The ESE has previously submitted to the USED extensive documentation related to Science assessments in grades 5 and 8.

Massachusetts implemented fully operational end-of-course high school Science assessments in spring 2007. End-of-course tests were successfully implemented in Biology, Chemistry, Introductory Physics, and Technology/Engineering. Performance standards were set in summer 2007. Full reporting of results occurred in fall 2007 at the student, school, district, and state levels.

MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt) is also administered on a fully operational basis in Science. MCAS-Alt is primarily intended for severely cognitively disabled students who are unable to participate in MCAS with or without accommodations (as determined by the student's Individualized Education Plan team). Massachusetts annually administers the statewide MCAS-Alt which consists of a portfolio of materials collected during the school year by teachers.

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	509,288	505,348	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,469	1,450	98.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	24,555	24,437	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	41,863	41,263	98.6
Hispanic	68,854	67,822	98.5
White, non-Hispanic	362,549	360,475	99.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	92,182	90,326	98.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,973	25,662	98.8
Economically disadvantaged students	156,352	154,521	98.8
Migratory students	51	50	98.0
Male	261,887	259,530	99.1
Female	247,060	245,483	99.4
<b>Comments: In the 2007-08 school year, there were 3,218 first-year LEP students tested in Mathematics for diagnostic purposes and counted as participants, but not assigned a proficiency level.</b>			

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	10,714	11.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	71,708	79.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	147	0.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0

Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,757	8.6
Total	90,326	

**Comments: In the 2007-08 school year, there were 89 first-year LEP students in the Special Education subgroup tested in Mathematics for diagnostic purposes and counted as participants, but not assigned a proficiency level.**

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	508,872	504,128	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,463	1,444	98.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	24,480	24,297	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	41,758	41,110	98.5
Hispanic	68,726	67,395	98.1
White, non-Hispanic	362,521	360,061	99.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	92,188	90,175	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,643	24,943	97.3
Economically disadvantaged students	156,263	153,969	98.5
Migratory students	51	51	100.0
Male	261,663	258,833	98.9
Female	246,923	245,024	99.2
<b>Comments: In the 2007-08 school year, there were 2,873 first-year LEP students tested in English Languages Arts for diagnostic purposes and counted as participants, but not assigned a proficiency level.</b>			

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	9,936	11.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	72,573	80.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	94	0.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,572	8.4
Total	90,175	
<b>Comments: In the 2007-08 school year, there were 82 first-year LEP students in the Special Education subgroup tested in English Language Arts for diagnostic purposes and counted as participants, but not assigned a proficiency level.</b>		

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	262,474	258,485	98.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	758	745	98.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	12,407	12,286	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	22,141	21,512	97.2
Hispanic	34,961	33,864	96.9
White, non-Hispanic	187,507	185,448	98.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	45,678	43,998	96.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,956	10,604	96.8
Economically disadvantaged students	77,106	75,114	97.4
Migratory students	16	16	100.0
Male	134,447	132,139	98.3
Female	127,873	126,194	98.7

**Comments: In the 2007-08 school year, there were 1,416 first-year LEP students tested in Science for diagnostic purposes and counted as participants, but 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	9,440	21.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,651	71.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	49	0.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,858	6.5
Total	43,998	

**Comments: In the 2007-08 school year, there were 75 first-year LEP students in the Special Education subgroup tested in Science for diagnostic purposes and counted as participants, but 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

	# 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
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	70,393	42,853	60.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	102	50.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,443	2,505	72.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,542	2,057	37.1
Hispanic	10,108	3,921	38.8
White, non-Hispanic	49,538	33,385	67.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,132	3,471	28.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,064	1,715	33.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,319	9,128	40.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,092	21,644	60.0
Female	34,264	21,200	61.9
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

	# 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
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	70,284	39,210	55.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	85	41.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,431	2,116	61.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,540	1,783	32.2
Hispanic	10,073	2,882	28.6
White, non-Hispanic	49,487	31,516	63.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,108	2,710	22.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,028	1,003	19.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,285	7,061	31.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,022	18,799	52.2
Female	34,228	20,400	59.6
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: The ESE did not administer a science assessment to students in grade 3 for the 2007-08 school year.</b>			

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

	# 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
<b>Grade 4</b>			
All students	71,450	35,367	49.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	73	37.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,507	2,326	66.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,608	1,453	25.9
Hispanic	9,779	2,716	27.8
White, non-Hispanic	50,848	28,079	55.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,214	2,351	17.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,140	819	19.8
Economically disadvantaged students	22,447	6,549	29.2
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	36,750	17,878	48.6
Female	34,672	17,483	50.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

	# 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
<b>Grade 4</b>			
All students	71,162	34,614	48.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	190	63	33.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,495	1,948	55.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,583	1,393	25.0
Hispanic	9,716	2,246	23.1
White, non-Hispanic	50,670	28,226	55.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,134	1,856	14.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,093	460	11.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,338	5,687	25.5
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	36,579	15,429	42.2
Female	34,563	19,181	55.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: The ESE did not administer a science assessment to students in grade 4 for the 2007-08 school year.</b>			

