

# 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**

**MAINE**



**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:

Maine

Address:

23 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333-0023

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jacqueline Soychak

Telephone: 207-624-6734

Fax: 207-624-6731

e-mail: [jacqueline.soychak@maine.gov](mailto:jacqueline.soychak@maine.gov)

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

Jacqueline Soychak

Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:20:14 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions to content standards have taken place.

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 state is in the process of joining Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont for assessment in reading, writing, and mathematics for grades 3 through 8. This would be effective in 2009-10.

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.

Science standards and assessments have not been changed and there are no plans. The standards adopted in 2007 will be the standards assessed in March 2009. Maine's assessments and academic achievement standards in science have not yet been approved.

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State NCLB assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	102,019	101,115	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	779	769	98.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,542	1,515	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic	2,659	2,611	98.2
Hispanic	1,109	1,080	97.4
White, non-Hispanic	95,930	95,140	99.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,122	16,867	98.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,869	2,770	96.6
Economically disadvantaged students	36,868	36,411	98.8
Migratory students	35	35	100.0
Male	52,341	51,843	99.0
Female	49,678	49,272	99.2
<b>Comments:</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	3,260	19.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,470	73.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,137	6.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	16,867	

**Comments:**

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	102,034	100,841	98.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	779	767	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,542	1,498	97.2
Black, non-Hispanic	2,659	2,568	96.6
Hispanic	1,109	1,068	96.3
White, non-Hispanic	95,945	94,940	99.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,127	16,822	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,870	2,676	93.2
Economically disadvantaged students	36,873	36,271	98.4
Migratory students	35	35	100.0
Male	52,349	51,691	98.7
Female	49,685	49,150	98.9
<b>Comments:</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	3,181	18.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,501	74.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,140	6.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	16,822	
<b>Comments:</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	44,966	44,139	98.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	322	311	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	664	644	97.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,059	1,022	96.5
Hispanic	447	421	94.2
White, non-Hispanic	42,474	41,741	98.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,226	6,998	96.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,388	1,276	91.9
Economically disadvantaged students	14,986	14,602	97.4
Migratory students	17	17	100.0
Male	22,996	22,566	98.1
Female	21,970	21,573	98.2
<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 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	1,619	23.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,888	69.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	491	7.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	6,998	
<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 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

<b>Grade 3</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	13,710	9,138	66.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	114	60	52.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	206	136	66.0
Black, non-Hispanic	392	159	40.6
Hispanic	159	90	56.6
White, non-Hispanic	12,839	8,693	67.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,329	1,019	43.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	374	146	39.0
Economically disadvantaged students	5,530	3,022	54.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,108	4,866	68.5
Female	6,602	4,272	64.7

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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 collection tool.

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

<b>Grade 3</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	13,709	8,711	63.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	114	60	52.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	205	126	61.5
Black, non-Hispanic	386	164	42.5
Hispanic	158	83	52.5
White, non-Hispanic	12,846	8,278	64.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,333	786	33.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	365	141	38.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,530	2,763	50.0
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,105	4,217	59.4
Female	6,604	4,494	68.0

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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 collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

	<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>
<b>Grade 3</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: Maine tested Science in grades 4, 8, and 11.</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

<b>Grade 4</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	14,122	8,499	60.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	49	48.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	262	171	65.3
Black, non-Hispanic	388	117	30.2
Hispanic	166	76	45.8
White, non-Hispanic	13,205	8,086	61.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,498	906	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	399	158	39.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,538	2,569	46.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,155	4,409	61.6
Female	6,967	4,090	58.7

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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.

### 1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</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	14,123	8,943	63.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	47	46.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	258	173	67.1
Black, non-Hispanic	384	144	37.5
Hispanic	165	76	46.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,215	8,503	64.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,504	788	31.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	389	141	36.2
Economically disadvantaged students	5,539	2,732	49.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,155	4,286	59.9
Female	6,968	4,657	66.8

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</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	14,114	8,121	57.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	101	47	46.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	262	151	57.6
Black, non-Hispanic	386	112	29.0
Hispanic	166	69	41.6
White, non-Hispanic	13,199	7,742	58.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,494	925	37.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	396	110	27.8
Economically disadvantaged students	5,534	2,451	44.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,152	4,287	59.9
Female	6,962	3,834	55.1
<b>Comments:</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

<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	14,155	9,001	63.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	118	56	47.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	199	148	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	398	151	37.9
Hispanic	174	86	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,266	8,560	64.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,525	843	33.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	356	157	44.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5,531	2,800	50.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,338	4,710	64.2
Female	6,817	4,291	62.9
<b>Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.</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.

