

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

MICHIGAN



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:
Michigan Department of Education

Address:
PO Box 30008
Lansing MI 48909

Person to contact about this report:

Name: MaryAlice Galloway

Telephone: 517-241-4185

Fax: 517-335-4565

e-mail: gallowaym@michigan.gov

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

Friday, April 3, 2009, 2:55:32 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 or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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.

No revisions or changes to assessments taken or planned.

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.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.

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	885,429	844,519	95.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,364	7,823	93.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	22,097	21,468	97.2
Black, non-Hispanic	169,387	163,697	96.6
Hispanic	39,036	38,558	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	638,992	605,448	94.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	122,126	114,418	93.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,184	27,211	93.2
Economically disadvantaged students	337,308	326,845	96.9
Migratory students	1,659	1,649	99.4
Male	452,548	431,811	95.4
Female	432,278	412,708	95.5
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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	47,968	41.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	44,958	39.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	21,492	18.8

Total	114,418	
Comments: Data have been checked.		

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	885,094	839,935	94.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,358	7,780	93.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	22,097	20,989	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	169,375	162,522	96.0
Hispanic	38,748	38,083	98.3
White, non-Hispanic	638,992	603,066	94.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	122,126	113,703	93.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,184	25,983	89.0
Economically disadvantaged students	337,308	324,440	96.2
Migratory students	1,620	1,609	99.3
Male	452,548	429,210	94.8
Female	432,278	410,725	95.0
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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	58,564	51.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	32,186	28.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	22,953	20.2
Total	113,703	
Comments: Data have been checked.		

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	370,030	360,639	97.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,368	3,272	97.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,880	8,783	98.9
Black, non-Hispanic	72,580	67,612	93.2
Hispanic	15,244	14,808	97.1
White, non-Hispanic	267,167	263,399	98.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,159	47,671	95.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,762	9,537	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	133,410	128,584	96.4
Migratory students	587	582	99.1
Male	188,924	183,268	97.0
Female	181,924	177,371	97.5
Comments: All students includes multiracial students.			

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	17,385	36.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	21,683	45.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,603	18.0
Total	47,671	
Comments: Data have been checked.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	118,339	106,372	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,089	982	90.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,241	3,130	96.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,610	18,009	76.3
Hispanic	6,213	5,293	85.2
White, non-Hispanic	82,854	77,760	93.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,625	12,079	77.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,590	4,644	83.1
Economically disadvantaged students	50,829	42,540	83.7
Migratory students	281	237	84.3
Male	60,682	54,603	90.0
Female	57,657	51,769	89.8
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	117,922	95,388	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,083	861	79.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,151	2,841	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,522	15,775	67.1
Hispanic	6,153	4,378	71.2
White, non-Hispanic	82,686	70,476	85.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,583	9,081	58.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,388	3,417	63.4
Economically disadvantaged students	50,613	36,096	71.3
Migratory students	281	182	64.8
Male	60,431	47,277	78.2
Female	57,491	48,111	83.7
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

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

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

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	118,749	101,746	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,086	924	85.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,321	3,142	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,539	16,235	69.0
Hispanic	6,110	4,842	79.2
White, non-Hispanic	83,421	75,525	90.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,924	11,479	67.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,585	3,399	74.1
Economically disadvantaged students	49,917	38,529	77.2
Migratory students	263	212	80.6
Male	61,066	52,295	85.6
Female	57,683	49,451	85.7
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 4			
All students	118,323	90,450	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,084	809	74.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,215	2,774	86.3
Black, non-Hispanic	23,441	13,372	57.0
Hispanic	6,038	3,904	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	83,282	68,619	82.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,867	8,562	50.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,360	2,163	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	49,690	31,892	64.2
Migratory students	256	151	59.0
Male	60,844	44,672	73.4
Female	57,479	45,778	79.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