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

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

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	70,748	36,960	52.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	70	33.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,367	2,401	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,522	1,557	28.2
Hispanic	9,328	2,449	26.3
White, non-Hispanic	50,833	29,704	58.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,394	2,353	17.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,294	626	19.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,904	6,631	30.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,411	19,061	52.3
Female	34,311	17,894	52.2
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	70,644	43,168	61.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	91	44.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,366	2,308	68.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,522	2,024	36.7
Hispanic	9,293	2,966	31.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,775	34,872	68.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,403	3,101	23.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,265	501	15.3
Economically disadvantaged students	21,857	8,012	36.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,352	20,742	57.1
Female	34,271	22,417	65.4
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	70,689	35,119	49.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	70	33.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,363	1,886	56.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,515	1,054	19.1
Hispanic	9,315	1,773	19.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,800	13,776	27.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,369	2,837	21.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,289	324	9.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,873	5,116	23.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,377	18,620	51.2
Female	34,286	16,493	48.1
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	71,679	40,155	56.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	90	45.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,463	2,647	76.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,751	1,763	30.7
Hispanic	9,523	2,809	29.5
White, non-Hispanic	51,361	32,127	62.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,438	2,391	17.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,881	484	16.8
Economically disadvantaged students	22,174	7,338	33.1
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,032	20,506	55.4
Female	34,602	19,641	56.8
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.4 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
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	71,575	48,357	67.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	127	63.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,459	2,674	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,740	2,689	46.8
Hispanic	9,488	3,789	39.9
White, non-Hispanic	51,315	38,207	74.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,444	3,639	27.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,826	459	16.2
Economically disadvantaged students	22,143	9,901	44.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,002	23,089	62.4
Female	34,536	25,257	73.1
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: The ESE did not administer a science assessment to students in grade 6 for the 2007-08 school year.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,169	34,564	47.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	61	27.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,398	2,277	67.0
Black, non-Hispanic	6,138	1,281	20.9
Hispanic	9,684	1,886	19.5
White, non-Hispanic	52,320	28,434	54.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,669	1,608	11.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,526	250	9.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,664	5,296	23.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,676	17,785	47.2
Female	35,446	16,774	47.3
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	72,799	50,318	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	111	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,385	2,628	77.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,079	2,906	47.8
Hispanic	9,591	4,018	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	52,132	39,733	76.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,544	3,728	27.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,461	376	15.3
Economically disadvantaged students	22,476	10,314	45.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,458	23,055	61.5
Female	35,302	27,248	77.2
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: The ESE did not administer a science assessment to students in grade 7 for the 2007-08 school year.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,365	36,045	49.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	76	36.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,356	2,305	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,029	1,427	23.7
Hispanic	9,524	2,135	22.4
White, non-Hispanic	53,017	29,559	55.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,047	1,509	11.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,433	230	9.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,243	5,629	25.3
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	37,832	18,608	49.2
Female	35,492	17,433	49.1
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	73,268	55,161	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	212	132	62.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,355	2,738	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6,023	3,451	57.3
Hispanic	9,462	4,756	50.3
White, non-Hispanic	52,986	43,202	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,027	4,730	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,385	440	18.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22,189	12,094	54.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	37,806	26,979	71.4
Female	35,421	28,168	79.5
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

	# 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
<b>Grade 8</b>			
All students	73,203	28,550	39.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	58	27.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,358	1,636	48.7
Black, non-Hispanic	6,003	700	11.7
Hispanic	9,470	1,047	11.1
White, non-Hispanic	52,940	24,693	46.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,972	1,374	10.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,431	64	2.6
Economically disadvantaged students	22,139	3,165	14.3
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	37,739	15,446	40.9
Female	35,424	13,099	37.0
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

	# 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
<b>High School</b>			
All students	71,166	51,009	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	133	65.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,279	2,778	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,946	2,827	47.5
Hispanic	8,381	3,830	45.7
White, non-Hispanic	52,120	40,636	78.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,341	3,717	32.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,106	655	31.1
Economically disadvantaged students	18,468	9,463	51.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	35,989	25,800	71.7
Female	35,093	25,180	71.8
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	71,510	53,208	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	141	68.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,274	2,525	77.1
Black, non-Hispanic	6,002	3,321	55.3
Hispanic	8,471	4,158	49.1
White, non-Hispanic	52,316	42,208	80.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,433	3,925	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,092	345	16.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,676	10,008	53.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	36,139	25,277	69.9
Female	35,295	27,904	79.1
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	68,358	38,906	56.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	92	46.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,078	2,090	67.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,509	1,522	27.6
Hispanic	7,877	1,945	24.7
White, non-Hispanic	50,623	32,696	64.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,787	2,220	20.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,676	205	12.2
Economically disadvantaged students	17,572	5,436	30.9
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	34,591	19,905	57.5
Female	33,767	19,001	56.3
<b>Comments: The number of students scoring at or above proficient in the Migrant subgroup has been suppressed due to a small N size.</b>			

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	1,770	648	36.6
Districts	386	84	21.8
<b>Comments: The total numbers do not include 5 districts and 100 schools that did not receive AYP determinations in the 2007-08 school year because of small enrollment or PK-K grade configurations.</b>			

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	970	244	25.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	471	51	10.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	499	193	38.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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
349	68	19.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

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. 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	36
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	5
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	13
Replacement of the principal	3
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	40
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	47
<b>Comments: As reported by districts in Title I Data Collection application.</b>	

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)	11
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	3
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	114
<b>Comments: As reported by districts in Title I Data Collection application.</b>	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. Changed governance structure of the school in a significant manner that either diminished school-based management and decision making or increased control, monitoring, and oversight of the school's operations and educational management program by the district.
2. Closed the school and reopened it as a focus or theme school with new staff or staff skilled in the focus area.
3. Reconstituted the school into smaller learning communities.
4. Implemented intervention and monitoring process to accelerate school improvement.
5. Shared governance with State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
6. Combined school with higher performing school for extended learning opportunities during after-school hours.
7. Split single school into two separate schools and hired new principals to lead the schools.
8. Contracted with a local institution of higher education to assist in oversight of school's instructional program.
9. Signed Memorandum of Understanding with State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to provide technical assistance in conducting an expert review, including cooperative Learning Walks in the school to detail cause of low student performance and to recommend improvement initiatives to address causes of low student performance.