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -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	14,151	8,936	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	118	52	44.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	198	136	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	394	158	40.1
Hispanic	168	83	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	13,273	8,507	64.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,527	723	28.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	345	138	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	5,524	2,748	49.7
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,335	4,297	58.6
Female	6,816	4,639	68.1
<b>Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.</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.

**1.3.3.3 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	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: Maine tested Science in grades 4, 8, and 11.</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

<b>Grade 6</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	14,268	7,613	53.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	36	32.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	248	156	62.9
Black, non-Hispanic	413	125	30.3
Hispanic	147	61	41.5
White, non-Hispanic	13,350	7,235	54.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,479	577	23.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	360	107	29.7
Economically disadvantaged students	5,279	2,051	38.9
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,221	3,852	53.3
Female	7,047	3,761	53.4

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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

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

<b>Grade 6</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	14,261	10,013	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	110	63	57.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	248	188	75.8
Black, non-Hispanic	403	220	54.6
Hispanic	147	78	53.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,353	9,464	70.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,479	836	33.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	350	177	50.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,273	3,027	57.4
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,221	4,711	65.2
Female	7,040	5,302	75.3

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6**

	<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>
<b>Grade 6</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: Maine tested Science in grades 4, 8, and 11.</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	14,693	7,836	53.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	40	35.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	217	129	59.4
Black, non-Hispanic	375	113	30.1
Hispanic	177	74	41.8
White, non-Hispanic	13,812	7,480	54.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,496	538	21.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	374	119	31.8
Economically disadvantaged students	5,406	2,008	37.1
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	7,560	3,987	52.7
Female	7,133	3,849	54.0

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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	14,692	10,767	73.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	112	66	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	212	156	73.6
Black, non-Hispanic	369	216	58.5
Hispanic	175	117	66.9
White, non-Hispanic	13,824	10,212	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,507	862	34.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	361	199	55.1
Economically disadvantaged students	5,406	3,288	60.8
Migratory students	N<10	0	
Male	7,560	5,150	68.1
Female	7,132	5,617	78.8

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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># 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>
<b>Grade 7</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: Maine tested Science in grades 4, 8, and 11.</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	15,094	7,718	51.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	32	27.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	182	120	65.9
Black, non-Hispanic	360	96	26.7
Hispanic	136	57	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	14,299	7,413	51.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,439	456	18.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	335	109	32.5
Economically disadvantaged students	5,324	1,878	35.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,839	4,015	51.2
Female	7,255	3,703	51.0

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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	15,098	10,710	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	61	52.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	180	127	70.6
Black, non-Hispanic	356	175	49.2
Hispanic	136	75	55.1
White, non-Hispanic	14,309	10,272	71.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,444	704	28.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	328	136	41.5
Economically disadvantaged students	5,329	2,999	56.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,843	5,104	65.1
Female	7,255	5,606	77.3

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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**

<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	15,077	10,086	66.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	117	56	47.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	182	126	69.2
Black, non-Hispanic	356	143	40.2
Hispanic	136	74	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	14,286	9,687	67.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,429	809	33.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	335	120	35.8
Economically disadvantaged students	5,313	2,791	52.5
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,826	5,354	68.4
Female	7,251	4,732	65.3
<b>Comments:</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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	15,073	6,265	41.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	97	25	25.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	201	89	44.3
Black, non-Hispanic	285	39	13.7
Hispanic	121	31	25.6
White, non-Hispanic	14,369	6,081	42.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,101	271	12.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	572	118	20.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3,803	925	24.3
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,622	3,302	43.3
Female	7,451	2,963	39.8