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

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

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	119,145	88,444	74.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,092	748	68.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,235	2,901	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,419	12,096	51.7
Hispanic	5,730	3,574	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	84,473	68,258	80.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,439	8,650	49.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,046	2,212	54.7
Economically disadvantaged students	49,310	30,061	61.0
Migratory students	283	167	59.0
Male	60,956	45,752	75.1
Female	58,189	42,692	73.4
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	118,182	91,787	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,085	802	73.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,151	2,699	85.7
Black, non-Hispanic	23,234	13,682	58.9
Hispanic	5,627	3,596	63.9
White, non-Hispanic	83,895	70,084	83.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,322	8,550	49.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,862	1,736	45.0
Economically disadvantaged students	48,832	32,029	65.6
Migratory students	274	125	45.6
Male	60,431	45,160	74.7
Female	57,751	46,627	80.7
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 5			
All students	118,895	96,349	81.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,089	877	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,224	2,857	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	23,344	13,584	58.2
Hispanic	5,712	3,933	68.9
White, non-Hispanic	84,333	74,133	87.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,333	10,550	60.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,019	2,127	52.9
Economically disadvantaged students	49,147	33,917	69.0
Migratory students	277	154	55.6
Male	60,808	49,216	80.9
Female	58,087	47,133	81.1
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	121,070	88,218	72.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,143	795	69.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,027	2,701	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,872	11,556	48.4
Hispanic	5,606	3,472	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	86,298	68,876	79.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,689	7,193	43.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,625	1,860	51.3
Economically disadvantaged students	48,380	28,400	58.7
Migratory students	239	136	56.9
Male	61,931	44,920	72.5
Female	59,139	43,298	73.2
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	119,960	95,630	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,126	885	78.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,953	2,633	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	23,682	14,131	59.7
Hispanic	5,518	3,849	69.8
White, non-Hispanic	85,561	73,256	85.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,519	8,214	49.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,381	1,811	53.6
Economically disadvantaged students	47,804	32,478	67.9
Migratory students	230	145	63.0
Male	61,329	46,736	76.2
Female	58,631	48,894	83.4
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

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

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

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	125,113	90,857	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,226	835	68.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,061	2,700	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	24,884	12,116	48.7
Hispanic	5,807	3,533	60.8
White, non-Hispanic	89,104	70,962	79.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,241	6,757	39.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,839	1,952	50.8
Economically disadvantaged students	48,872	28,633	58.6
Migratory students	275	154	56.0
Male	64,520	45,996	71.3
Female	60,593	44,861	74.0
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	124,641	92,969	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,226	869	70.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,004	2,553	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	24,707	12,495	50.6
Hispanic	5,731	3,579	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	88,947	72,693	81.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,175	7,272	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,665	1,614	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	48,556	29,296	60.3
Migratory students	265	133	50.2
Male	64,232	45,241	70.4
Female	60,409	47,728	79.0
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	126,101	90,509	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,245	846	68.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,856	2,537	88.8
Black, non-Hispanic	25,711	11,873	46.2
Hispanic	5,355	3,208	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	89,983	71,402	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,260	6,995	40.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,405	1,758	51.6
Economically disadvantaged students	47,399	26,999	57.0
Migratory students	227	131	57.7
Male	64,861	46,459	71.6
Female	61,240	44,050	71.9
Comments:			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	125,627	94,901	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,239	871	70.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,798	2,406	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	25,536	14,215	55.7
Hispanic	5,299	3,337	63.0
White, non-Hispanic	89,804	73,328	81.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,181	7,553	44.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,243	1,457	44.9
Economically disadvantaged students	47,122	29,632	62.9
Migratory students	223	115	51.6
Male	64,593	45,172	69.9
Female	61,034	49,729	81.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 8			
All students	125,765	98,903	78.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,242	963	77.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,850	2,481	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	25,570	13,747	53.8
Hispanic	5,339	3,560	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	89,807	77,411	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,105	8,376	49.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,385	1,664	49.2
Economically disadvantaged students	47,208	30,664	65.0
Migratory students	224	123	54.9
Male	64,664	50,395	77.9
Female	61,101	48,508	79.4
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	116,002	54,188	46.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	942	341	36.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,727	1,836	67.3
Black, non-Hispanic	18,662	2,859	15.3
Hispanic	3,737	1,078	28.8
White, non-Hispanic	89,315	47,809	53.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,240	2,801	21.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,121	400	18.9
Economically disadvantaged students	32,138	8,787	27.3
Migratory students	81	12	14.8
Male	57,795	28,746	49.7
Female	58,207	25,442	43.7
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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	115,280	61,116	53.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	937	437	46.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,717	1,721	63.3
Black, non-Hispanic	18,400	4,596	25.0
Hispanic	3,717	1,177	31.7
White, non-Hispanic	88,891	52,886	59.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,056	3,393	26.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,084	273	13.1
Economically disadvantaged students	31,823	10,625	33.4
Migratory students	80	12	15.0
Male	57,350	27,861	48.6
Female	57,930	33,255	57.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# 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
High School			
All students	115,927	77,411	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	941	485	51.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,732	1,824	66.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,644	4,347	23.3
Hispanic	3,746	1,354	36.1
White, non-Hispanic	89,243	57,479	64.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,233	3,512	26.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,123	341	16.1
Economically disadvantaged students	32,094	11,790	36.7
Migratory students	81	14	17.3
Male	57,767	33,850	58.6
Female	58,160	31,969	55.0
Comments:			