## 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.

<sup>2</sup>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.

1. Commissioner's Districts -In 2007-2008, the ESE reorganized the structure of its assistance delivery system using a cohort approach determined by the size and accountability status of its districts. Nine of the largest urban districts, in which over 80% of the state's schools in Corrective Action and Restructuring in the aggregate were located, became known as the Commissioner's Districts. All of these districts were in Corrective Action under NCLB as well. Department staff and resources were prioritized to support these districts. (See section 1.4.4.2 for the targeted assistance strategies that were prioritized for the Commissioner's Districts.)
2. Memoranda of Understanding were negotiated with each of the Commissioner's Districts to identify district needs and to document district and ESE staffing and financial resources that would be deployed to address the needs. Periodic discussions were framed to review district and school data, as well as to reflect on the progress of district improvement initiatives and oversight in the schools with NCLB status.
3. Urban Superintendents Network -Twenty-three of the state's districts in Corrective Action meet monthly in a leadership network. The Urban Superintendents Network provides monthly networking opportunity for districts with common challenges to meet together and with ESE. Monthly meetings, planned collaboratively by a Department of Education and Superintendent team, provide opportunities for information sharing and policy input, as well as focused problem solving and collaboration among the districts and with the Department of Education. In 2007-2008, the Network held multi-meeting focused discussions with the Superintendents and other members of their leadership teams to analyze needs and share effective strategies on pressing topics to provide a springboard for additional collaboration among the districts and department. These topical discussions included: mathematics achievement, educational programming and performance for English language learners, and the persistent graduation and drop out challenges. These focused discussions have resulted in additional collaboration with dedicated district and Department staff through networking and work groups to work together to improve school and district practices and develop new solutions to persistent, common challenges.
4. Mathematics Liaisons -In October 2004, the Superintendent of each of the 23 urban districts in the Commonwealth appointed a liaison to this statewide network. The director of mathematics in the district typically serves in this role and often brings other members of the math leadership team to the monthly meeting. Liaisons act as the bridge between statewide programs and local math initiatives and are responsible for both integrating statewide opportunities into district activities as well as scaling up local efforts to improve student achievement in mathematics. The network collaborates around shared issues to problem-solve, build capacity, and provide feedback on mathematics initiatives and ESE policy. The Mathematics Liaisons typically meet monthly

during the school year. Last year, the network reviewed trends in AYP data, shared on systemic improvements related to CSR that contributed to improvement in their districts, and collaboratively selected and examined twelve mathematics intervention programs to inform purchasing decisions. Of the remaining 350+ districts across the state, there is a wide range of size, demographics, communities, and level of infrastructure. Four of these districts are designated as Underperforming under the MA School and District Accountability System, 49 are in Corrective Action and have Commonwealth Priority Schools (schools identified for Corrective Action or Restructuring for students in the aggregate); 22 have some NCLB accountability status with some schools identified for subgroups (any status) or for improvement in the aggregate; the rest either have no district NCLB accountability status but have schools identified for subgroups (any status) or for improvement in the aggregate, or have no district or school status. We recognize the need to provide all districts with support, and are developing a system that will initially address the schools and districts most in need of support, but ultimately provide tiered support to all districts in the Commonwealth.

In an effort to leverage resources and maximize the impact of federal funds, we directed a percentage of the FY 08 Title I School Improvement Grant regionally to Title I districts that had a 2007 AYP status of Corrective Action and/or had Commonwealth Priority Schools. In groups of at least three, districts operated federally supported summer academies for teachers and in some cases, students, to improve teacher instructional practice and student achievement in ELA and mathematics. This regional distribution of funding enabled us to pilot a more collaborative regional approach to supporting small and medium sized districts in need of intervention that alone lack the infrastructure and capacity to address causes of low performance. From the 2008 data, we have learned that districts have greater capacity working together regionally towards school improvement efforts than they do working alone. In many cases, cross-district networks were formed that have continued to collaborate beyond the grant period.

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	4
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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	4	4
Schools	43	26
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	10/17/08
---	----------

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

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
- Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007 08.
- Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
- Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY

2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	94,600	94,112
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	31,142	29,148
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	32.9	31.0
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	38,060	40,210
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	40.2	42.7
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	324	
<b>Comments: The denominator for each percentage represents the number of students in the tested grades in the school.</b>		

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

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	18
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	3
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	302
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>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.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		95	1	3		
<b>Comments: Data provided for the 95 "Commonwealth Priority Schools" located in the nine "Commissioner's Districts" in Massachusetts in 2007-08.</b>						