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	14,783	7,203	48.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	95	30	31.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	193	74	38.3
Black, non-Hispanic	259	67	25.9
Hispanic	116	43	37.1
White, non-Hispanic	14,120	6,989	49.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,028	330	16.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	514	134	26.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,653	1,177	32.2
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,457	3,489	46.8
Female	7,326	3,714	50.7

**Comments: Due to Maine's small minority populations, even a small change in population numbers causes percentages to be different than previous years.**

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	14,948	6,322	42.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	93	23	24.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	200	77	38.5
Black, non-Hispanic	280	60	21.4
Hispanic	119	32	26.9
White, non-Hispanic	14,256	6,130	43.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,075	302	14.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	545	115	21.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,755	1,038	27.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	7,588	3,507	46.2
Female	7,360	2,815	38.2
<b>Comments:</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	632	418	66.1
Districts	226	216	95.6
<b>Comments:</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	422	320	75.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	20	14	70.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	402	306	76.1
<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
209	198	94.7
<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.

<sup>1</sup> 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	2
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
<b>Comments: There were 3 Title IA schools in SIY 3-restructuring, in 2007-08.</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)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
<b>Comments: There were no Title IA schools identified as SIY5 (Restructuring year 2) in 2007-08</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.

Not applicable

## 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<sup>2</sup>)
- 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.

There were no districts identified for improvement during the 2007-2008 school year.

We are beginning our work with the one Title IA district identified for improvement for the 2008-09 school year. The district has been provided with SEA improvement consultants. The consultants are assisting the district's improvement planning team in a review of district data for common issues, successful strategies and initiatives. This assistance includes a comprehensive review of achievement data. This district also has four schools identified for priority school One status in SIY2 and three in SIY1). School improvement activities being implemented in the LEA's Title IA priority schools are being made available to all district schools.

In addition, there are efforts to review progress in other Federal programs, i.e. Title II, Title III, and IDEA, to coordinate improvement activities across programs.

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

### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments: There were no districts identified for improvement during 2007-2008.</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	0	0
Schools	48	2
<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	9/30/08
---	---------

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 2006-07. 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	8,409	8,674
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	2,142	2,184
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	25.5	25.2
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	2,761	2,682
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	32.8	30.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	21	
<b>Comments: Total number of enrolled students includes students in non-tested grades. The figures in the SY 2006-07 column include only data for schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-2008.</b>		

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

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

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

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	9
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	6
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	6
<b>Comments: One of the schools that did not make AYP 2007-08 has removed Title IA funding for the 2008-09 school year.</b>	

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

### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<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>
6 = Combo 1	Used a combination of #1, 2	9	2	4	A	
7 = Combo 2	Used a combination of #1, 2, 3	4	1	2	A	
8 = Combo 3	Used a combination of #1, 2, 3, 5	5	1	2	A	
1	Also includes #2 and #5	2	1	1	A	
2		0	0	0	D	no comment
3		0	0	0	D	no comment
4		0	0	0	D	no comment
5		0	0	0	D	no comment
<b>Comments: All schools employed multiple strategies, as outlined above.</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 83I.

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Maine employed a number of techniques to share the strategies identified on 1.4.8.3. Much of the planning work was completed by school improvement planning teams, in conjunction with the technical assistance and support provided by MDOE Title IA school improvement consultants (CIPS consultants).

The MDOE CIPS team meets on a weekly basis to discuss school plans, receive professional development, and share effective improvement strategies. This information is then shared at the school level , through school improvement team meetings.

A new strategy employed this year includes the use of teleseminars to disseminate information, without requiring additional travel. Four topics were provided, each providing a national, state, and school level perspective of effective strategies. Offerings for 2007-08 included Content area literacy, differentiated instruction, co-teaching , and Formative assessment. All Title IA CIPS schools and monitor schools were invited to participate. The sessions are all posted on the MDOE/NCLB website, providing opportunities for school access the information. We are hoping to continue this type of outreach this year, with a focus on data and data analysis for school improvements.

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: 1.4 %

**Comments: This was the maximum amount available based on the 100% hold harmless requirement**

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.

In 2007-08, Maine had 21 Title Ia CIPS schools. Funds needed for evaluation and technical assistance were taken from 1003(a).
---

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

In 2007-2008, there were no actions taken for school improvement purposes that were supported with funds other than those provided by 1003 (a) or 1003 (g).