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

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

1.4 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	4,039	2,951	73.1
Districts	837	756	90.3
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,914	1,629	85.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	880	680	77.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,034	949	91.8
Comments: Data have been checked.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
740	721	97.4
Comments: Data have been checked.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	12
Extension of the school year or school day	1
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	7
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	9
Comments:	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	39
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	43
Comments:	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools that used: Turn around specialists-47; Governing Board-3; Schools of Choice-1; Reform model-10.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2007 2008 School Year, Michigan had no districts in phases of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

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	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
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)	
Comments: No Michigan districts were in Corrective Action in 2007-08.	

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	149	131
Schools	647	387
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	08/15/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	25,477	28,701
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	8,354	8,027
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	32.8	28.0
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	9,803	10,604
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	38.5	36.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	96	
Comments: The reported number of students enrolled are those enrolled in grade levels tested (3-8 and 11).		

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	21
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	13
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	73
Comments:	

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

1.4.8.3 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
<p>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.</p>	<p>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>	<p>Number of schools in which the strategy (s) was used</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</p>	<p>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</p>	<p>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</p>	<p>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</p>
<p>6 = Combo 1 2</p>	<p>Schools not making AYP for reasons of proficiency must participate in the Title I Statewide System of Support. This includes mentors, coaches, academies, professional development, and partnerships. Additionally, schools not making AYP for reasons of proficiency in Phase 3 and above are allocated a subgrant to address the reasons the school did not make AYP. Strategies 1,2,3,4,and 5 are applied.</p>	<p>96</p>			<p>D</p>	<p>It is not possible to isolate one variable from a multiple of variables used for school improvement. We are unable to determine an exact number directly related to one strategy</p>
<p>Comments:</p>						

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.

We have used the following media to share:

1. Our Regional Service Areas who have Title I schools not making AYP meet quarterly to share issues and successes
2. All schools have access to effective strategies through our school improvement website, which links to North Central Association/AdvancED research. this information is available online.
3. Schools are invited to State School Improvement Conferences, where effective strategies are shared. Schools that have come "off the list" are recognized, and some have been asked to present the practices they used to other conference goers.
4. Field Services consultants are assigned to all Title I schools. During onsite visits, they share how other schools are implementing best practices
5. Schools not making AYP for proficiency in Phases 1 and above are assigned a mentor team to assist with implementing the school improvement plan. Mentors assist a school in choosing and implementing best practices that relate to the reasons not making AYP
6. All schools have access to the Michigan School Improvement Framework, which lists best practices in the areas of leadership, data and information management, teaching for learning, personnel and professional learning, and school and community relations. This document can be accessed online.
7. All schools have access to a comprehensive needs assessment, which provides a rubric where a school can measure its efforts against the best practices described in the Michigan School Improvement Framework (see description above, number 6). This document can be accessed online
8. MDE staff presents at statewide and regional conferences to share best practices. Target audiences have included local superintendents, principals, teachers, and boards of education
9. MDE is partnering with a variety of professional organizations within the state to develop local capacity. One example is working with Calhoun Intermediate School District, which developed a program of professional development around the interpretation of student data. We are offering this program statewide to districts using their expertise.
10. Schools in AYP Phase 3 or above for reasons of proficiency receive a leadership coach. The role of the coach is to assist the building leadership team in dealing with building issues that impede the implementation of the building school improvement plan. Strategies shared are reflected in the School Improvement Framework.
11. Schools in Phase 3 or above receiving a leadership coach also have the principal, coach and leadership attend an academy that focuses on aligning resources and systems in the building so the school improvement plan might be implemented. Best practices of instructional leadership are emphasized.