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

#### 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.

1. Tools -The ESE has developed tools and protocols to support district leadership to monitor and collect data on teaching and learning practices. An example is a set of tools to support collecting data on classroom practices through a 'learning walk'. The Department trained school and district leaders in the Commissioner's Districts to use the tools and has modeled the effective use of the tools in districts' classrooms. The Learning Walk Continuum, along with the associated protocols and templates, is intended to provide a framework for conducting evidence based observations in classrooms to gather and report on information about teaching and learning practices in schools. The Learning Walk Continuum has been used by teams of state, school and district leaders to conduct periodic 20-30 minute classroom observations in a school. In addition, other tools were developed and used to support effective use of common planning time and professional learning.
2. Networking -As stated above, the Department has promoted networking and has used these networks to focus on particular issues of practices. From the Urban Superintendents Network, a Working Group was formed to support collaborative learning among district teams to foster effective drop out prevention strategies and to improve graduation rates. The Mathematics Liaison network collaboratively developed a document to share effective strategies for mathematics coaching. Similarly, the Science Liaison Network supported the development of a document on the Characteristics of An Effective Standards Based Mathematics Classroom that promoted a common vision among science educators and science departments in the urban districts.
3. Training -The Department has support quality 'Train the Trainer' programs for teachers of English Language Learners including sheltering content and English and a Second Language. In addition, schools and districts receiving Reading First or the state-funded John Silber Early Reading Initiative funding for K-3 reading instruction participated in comprehensive ongoing professional development. This included: 1) participation in statewide professional development delivered by nationally recognized experts on topics identified by ESE as critical to improvement efforts. In 2007-2008, topics included writing to inform reading comprehension and literacy skills and content area knowledge; 2) participation in ongoing professional development to link research to practice; and 3) school and district support for the implementation of evidence-based literacy practices including support of school-based literacy coaches.

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

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

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

##### **1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 2.1 %

**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 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education did not conduct any evaluation or technical assistance activities using 1003(g) funds during the 2007-08 school year.

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

831.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The ESE has undertaken several initiatives to support school improvement for schools with NCLB status using state or other fund resources. These include:

1. School and District Leadership Training: Nearly 1000 current and aspiring leaders have participated in the thirty-three day training conducted through the National Institute for School Leadership over the past few years.
2. Early Reading programs have been supported by state funds aligned with Reading First.
3. Training for Sheltered English Immersion teachers have been funded by state professional development funds for English language learners.
4. Expanded Learning Time programs have been funded in schools adding 25% more time to regular school days using state funding.
5. Support for redesigning or providing targeted assistance to chronically low performing schools has been provided using state resources.
6. Mathematics content training has been provided using both Title IIB and state funds.

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	302,837
Applied to transfer	1,002
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	951

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
<b>Comments: These data have been verified, are correct and any significant change can be attributed to the transition to a student-level collection. The ESE only has student level data on Title I school choice for the 2007-08 school year.</b>	

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	\$ 403,778
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	127
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school<sup>3</sup> 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.*

<sup>3</sup> 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	113,260
Applied for supplemental educational services	9,428
Received supplemental educational services	8,927
<b>Comments: The data on the number of students that applied for supplemental education services does not include data from Boston or Springfield, but those districts are included in the data on the number of students that received supplemental education services.</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 10,447,888
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	275,588	263,793	95.7	11,795	4.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	48,028	44,959	93.6	3,069	6.4
Low-poverty schools	52,318	51,270	98.0	1,048	2.0
All elementary schools	193,330	186,669	96.6	6,661	3.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	15,374	13,626	88.6	1,748	11.4
Low-poverty schools	24,470	23,486	96.0	984	4.0
All secondary schools	82,258	77,124	93.8	5,134	6.2
<b>Comments: The large change in the data can be attributed to including middle schools in the secondary level analysis. In 2006-07, the ESE included middle schools in the Elementary level.</b>					

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 ESE uses a departmentalized approach where self-contained elementary classrooms are weighted by a factor of five.

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

#### FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- 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
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	36.5
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	9.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	54.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "Other" option was used because the ESE does not collect alternative route program information through our Education Personnel Information Management System, which is the source of the data above. Therefore, the data represented in "Other" are those teachers who are not fully certified, but their alternative program status is unknown.

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

	Percentage
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	31.2

Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	14.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	54.7
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "Other" option was used because the ESE does not collect alternative route program information through our Education Personnel Information Management System, which is the source of the data above. Therefore, the data represented in "Other" are those teachers who are not fully certified, but their alternative program status is unknown.

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	54.6	7.2
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch.	
Secondary schools	52.9	8.9
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for free or reduced price lunch.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	48,966
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.	46,378
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	30,793
Portuguese	4,461
Khmer/Khmer	2,368
Haitian Creole	2,185
Vietnamese	2,104

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

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	48,966
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,945
Total	51,911
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	22,754
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	43.8
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	45,881
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,616
Total	48,497
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.**

	<b>Results</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	27,483	57.0
ELP attainment	21,106	44.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

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).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

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)
Spanish
<b>Comments:</b>

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
<b>Comments:</b>

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
<b>Comments:</b>

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

Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

#### 1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

#### Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
7,958	8,123	16,081
<b>Comments:</b>		

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
10,797	4,357	40.4	6,440
<b>Comments:</b>			

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
10,778	4,655	43.2	6,123
<b>Comments:</b>			

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
4,668	1,008	21.6	3,660
<b>Comments:</b>			

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	57
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	4
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	47
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	48
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	4
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	5
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	34
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	34
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	30
<b>Comments: There are a total of 57 subgrantees for the year. Only 54 subgrantees are included in the AMAO reporting because two years of performance data are needed to make a determination.</b>	

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>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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
22,130	2,353	3

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

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

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.**

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	869
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	475

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.

The estimated number of teachers is based upon an assumption that the number of LEP students will continue to increase at a rate consistent with the past three years.