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

#### 1.4.9 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	7,046
Applied to transfer	N<10
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	N<10

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: This is the first year that any students in Title IA priority schools have utilized the choice option.</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	\$ 0
<b>Comments: None of the 6 students required transportation.</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	18
<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	2,113
Applied for supplemental educational services	110
Received supplemental educational services	103
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 124,224
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

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

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	55,161	52,890	95.9	2,271	4.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	7,193	6,921	96.2	272	3.8
Low-poverty schools	3,254	3,218	98.9	36	1.1
All elementary schools	19,955	19,340	96.9	615	3.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	5,212	4,887	93.8	325	6.2
Low-poverty schools	11,427	11,041	96.6	386	3.4
All secondary schools	35,206	33,550	95.3	1,656	4.7
<b>Comments:</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 State of Maine counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class.

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

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

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
<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	41.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	18.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	7.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other reasons why core academic classes taught by non-HQT: There are teachers who out of necessity are reassigned from content area in which they are HQT into content areas in which they are not HQT, then assigned a "Teacher Action Statement" and required to work toward HQT status to be retained.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	38.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	16.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	35.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	9.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	49.9	25.0
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	49.9	25.0
Poverty metric used	The percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch.	
<b>Comments: These are the same figures used each year. This error message came up last year also. There have been no change in the quartile breaks since the 2005-2006 school year.</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	French
Yes	Two-way immersion	French
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Passamaquoddy
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There is no additional response

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	4,606
<b>Comments:</b> No comments	

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

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

### 1.6.2.2 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.	3,907
<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
Somali	1,400
Spanish	561
French	342
Khmer	305
Chinese	269

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

Passamaquoddy 239

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	3,824
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	565
Total	4,389
<b>Comments: The 4606 is an unduplicated count of LEP for the entire year and 4389 is LEP enrollment during the testing cycle. Both numbers reflect LEP enrollment at different points in time. Data is getting better in order to verify ELLS who should be tested. For 20082009 testing cycle, the State ordered the Pre-ID labels to improve measures to ensure all ELLs are tested. High school students do not willingly participate, which makes it difficult to administer all domains because of absences and skipping class on test administration days. However, participation rates are being addressed through Maine's accountability process.</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.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	690
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	15.7
<b>Comments: Participation rates are being addressed through Maine's accountability process</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.

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,222
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	457
Total	3,679
<b>Comments: 3907 is the unduplicated count of Title III LEP for the entire school year and 3679 is the LEP enrollment during the testing cycle. The two numbers represent LEP enrollment at different points in time. For the 2008-2009 ELP assessment administration, the State ordered the PreID labels to improve measures to ensure all ELLs are tested. The Title III Director serves on the Maine Accountability Team to establish intervention methods to improve high school participation in all state assessments including the ELP assessment. Therefore, participation rates are being addressed through Maine's accountability process.</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:

- 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.**
- 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.**
- Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	1,881	51.0
ELP attainment	131	3.0
<b>Comments: No additional 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).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments: State offers tests in English only</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)
none
<b>Comments: No native language assessments are offered</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> No native language assessments are given

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> No native language assessments are given

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

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

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

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

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
N<10	N<10	N<10
<b>Comments: No additional comment</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
N<10	N<10	100.0	0
<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
N<10	N<10	100.0	0
<b>Comments: No additional comment</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
N<10	N<10	66.7	1
<b>Comments: No additional comment</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	12
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	8
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	8
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	11
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	11
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	0
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments: No additional comments</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> The state met AMAOs II and III but did not meet AMAO I	

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: No additional 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
431	151	1

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.

There is no additional response

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.	95
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	50

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.

NA

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	12	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	12	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	10	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	9	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	8	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	11	1,095
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	11	180
PD provided to principals	11	54
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	12	86
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	10	370
PD provided to community based organization personnel	8	212
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1,997</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No additional response

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

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

#### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	10/06/08	96
<b>Comments: Funds are not dispersed until LEAs have submitted Performance Reports and Applications are approved</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.

The process time is appropriate and requires this amount of time to ensure accountability of Title III programs and services.