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: %

Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Section 1003(g)(8) funds, in the amount of \$4.2 million, have been awarded through a competitive grant process. The Title I Accountability Grant serves as an enhancement to the Michigan Statewide System of Support, providing Phase I and II schools with site based data and instructional coaches, targeting sub group population achievement. The Michigan Department of Education, Office of School Improvement, is working collaboratively with the grant recipient to ensure program implementation in SY 2008-09.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Michigan Department of Education's Statewide System of Support for Title I high priority schools has introduced supports positioned to assist schools in returning to Phase 0.

Beginning in 2007-2008, MDE launched a broad initiative focused on Title I high priority schools. "High priority" is any school in Phase 1 or greater not making AYP. The focus of the broad initiative spotlights schools not making AYP for reasons of proficiency (one or more subgroups not reaching the target in English Language Arts or mathematics) The system as a whole is described as the Statewide System of Support (SSOS) for Title I schools.

The Statewide System of Support begins with personalized visits by a Process Mentor Team. The team help the staff review its school improvement plan, set short term instructional goals, and help keep the spotlight on student achievement. As schools move into higher phases, the focus intensifies. Program auditors visit in Phase 3, reviewing the progress of the school in relation to the School Improvement Framework Benchmarks. Also in Phase 3, principals attend a principal fellowship and are assigned a leadership coach. A complete description by phase is on the following page.

Intermediate School Districts (ISDs) and Regional Service Agencies (RESAs) are significant partners in the SSOS. ISDs with high priority Title I schools within their service areas are awarded funds to assist with school needs. Working with local districts, ISDs examine school improvement initiatives within their regions. Support to locals is based on need, including attention to the content areas, data, and working with special populations.

The MDE continues to support statewide initiatives such as the School Improvement Framework, the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, and the School Improvement planning process. All SSOS activities are directly connected to the statewide initiatives.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	74,221
Applied to transfer	312
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	201

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

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

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 251,563
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	40
Comments: 1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA were in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. 2. LEA only had a single school at the grade level of the school at which students were eligible for public school choice. 3. In both of the instances above, neighboring or contiguous LEAs rarely choose to accept public school choice transfer students. 4. Michigan has had schools of choice legislation in place since 1996. Many families have made a choice prior to the release of AYP information, and choose not to transfer based on AYP phase/performance. This is particularly true with public school academies, especially those that operate as alternative schools. Quite often the only choice these families have is a return to the district of residence, which is often not a viable option due to #1 & #2 above.	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	51,069
Applied for supplemental educational services	16,044
Received supplemental educational services	16,044
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 17,705,565
Comments:	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	221,778	218,731	98.6	3,047	1.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	16,311	16,267	99.7	44	0.3
Low-poverty schools	12,748	12,720	99.8	28	0.2
All elementary schools	55,721	55,634	99.8	87	0.2
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	24,730	24,254	98.1	476	1.9
Low-poverty schools	56,858	55,968	98.4	890	1.6
All secondary schools	166,057	163,097	98.2	2,960	1.8
Comments: The October 2007 change in how we identify our secondary special education teachers as Highly Qualified has resulted in a greater number of non-HQTs at the secondary level. We continue to assist LEAs and special education teachers to demonstrate competency in the core subject areas.					

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.