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.**

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	27	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	0	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	45	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	45	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	2	
Other (Explain in comment box)	49	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	57	3,653
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	32	180
PD provided to principals	11	15
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	16	47
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	0	0
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>3,896</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Forty-nine subgrantees participated in professional development focused on key factors affecting second language acquisition and how these factors impact classroom organization and instruction in addition to the implications cultural differences have on classroom organization and instruction.

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

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

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

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.

For the last two years, the MA ESE has worked to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to its subgrantees. We have streamlined the application process considerably. Within one week of the State's notification of its Title III allocation, LEAs are notified that the funds are available and that the LEA can submit its application for funds.

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
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.7
Black, non-Hispanic	65.2
Hispanic	58.5
White, non-Hispanic	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	62.8
Limited English proficient	53.3
Economically disadvantaged	65.2
Migratory students	73.2
Male	77.8
Female	84.1
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	3.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	6.4
Hispanic	9.1
White, non-Hispanic	2.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.8
Limited English proficient	10.4
Economically disadvantaged	5.8
Migratory students	3.8
Male	4.4
Female	3.3
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	370	240
LEAs with subgrants	21	20
Total	391	260
<b>Comments:</b>		

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)	67	466
K	193	734
1	198	856
2	217	823
3	206	722
4	191	694
5	190	665
6	198	664
7	228	646
8	255	726
9	387	829
10	316	589
11	266	417
12	291	399
Ungraded	16	0
Total	3,219	9,230
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	1,737	5,110
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,220	3,367
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	30	102
Hotels/Motels	232	651
Total	3,219	9,230
<b>Comments:</b>		

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)	566
K	681
1	782
2	795
3	680
4	674
5	631
6	660
7	644
8	742
9	870
10	606
11	432
12	382
Ungraded	109
Total	9,254
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	317
Migratory children/youth	81
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,850
Limited English proficient students	1,948
<b>Comments:</b>	

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	17
Expedited evaluations	14
Staff professional development and awareness	17
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	17
Transportation	16
Early childhood programs	14
Assistance with participation in school programs	19
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	18
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	14
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	19
Coordination between schools and agencies	20
Counseling	12
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	15
Clothing to meet a school requirement	15
School supplies	19
Referral to other programs and services	18
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	14
Other (optional – in comment box below)	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Training for service providers, Immunization and Technology assistance.

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

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	2
Transportation	9
School records	2
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Mobility of children awaiting foster care -9 subgrantees Absences during testing -2 subgrantees Inadequate clothing -1 subgrantee

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	445	82
4	456	51
5	386	74
6	305	114
7	365	93
8	395	141
High School	292	98
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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	461	111
4	460	71
5	391	61
6	410	72
7	367	32
8	393	42
High School	294	91
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	68
K	24
1	21
2	15
3	12
4	14
5	N<10
6	11
7	10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	244
Total	452
<b>Comments:</b>	

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 number of Category 1 children reported for program year 2006 -2007 was 666 and the number of Category I children being reported for 2007 -2008 is 452, a reduction of 214 children.

The reduction in the number of children identified for the program year 2007 -2008 is attributed to several factors. First, the enforcement of illegal immigration has had a significant effect on the number of migrant families willing to come forward to be interviewed for eligibility. In Massachusetts, there have been widely publicized crackdowns in which immigrant families have been broken apart and members detained and deported. Therefore, it is not surprising that migrant families are reluctant to provide the extensive identification information required to qualify.

Second, families that traditionally travel to the Western Region of Massachusetts (Springfield, Holyoke, Northampton) did not arrive as they normally do between April and August. A possible reason for this is the tobacco growers in western Massachusetts and in Connecticut have either reduced or stopped production.

Third, the cranberry growers, major employers in the Southeast Region, stopped production because too many cranberries were already in storage. The fishing industry, the other major employer of migrant workers in the Southeast Region, has been hurt by the restrictions placed on the fishing industry.

Fourth, the North-central Region has been impacted by the restrictions in the fishing industry and by the downsizing of employees in food and fish processing plants. In addition, a growing number of employers have determined that securing contracted workers is a more cost efficient and a more manageable way for them to accomplish the necessary work. For the fourth consecutive year in Massachusetts, we have seen an increase in the number of emancipated youth who have come to the Commonwealth and who have been hired by temporary agencies to do migrant eligible work. These youth, for the most part, are single young men.

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).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17
K	7
1	10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	0
11	N<10
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	80
Total	147
<b>Comments:</b>	

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 number of Category 2 children reported for program year 2006 -2007 was 151 and the number of Category 2 children reported for program year 2007 -2008 is 147, a decrease of 4 children served in the Massachusetts Migrant Education Program (MMEP) summer projects. The number of children served in the MMEP summer projects has remained virtually the same despite the reduction in the number of eligible migrant children who could be served.

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.

Massachusetts used a proprietary student information system which was developed exclusively for the Migrant Education Program using the FileMaker Pro software. The counts for the 2006-07 program year were generated using the same system.

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.

The identification and recruitment of migrant children is the primary role of Community Liaisons and is conducted twelve months a year. The Community Liaisons make the initial direct contact with the potentially eligible migrant family, obtain eligibility information, and have the primary responsibility for the determination and documentation of student eligibility. Day-to-day supervision of the Community Liaisons and implementation of identification and recruitment efforts are the responsibility of the MMEP's three Regional Directors, who are assisted by a team leader, or "verifier" who helps with the verification of all paperwork submitted.

Primary responsibility for system planning, policy, and interstate/intrastate coordination is assigned to the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator who is directly supervised by the State Director. Through this structure, the identification and recruitment component provides for regional supervision and coordination of identification and recruitment (Community Liaisons) while maintaining a centralized planning and monitoring system designed to ensure strict compliance with federal student eligibility requirements.