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: Sources of Data: (1) Maine School Incidence of Prohibited Behavior Data (reported expulsions) collected during 2005-06, 2006-07 &amp; 2007-08 academic school years. (2) Maine Gun-Free Schools Reports collected during 2005-06, 2006-07 &amp; 2007-08 school years.</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	82.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	70.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	81.0
Black, non-Hispanic	80.0
Hispanic	70.0
White, non-Hispanic	81.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	70.0
Limited English proficient	82.0
Economically disadvantaged	69.0
Migratory students	50.0
Male	79.0
Female	84.0
<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	5.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5.9
Hispanic	6.6
White, non-Hispanic	5.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7.7
Limited English proficient	3.6
Economically disadvantaged	8.3
Migratory students	0.0
Male	5.8
Female	4.5
<b>Comments: This data has been verified.</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	178	173
LEAs with subgrants	3	3
Total	181	176
<b>Comments: This year districts under new Legislation reorganized from 200 to less than 100, which should streamline data collection. Until this reorganization is completed, we still have districts that don't have schools, and configurations which report in different ways. We are working with districts which have not been reporting and plan to ensure compliance.</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)	N<10	N<10
K	44	20
1	43	14
2	55	11
3	38	N<10
4	46	N<10
5	50	13
6	37	16
7	46	20
8	28	25
9	57	62
10	75	97
11	120	82
12	127	68
Ungraded	11	150
Total	784	595
<b>Comments: cross checked Maine's EDEN data with individual paper data from local homeless liaisons as Maine transitions to electronic data, missing data from one source was captured in the other format for final homeless youth numbers</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	187	323
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	492	242
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	38	10
Hotels/Motels	67	20
Total	784	595
<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)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	13
9	36
10	55
11	48
12	35
Ungraded	109
Total	302
<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	262
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	98
Limited English proficient students	0
<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	3
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	3
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	3
Transportation	2
Early childhood programs	0
Assistance with participation in school programs	3
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	1
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	3
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	3
Coordination between schools and agencies	3
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
School supplies	3
Referral to other programs and services	3
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	3
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

other includes employment, housing, recreation, and legal 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	1
School Selection	1
Transportation	2
School records	1
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	N<10	0
6	0	0
7	0	0
8	N<10	0
High School	N<10	N<10
<b>Comments: Maine subgrants serve unaccompanied youth grades 9-12. The high school assessment is the SAT. Data not collected on EDEN</b>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	N<10	0
6	0	0
7	N<10	0
8	0	0
High School	N<10	N<10
<b>Comments: Maine subgrants serve unaccompanied youth grades 9-12. The assessment for high school is the SAT</b>		

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

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

**Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.**

### FAQs on Child Count:

*How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.*

*How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)*

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<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)	21
K	16
1	21
2	26
3	23
4	28
5	33
6	24
7	25
8	20
9	37
10	16
11	14
12	11
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	0
Total	321
<b>Comments: The overall student count is lower than the original submission because the MEP Director determined that one COE was lacking sufficiently conclusive detail to verify eligibility. The MEP staff also revised the grade levels on three students after closer review of the data, which accounts for a one student increase in grade 4.</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.

There is slight decrease in Category 1 numbers this year, although it is less than 10%. There were fewer children attending the summer day school at the blueberry harvest, although with the implementation of an evening youth program, there was an increase in recruitment efforts for older children which offset the decrease evident at the day school.

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)	14
K	12
1	15
2	20
3	12
4	19
5	21
6	15
7	14
8	N<10
9	10
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	0
Total	161
<p><b>Comments: The overall number of students served is slightly less than that reported in December because the Category II count in December inadvertently included students served during the regular school year. The actual decreases are in grades 3 (-1), 8 (-2), 9 (-1), 10 (-1), 11 (-4), and ungraded (-1). Total is ten students. Grade 6 shows an increase of one student because closer review of the original data showed that one individual student was erroneously identified as "served", while another individual who was served was not calculated. The switch of these two individuals produced a one person increase in grade 6.</b></p>	

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.

There has been a slight increase (less than 10%) in the number of students served this year as a result of the initial implementation of an evening youth program during the blueberry harvest.

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.