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
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	5.0
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	24.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	61.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the 87 total elementary classes taught by non-HQTs, 21 are identified as special education classes. The 24% given above is based upon data we have collected. We estimate that less than 10 teachers were teaching out-of-field (not fully certified) during the 2007-2008 school year and less than 5 teachers were unable to utilize the subject-knowledge test or HOUSSE options. The remaining teachers are believed to be unclear of the requirements of NCLB and how to demonstrate competency.

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)	1.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	75.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	5.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	19.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Of the total 2,960 secondary classes taught by non-HQTs, 2,231 are in special education. That accounts for 76% of the classes and is based upon data we have collected. Of the remaining 712 classes, we estimate that less than 150 were taught by teachers in out-of-field placements (not fully certified) during the 2007-2008 school year. Less than 30 assignments are estimated to have been taught by teachers who were unable to utilize the subject-knowledge test or HOUSSE options. The remaining teachers are believed to be unclear of the requirements of NCLB and how to demonstrate competency.

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	63.6	21.6
Poverty metric used	Percent of students eligible for free and reduced price school meals.	
Secondary schools	53.1	19.2
Poverty metric used	Percent of students eligible for free and reduced price school meals.	
Comments: This file is being resubmitted with separate quartiles for elementary and secondary on March 12, 2009.		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish; Finnish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish; Arabic; Chaldean
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish; Vietnamese; German; Russian; Arabic; Chaldean; Portuguese; Albanian; Chinese; Hmong
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish; Arabic; Ojibwe
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 Response	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	74,700
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.	64,922
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	20,225
Arabic	9,825
Chaldean	1,627
Albanian	1,204
Japanese	1,201

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

Bengali -1153; Chinese -960; Vietnamese -887; Korean -753; Hmong -613; Urdu -510; Romanian -468; German -434; Russian -366; Telugu -365; Bosnian -332; French -317; Croatian -302; Hindi -296; Tagalog -277; Polish -224; Punjabi -217; Gujarati -213; Laotian -183; Tamil -154; Portuguese -132; Malayalam -125; Serbian -121; Khmer -110; Farsi -106

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	76,322
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	76,322
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	19,403
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	25.4
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	67,174
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	67,174
Comments: .	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	30,868	78.0
ELP attainment	18,356	29.0
Comments: For Making Progress, 39,672 students were matched from 2008 to 2007. Of the 39,672 students, 30,868 made progress (30,868 / 39,672 = 78%). Of the 62,971 Title III students tested, 18,356 attained English language proficiency (18,356 / 62,971 = 29%).		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: State offers video versions of the mathematics and science assessments in Spanish and Arabic.	

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
Arabic
Comments: There are video versions of the assessment questions read in Spanish or Arabic for mathematics.

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)
Comments: No native language reading/language arts tests 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)
Spanish
Arabic
Comments: There are video versions of the science tests read in Spanish or Arabic.

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

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
8,288	1,455	9,743
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
Comments: As these are new data elements being requested this year, these elements are still being examined and will be provided to the OELA office at a later date.			

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
Comments: As these are new data elements being requested this year, these elements are still being examined and will be provided to the OELA office at a later date.			

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
Comments: As these are new data elements being requested this year, these elements are still being examined and will be provided to the OELA office at a later date.			

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	100
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	73
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	77
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	100
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	96
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	13
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 200708)	0
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
11,052	3,204	111

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.

Although the number of students actually funded is low in comparison to the total number of reported students, the old criteria and the wide disbursement of students led to this situation. With the criteria adopted and applicable to the 2008-09 school year, it is anticipated that the disparity will be reduced in the next report.

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.	606
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	75

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	42	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	45	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	35	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	21	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	15	
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	40	2,778
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	43	483
PD provided to principals	30	398
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	25	432

PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	34	762
PD provided to community based organization personnel	13	340
Total		5,193

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	01/04/08	135
Comments:		

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

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

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

Beginning with the 08-09 school year, calculations are based on information collected in SRSD/MSDS (statewide data systems) and information about the number of students tested. By utilizing this electronic information, allocations should be available to LEAs in August, following receipt of the federal allocation.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: For the 2007-08 school year no schools were identified as persistently dangerous.	