When potentially eligible migrant families have been located, the Community Liaisons ascertain eligibility through structured face-to-face interviews with the parents or guardians or with the emancipated youth. When recruiting in urban centers for families who have ceased to migrate but remain eligible for program services, Community Liaisons must assess the validity of the information gathered. This assessment may include contacting employers, reviewing industry surveys, and contacting community-based social service agencies. Once eligibility is determined, Community Liaisons complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and submit it for review and verification by the Regional Director and his/her "verifier." This documentation is reviewed once again by the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator who both validates the paperwork with desk audits and face-to-face interviews of families and/or emancipated youth who have been declared eligible.

At the point of identification, the Community Liaisons are required to recognize the family as being "new", "adding additional children" who joined the family after the last qualifying move, or "enrolled previously". Between September and February each year, the Community Liaisons interview every active eligible family during a face-to-face meeting to update the information on the COE.

The Community Liaisons are required to complete paper COE data sections on family (ethnicity, home language, father's last name, mother's last name, current address, current telephone number, school district), child[ren] (name, sex, birth date, school, grade, special education services) and qualifying eligibility (date children moved from last city and date they arrived in current city, who they moved with or joined), in the case of an emancipated youth, (all information mentioned above and the date they moved and arrived is noted) who is doing temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing activity, date employment was sought or obtained, name of employer), and other clarifying information.

The Community Liaisons are required to complete a data section on the standard COE on "Previous Qualifying Move(s), Activities, Address(es)". This provides information in addition to the last qualifying move, not only to substantiate the eligibility and to document residency, but also to identify families who may have made a migrant move within the Commonwealth and across programmatic regions. This measure and other verification and validation measures are implemented to preclude the duplication of a family in the program's database.

The Pupil Records Coordinator searches "family last name and first"; "similar name"; "English cognates"; "addresses and telephone numbers". Then the Pupil Records Coordinator searches "student names"; "birth dates"; and "parents names". If the Pupil Records Coordinator finds a single match, she then "pulls" the COE from the file drawer, reviews it, and checks the signatures.

After determining the Category 1 child count, the data for the Category 2 child count are collected by looking at all students who received services after the last day of the regular school year and before the first day of the new school year. The data contained in this Report refers to activities documented between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008.

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 eligible families/students/youth are enrolled in the migrant program's principal state database at one centralized location by the MMEP Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the data directly from validated COEs. Before the Pupil Records Coordinator assigns the unique family and unique child numbers, a search is conducted utilizing the mother's name, the names and dates of birth of the children, and a review of all records under the same last name. No new family can be enrolled into the database without this screen for duplicates. The data system that we use has a built-in capacity to use "wildcards" for single pieces of data: The discovery of a single variable, which matches a child or family, signals to the Pupil Records Coordinator that she must pull the COE and examine the information contained in it and all of the signatures. In this way, duplication of a family/child is prevented.

If the search is negative, the new family is enrolled and a unique family number and a unique student number are assigned by the Pupil Records Coordinator. Although the program's database can be accessed by regional staff for generating reports, the system restricts the regional staff from having the ability to enroll families/students or update eligibility information. The Student Database consists of a collection of discrete records. Using the relational capacity of the system, it is able to track an infinite number of educational service experiences while maintaining a single unique record for each student.

Student service data are collected and entered into the student enrollment record by regional staff. During the school year, Records Clerks gather the service data and enter it into an Enrollment Database, which is related to the Student Database. Record Aides are assigned to each summer project site and are responsible for the collection of daily attendance, service component information, and health-related information.

The MMEP administrative staff and records staff have worked with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE -formerly Department of Education) to develop a memorandum of understanding to allow MMEP access to education data collected by ESE. This data, including SIMS (Student Information Management System data), MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System data) and MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment), are integrated into the MMEP student data system for purpose of informing operational decision making, completing and confirming demographic data and to contribute to the pool of data for MSIX (Migrant Student Records Exchange Initiative).

The health-related information that is collected and entered into the database consists of information on: a student's allergies; medications; screenings for dental, hearing, vision, podiatric, and skin/scalp; first aid that was administered at the summer site; health exam and dental exam information; and information about health problems, names of doctors, hospitals, and clinics. In addition, information is collected and entered into the database on all academic services that a student receives at the summer project site or through home-based services.

The student information is forwarded from the Support Center to the Record Clerks located in each Regional Office. The Record Clerks enter enrollment and attendance information into the enrollment database, a separate and distinct relational database. The Records Clerks are required to train the Records Aides and to visit summer sites to review and monitor the work of the Records Aides.

Two distinct databases -a "student database" and an "enrollment database"-are included in the Support Center's data warehouse. The student database has been organized to ensure that there is only one record per student. The enrollment database, a related database, is used to characterize each incidence of education service. We use the records in the enrollment database to "flag" the student records for inclusion in the Category 2 child count. The student database is searched for records that meet eligibility criteria, including eligibility for service for at least one day during summer of the report year by last qualifying move; age-eligible; a check that the student has not been terminated before the beginning of that summer; and that the student has not turned three or has confirmation of residency after turning three during the report year. The student database is the primary generator of student counts because we can assure the "uniqueness" of each record, thereby avoiding duplication of student records in the counts.