The MEP used MIS2000 to generate the initial report for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts for 2007-2008. The child counts for the last reporting period 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.

How was the child count data collected?

Child count data were collected by state MEP staff and temporary recruiting staff.

What data were collected?

School information included:

Parent/guardian first and last name; current address; current phone number (if available); work phone number (if available); homebase address; homebase phone; state student ID (if applicable); student first/middle/last name; grade; birth date; gender; age; place of birth

Eligibility information:

QA Date; residency date; origin and destination of move; name of qualifying worker; relation to child; seek/obtain work; temporary/seasonal work; industry; specific activity; reason for temporary (if applicable); importance to livelihood; employer; additional comments (if applicable); signature of parent/guardian or eligible student (if qualifying worker) and signature of recruiter.

School information:

Homebase school; current school; date of enrollment.

For MEP programs:

type of services; total days enrolled; total days present; graduating; special services; withdrawal date; expected destination (if available); reason for withdrawal; school unit

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

Primary student data were collected on the COEs by MEP staff and temporary recruiters hired and trained by MEP staff for seasonal recruitment. One such temporary recruiter also participated in the two-day workshop provided to state MEP staff by MERC. The data were collected by means of personal interviews with parents and guardians during the blueberry harvest and broccoli harvest. One state recruiter, one state office-based temporary worker, and two additional temporary workers hired just for the blueberry harvest carried out the interviews. COE's were reviewed by MEP staff and in any case of incomplete data, recruiters returned to conduct follow-up interviews with workers. Information from completed COEs was entered into MIS2000 by the state MEP education specialist.

In some follow-up cases, data were collected by telephone interviews. These interviews were conducted by either state MEP staff or the same temporary staff mentioned above.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

Data were collected at the time of enrollment for MEP programs and upon identification of eligible workers during state-wide recruiting effort. Withdrawal data were collected at the time of outbound moves or, in the case of MEP programs, at the end of the program.

The same methods were used for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

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.

Child count data are inserted into MIS2000 by state staff at the time the student is enrolled, updated or withdrawn. Data are input by the MEP staff regardless of whether the information is collected by MEP staff or seasonal employees.

The report was generated to capture the population as defined in section 1.10.3.3.

The report included the following fields:

QA date; enrollment date; student ID; last name; last name2; first name; middle name; sex; birth date; age; grade; facility name; city, state code; withdrawal date; student seq; domid; dbid; sh seq.

This primary list of eligible students was compared to the data housed in the Maine state database (Infinite Campus) to identify eligible students who were enrolled in Maine schools for at least one day during the reporting period. The resultant matches formed the first portion of the population identified for the Category 1 count. Additionally, the primary list was compared to student attendance sheets for MEP funded programs. Any eligible student who participated for at least one day during the reporting period was assigned to the Category 1 count. The remaining list of eligible students generated from the primary list was then reviewed for evidence of residence within the state during the reporting period (for example, personal interview with recruiter). Any eligible students verified through this method were also assigned to the Category 1 count. Any student who appeared on the primary list as eligible during the reporting period and whose presence Data are updated by the MEP staff in Augusta based on information gathered either via follow-up phone calls to parents by MEP staff or trained temporary workers, or via personal interviews by state or seasonal recruiters.

The current state of data maintenance continues to be reviewed and revised. The concern reported in the 2006-2007 CSPR regarding the discrepancy between the MEP database (MIS2000) and the State of Maine education database (now Infinite Campus) and the classification of migrant eligible students continues to be addressed. Some improvement was achieved through direct communication with LEA's during the spring of 2008 to update MEP eligibility status, however the response from LEA's was not complete.

For the 2007-08 MEP data, MEP staff reviewed each record for the reporting period and cross-referenced with both summer attendance sheets and Infinite Campus to determine Category 1 and 2 counts, a process that was also utilized in the 2006-07 report. Migrant eligibility determinations are established by MEP staff and input to MIS2000 after review of the COE. Currently, LEA's indicate migrant eligibility in the state database, Infinite Campus. Infinite Campus data is used to populate most ED Facts reports, however any Migrant related data that is sent to ED Facts is taken from MIS2000 and aligned with student data in Infinite Campus to ensure data integrity and reliability. The population determined "migrant eligible" by the LEA's in Infinite Campus is still not consistent with the MEP's identified population in MIS2000. With the transition to a new state database, new steps are being developed and will be considered for modifying the method of "flagging" MEP eligible students. Given that eligibility determinations are made by the state MEP staff, efforts will be made to explore the possibility of shifting the responsibility of maintaining that data to the state staff in a manner consistent with state protocol and with respect for local control issues.

In addition to reconciling these two conflicting databases, MEP continues to improve data collection and management procedures including:

Revising and clarifying data collection tools and procedures for the MEP and participating LEA's;

Review of data elements (definitions & management) in MIS2000;

Developing a schedule of regular data maintenance;

Building on the communications with LEA's to increase the accuracy and time relevance of student data.

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 Category 2 data were collected and maintained in the same manner as Category 1 data. Category 2 data were verified before submission to ED by comparison checks with summer program attendance sheets and LEA progress reports.

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

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEP used MIS2000 to generate the initial report for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts for 2007-2008. The report produced a complete list of all students eligible during the reporting period.

The QA Date was entered as between 9/1/04 and 8/31/08. Twentysecond birthday was after the end date.

Age was calculated as of 8/31/08. Children under the age of 3 or over the age of 21 were not included in either Category 1 or Category 2 counts. Grade was based on reported grade during summer program for Canadian residents and enrollment date as of 8/31/08 for Maine enrolled students.

The initial report contained all enrollments for all students, which produced multiple entries on the Excel spreadsheet for some individuals. Any multiple enrollments were manually deleted from the Excel file by MEP staff and only the most recent enrollment was included in the count. Additionally, MEP staff reviewed the full list for similar names and birthdates to ensure that students were not replicated under like names. As with the 2006-2007 Category 1 count, the MEP staff requested that State data staff run a match report to compare MIS2000 data with State education data to verify which students enrolled for at least one day in Maine schools during the reporting period. Additionally, MEP staff reviewed attendance sheets for summer and school year MEP programs and verified student presence in the state for at least one day and participation in MEP-funded programs. MEP staff reviewed COE's of students enrolled during the reporting period to verify presence in the state based on QAD.

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.

The Category 2 count used the same system as the Category 1, with emphasis placed on review of attendance sheets.

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.

During the 2008 Blueberry Harvest School (BHS), four seasonal recruiters received 5 hours of on-site training prior to beginning recruiting efforts. One of these recruiters was a returning employee in this capacity, three were new positions. One subsequently quit after the training period. Modified training materials from the 2007 BHS recruiter training and the July training session with MERC for state MEP staff were used in the 2008 Blueberry Harvest recruiter training. Additionally, one state recruiter and one temporary staff person from Augusta assisted the seasonal recruiters in the field. Training sessions were carried out by the state director, state recruiter, and education specialist.

On-site training included:

- ? What is the Migrant Education Program?
- ? Basic migrant child eligibility factors, including PMOL, temporary and seasonal work;
- ? Qualifying Agricultural , Fishing or Forestry Activity;
- ? Recruitment Procedures;
- ? Recruiting tips: Before and After the interview;
- ? Sample COE completion.

The SEA uses a standard, triplicate COE to collect consistent data on eligible students. The COE is signed by both recruiter and parent and verified by either the state director or education specialist. A copy is available for parents and LEA's and the original is filed at the state MEP office.

COE's completed via personal interview during the 2008 Blueberry Harvest School were reviewed by either the state recruiter, temporary staff, education specialist, or the state director. If any information seemed unclear or incomplete the recruiters returned to the field to follow-up with the workers and obtain additional clarifying information. In the event that questions were identified after the close of the Blueberry Harvest School, state MEP staff followed-up with telephone calls to workers to obtain clarification. In the event that clarification could not be obtained and there was no prior complete eligibility documentation, the students were not included in the child count.

During the spring of 2008, three temporary staff were trained to complete follow-up interviews for school surveys and reinterviews for COE's from the 2007 Blueberry Harvest School (see next item). They attempted 249 follow-up calls for school surveys and were able to make contact with 201 families. Of the contacted families, 176 were not eligible for MEP services and 19 were found eligible. Twelve families requested that they not be contacted for services or follow-up. Seventeen families did not sign the completed COE's. The Maine MEP currently requires that the person interviewed for the COE sign the document before it is entered into MIS2000. Follow-up on unsigned COE's is underway.