The student database is the source for all student service data presented in reports such as the Office of Migrant Education's Category I and Category II Report. Within the student database only a single record exists for each student regardless of the number of services a student receives and despite the possibility of a student being served by more than one Massachusetts Migrant Education Program Region. In this database, an individual student cannot be counted more than once. When migrant child counts are requested by local, state or federal sources, the Pupil Records Coordinator conditions the query to the student database to access the information needed.

As an example, when Massachusetts needed to generate information for this Migrant Child Count Report (School Year 2007 -2008), the Pupil Records Coordinator first queried the system for all eligible children between the ages of 3 and 21 who had not graduated from high school, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who resided in Massachusetts between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008. An unduplicated count of 452 Category 1 migrant children was generated from that query. The Pupil Records Coordinator then queried the system for the count of all eligible children between the ages of 3 -21, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who received MEP-funded services between the last day of the 2007 -2008 school year and before the first day of the 2008 -2009 school year and who had not graduated from high school. An unduplicated count of 147 Category 2 migrant children was generated from that query.

When an eligible migrant student graduates from high school, the Community Liaison completes a "Change of Status Form" which is then forwarded to the Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the student as now being "inactive" and who enters the student's graduation date as the "termination date".

Queries on the student database for Category 1 and 2 counts include an elaborate screening process. This process prevents the inclusion of three-year-olds whose residency has not been documented (after they turn three) prior to the end of the report year or their termination date from the program. Additional screening prevents children at any age from being included in the count if their residency status has not been documented. If a student's eligibility expires before the summer projects begin, the student is excluded from the services that are provided in the summer projects. Community Liaisons are alerted by the Records Clerks in advance of the date that potential Category 1 migrant children will turn three. Community Liaisons are asked to visit the family and to update the COE as soon as possible to document residency of all eligible children.

The MMEP Regional Offices, on an on-going basis, provide migrant student lists to all school districts who are serving migrant students. These lists "flag" the eligible migrant students to assist the school districts in planning appropriate support for those students and to facilitate the sharing of education information by the school and MMEP region.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A.

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

### **1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 Count: The Massachusetts Migrant Education Program's student database has a built-in calculation for the expiration of eligibility. To verify the accuracy of the database, on a daily basis the Pupil Records Coordinator does a "find" of active students between the ages of three through twenty-one who had not graduated from high school. If discrepancies are discovered, the Pupil Records Coordinator reviews the COEs and consults the Community Liaisons, the Records Clerks, and/or the Regional Director for a determination of eligibility on those students.

All children turning three during the report period are tested for confirmation of residency after their third birthday---a face-to-face or telephone confirmation must be documented before the child's information is entered into the relational database. The same system is used for all other migrant students. For a student to be included in the twelve-month count, each one of the conditions mentioned above must be satisfied.

Category 2 Count: For a student to be included in the Category 2 count, the conditions mentioned above must be met along with one additional criterion -that service has been provided through MEP funds (and documented in a related database) after the last day of the 2007 -2008 school year ended and before the 2008 -2009 school year began.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A.

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

#### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The quality control system in place during the 2007 -2008 program year consisted of four phases and involved at least two individuals who shared responsibility for the review and monitoring of eligibility determinations. That system is described below:

Phase One: Quality control began with quality training. Each year Community Liaisons are required to attend (a) training sessions which review technical guides/reports, federal guidelines (eligibility, principal means of livelihood, etc.), the state Identification and Recruitment Manual and (b) additional training on interviewing techniques, information on welfare reform, education reform, access to social and human services, CHIPs information, and other information that impacts migrant families. On May 7 and May 21, 2008 the MMEP program sponsored workshops on recruitment strategies and practices which were presented by Merced Flores and David Gutierrez of the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) to all MMEP staff. In addition, each year Community Liaisons and Recruiters are required to pass a competency test in order to demonstrate requisite knowledge of all Identification and Recruitment procedures and eligibility guidelines.

Phase Two: Community Liaisons submit the completed COEs to their Regional Director. All COEs are reviewed by the Regional Directors to determine if the eligibility determination was correct, creditable and that the COE was accurate and complete. To facilitate the verification process, the Regional Directors update information on the major agricultural and fishing activities within their Region on a routine basis. If there are questions about information on COEs, the COEs are returned to the Community Liaisons for correction or further explanation.

Phase Three: Regional Directors submit their COEs to the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. All COEs are validated by the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator to authorize student enrollment into the migrant program's student database. The review at this stage ensures that the eligibility of children considered to be migratory was properly documented and verified and that the eligibility data were creditable. If there were questions about information on the COEs, the COEs were returned to the Regional Directors for correction or further explanation.

Phase Four: The final quality control process-auditing-is done by the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator on a "pre-enrollment" basis. During this phase, on a random sample basis, COEs of each Community Liaison are "field audited" (by telephone, letter, a home visit, a public school visit, and/or an employer visit) to ensure that both the identification and recruitment and information management systems are functioning properly. The Identification and Recruitment Coordinator reviews all "problematic" COEs with the MMEP State Director. It was the State Director who, in these rare cases, is the final arbitrator and determines whether the family/children are migratory and should be enrolled in the MMEP's student database.

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.

As stated elsewhere in this report, every Certificate of Eligibility is reviewed at the regional office and verified by the regional director. Within 5-10 days of receipt of a regionally verified COE at the Migrant Support Center, the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator would visit the residence or place of employment of a prospective migrant person in order to conduct a re-interview.

For the report period of September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2008, 35% of statewide verified COEs were subject to a re-interview procedure to ensure a high level of quality control. All re-interview sessions are attended by the Community Liaison/Recruiter, Identification and Recruitment Coordinator, as well as the prospective migrant person. In the course of a re-interview session every item recorded on the eligibility section of the COE and the emancipated youth's age is reviewed for consistency and accuracy.

If the information on the COE is found to be consistent and accurate by the re-interviewing authority, the positive result of the re-interview session is noted on an independent form (Basic Interviewing Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form). If the information on the COE is found to be inconsistent with the re-interview and/or found to be inaccurate, the COE is rejected and the family is deemed ineligible for services under Migrant Education and advised that they do not qualify for services. The family is advised immediately of the disqualification and the family's copy of the Certificate of Eligibility is handed over to them. For those cases in which the COE is rejected, the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator follows-up with the Community Liaison and Recruiter to clarify any potential misunderstandings about eligibility guidelines.

A quality control sheet (Basic Interview Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form) is used to record the results of the audit (re-interview) visit. This quality control form is completed by the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator, then attached and filed with the original COE.

Number of eligibility determinations sampled 49  
Number for which a test was completed 49  
Number found eligible 45

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.  
The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator (a single person acting at the State level), follows a protocol of "pulling" Certificates of Eligibility (COE) on a random sample basis to review and verify the information in the Student Database against the COE; when entering information from the COE Update Forms into the Database, spot checks are implemented, such as a review of family and child unique numbers, and other data that has already been entered into the database; and on a daily basis manual confirmation on the eligibility expiration date of all students is completed. In addition, at the MMEP Regional Offices, the Records Clerks are also reviewing COE data against COE "update data" for accuracy on an on-going basis.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The final steps taken by the Pupil Records Coordinator are (1) to audit a sample of student records and pull the COEs to confirm the eligibility through an examination of the "hard copy" documentation and (2) through the system's built-in programs of "finds" and "sorts", to try to replicate the student counts by using different methodologies. All summer services provided to eligible students through MEP-funding are provided by the MMEP. Information that is reviewed throughout the year is contained in the COEs and in the MMEP permission forms.

The standard procedure for identifying the records to be included in the count relies on calculation fields in the student database which flag records that meet specific criteria via Boolean operations on data in fields from the student database as well as fields from other related databases. For example one of the set of flag fields used in executing the Category 1 eligibility count, marks a record if the child's last qualifying move was within three years of the beginning of the report period and if a termination date for that child exists, only if the termination occurred after the beginning of the report period.

One strategy used to check the accuracy of that flag is to find all student records with an last qualifying move that falls within the acceptable range for the report year. This group of records is then sorted using the flag field as well as the termination date field and any irregularities can be observed by examining each record. Although this process seems cumbersome, the sort accelerates the process. There will be a series of records, which represent active students with no termination date and, if the flag is observed to be behaving properly, these records may be dispensed with rather quickly. Similarly those records having termination dates after the beginning of the report period should also be flagged and this can rapidly be confirmed. The remaining records should not be flagged and should represent records with termination dates prior to the beginning of the report period. Due to the sort order, the borders for each series are predictable and can be readily identified.

Those records in proximity to the borders may be examined more carefully for irregularities, such as unexpected flags or absence of flags. After the found set is satisfactorily examined the omitted records are sorted and examined similarly. Any flagged records in this set would indicate the existence of false positives in which a last qualifying move would be outside of the acceptable three-year range. This is just one example of how a series of finds and sorts combined with scanning of individual records are used to confirm the validity of the compiled data.

On a semi-monthly basis throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator generates a child count report and submits it to the State Director. This report is reviewed by the State Director and the Regional Directors and is compared against previous child counts and recruitment targets.

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.

As a result of Massachusetts' statewide re-interviewing initiative in 2006, the MMEP has taken steps to refine and improve upon the quality control exercised over the recruitment and identification of eligible migrant students. The revised framework for monitoring the accuracy of our work is detailed below.

Briefly described, the new framework introduces an additional layer of oversight during the work of recruiting eligible migrant children. Instead of leaving quality control exclusively in the hands of the MMEP Support Center, each region will now call upon "verifiers" to assist in the process. Verifiers will review the paperwork of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE), confer with Regional Directors, and then together sign off on the accuracy and thoroughness of the COEs being submitted to the Support Center. The objective here, in addition, to having an extra set of "eyes" to review the paperwork is to pro actively identify any potential errors and/or misidentified families well before they are declared eligible. In so doing, verifiers will also free additional time for Support Center personnel to conduct more face-to-face re-interviews of families. The need for more face-to-face re-interviews was one of the many recommendations to surface in the Statewide Director's Re-interviewing Report to the Office of Migrant Education in 2006.

The flow chart outlined in the "Conceptual Framework" calls for Community Liaisons to submit their COEs to a verifier who will then use MMEPs existing standards for quality control to check the COEs for accuracy. The COEs submitted by the Regional Directors will then undergo a process of "validation" by the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator and staff at the Support Center. Validation activities will, among other things, consist of telephone checks of schools and employers, and face-to-face re-interviews on a systematic basis throughout each school year. In the event that a COE and/or family is discovered to be ineligible for service, Support Staff will send a MMEP "Failure to Validate Form" (and other documents) back to the Regional Director and Verifier, informing them of the change in status.

MMEP continues to strengthen the comprehensive quality control training program launched in 2007. Components include Statewide training for recruiters, community liaisons and regional staff; supplemental training by the Migrant Education Resource Center and a systematic administrative review of all Identification and Recruitment policies and procedures.

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.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts nor the underlying eligibility determinations upon which the counts are based.

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