Since July of 2007, all COE's are reviewed by either the education specialist or the state MEP director. In cases of ambiguous or incomplete data or eligibility questions, COE's are forwarded to the state director. The director then determines eligibility/ineligibility (in cases of complete information) or whether a follow-up interview is necessary to gather more information. Follow-up interviews are carried out by the state recruiter, the education specialist, a trained temporary staff person, or the director.

Questions of eligibility are discussed at the state level and doubts or ambiguous situations are referred to the OME Program Officer. One of the state recruiters attended the 2007 ID&R Forum to update skills and knowledge. Both state recruiters and the state director attended the 2008 ID&R Forum with the same purpose.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MEP hired temporary staff in February 2008 to conduct reinterviews for participants in the 2007 summer blueberry harvest program. The staff received 5 hours of training including conducting "mock" interviews with MEP staff. The temporary staff used a telephone script and sample COE to collect student and family information, with particular emphasis given to clarifying Principle Means of Livelihood. The Temporary staff were able to direct questions to the state staff as needed. Of a total of 107 COE's reviewed, the temporary staff were able to make contact with representatives for 89. The breakdown of the reinterviewing effort is as follows:  
18 COE's had no active phone numbers (in some cases, MEP staff were able to communicate with the schools indicated on the COE but unable to locate the families);  
60 interviews were completed, including two that required interpretation by MEP staff. Four of the 60 resulted in new, updated COE's and one was determined ineligible based on PMOL;  
25 attempts resulted in no response (multiple messages were left but no contact was established);  
2 required interpretation services and were not completed due to failure to locate interpreter services;  
2 contacts expressed an unwillingness to cooperate with staff to complete the reinterview.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Maine MEP is still renewing and developing it's data management procedures. During the reporting period, information was entered into MIS2000 directly from the COE's following review and verification by state staff. Any questions on individual COE's were investigated by the state director, education specialist, state recruiters, or temporary staff with oversight from state MEP staff.

Efforts were started in August of 2008 to improve program use of the MIS2000 software. These efforts include training with Pennsylvania MIS2000 administrators, updating appearance and functionality of software with contractor, and improved data collection and input at the SEA.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state MEP staff created a master list of eligible and present students based on the criteria outlined in section 1.10.3.3. The state MEP staff reviewed each individual student record for accuracy. Prior to submission, any cases of students with lingering questions as to eligibility were either clarified through follow-up interviews and/or additional data collection or removed from the child count.

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.

- ? Conduct random re-interviews.
- ? Expand recruiting efforts at blueberry harvest and state-wide.
- ? Continue new collaborative effort with state of New York to complete state-wide recruitment "sweep".
- ? Expand on-site recruiter training for 2009 Blueberry Harvest School.
- ? Continue improvements to MIS2000 usage and data input, in conjunction with software contractor and Pennsylvania staff.
- ? Continue data review with state Data Management Team to streamline data collection process and minimize discrepancies between MEP database (MIS2000) and state database (Infinite Campus).

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In general, the quality of the data housed in MIS2000 for the Maine MEP has improved during this past year. There has been concerted effort to refine the filing system so that the electronic data can be easily verified with reference to original documents and vice versa. There has been a protocol established for maintaining records and this protocol is documented and also stored for immediate reference in the filing drawers. Any individual may access the files and find a clear explanation of the system for both reference and implementation. However, staff are still learning the intricacies and potential of the database, MIS2000, and there are data elements that still need to be collected, such as clear indicators of residence. Upon the advice of OME Program Officers, the MEP staff have sought technical assistance with MIS2000 and are working with data managers in Migrant Education and the software company itself to refine our system and improve the collection of data and thereby the overall performance capabilities of the software. In terms of the accuracy of reported data for 2007-2008, MEP staff have utilized supplemental methods (described above) to ensure that the counts submitted are correct. The goal is to improve the collection and maintenance of data so that future reports can be generated directly from MIS2000 with less need for additional, record-by-record, manual verification efforts.

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