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	75.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	56.4
Hispanic	57.8
White, non-Hispanic	81.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	61.0
Limited English proficient	69.7
Economically disadvantaged	57.0
Migratory students	57.0
Male	71.1
Female	80.1

Comments: With the reporting of SY 2006-07 graduation and dropout rates, Michigan is now able to report sub-groups based on the NGA's four-year cohort. Our Pacific Islander students were collected and reported as a separate sub-group from our Asian students. As well, Multiracial students were tabulated and reported as a separate sub-group. The graduation rates for these sub-groups are as follows: Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 77.7% Multiracial, 69.0%

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	7.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	10.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.5
Black, non-Hispanic	17.6
Hispanic	12.0
White, non-Hispanic	4.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8.8
Limited English proficient	7.5
Economically disadvantaged	10.9
Migratory students	5.4
Male	8.8
Female	6.6
Comments: These preliminary data were tabulated utilizing the NCES/CCD event dropout methodology. Our Pacific Islander students were collected and reported as a separate sub-group from our Asian students. As well, Multiracial students were tabulated and reported as a separate sub-group. The dropout rates for these sub-groups are as follows: Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 8.8% Multiracial, 8.1%	

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	375	101
LEAs with subgrants	457	453
Total	832	554
Comments: Fifteen (15) of Michigan's 31 subgrantees are Intermediate School Districts (ISDs), representing multiple LEAs. Other subgrantees also include smaller consortia of LEAs. The total number of LEAs represented within MI subgrants is 457.		

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)	10	1,548
K	140	1,043
1	447	1,085
2	152	1,024
3	131	1,003
4	118	937
5	105	1,100
6	224	811
7	100	798
8	301	1,474
9	182	1,101
10	122	920
11	114	918
12	124	1,996
Ungraded	51	356
Total	2,321	16,114

Comments: The current year (2007-2008) is the first year that ALL Michigan LEAs were required to report identified homeless students and their nighttime residence in the Single Record Student Database (SRSD) system. The current compliance rate is 67% for 2007-08. Based on the discrepancies in counts between LEAs with and without subgrants, additional technical assistance and training will be provided to non-subgrantees on eligibility, identification and reporting of homeless children and youth.

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	361	5,265
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,109	5,925
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	167	1,310
Hotels/Motels	57	681
Total	1,694	13,181

Comments: Based on the discrepancies in counts between LEAs with and without subgrants, additional technical assistance and training will be provided to non-subgrantees on eligibility, identification and reporting of homeless students. Grade-level data do not match the Nighttime Residence count totals or achievement totals due to inadequacies of the student data system and inconsistencies in reporting by district personnel. A new data system will begin for the 2009-10 school year.

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,527
K	1,002
1	1,048
2	989
3	964
4	907
5	1,074
6	794
7	780
8	1,448
9	1,063
10	889
11	889
12	1,952
Ungraded	356
Total	15,682

Comments: Michigan's 31 subgrantees serve approximately 55% of the State's LEAs (including Public School Academies/Charter Schools). The "Ungraded" category was significantly low in reporting counts for 2007-08. Definitions of all categories, particularly "Ungraded," will be clarified and shared in technical assistance and training to liaisons in all LEAs. Grade level data do not match the nighttime residence count totals or achievement totals due to inadequacies of the student data system and inconsistencies in reporting by district personnel. A new data system will begin for the 2009-10 school year.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts 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	3,606
Migratory children/youth	91
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,784
Limited English proficient students	290

Comments: "Unaccompanied Youth" are not currently tracked in the SRSD system by non-subgrantees. The State EHCY Program will request manual reporting for 2008-09, and work toward including the item in the mandated SRSD reporting for 2009-2010.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts 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	308
Expedited evaluations	163
Staff professional development and awareness	349
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	322
Transportation	426
Early childhood programs	177
Assistance with participation in school programs	349
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	322
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	276
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	349
Coordination between schools and agencies	236
Counseling	263
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	367
Clothing to meet a school requirement	367
School supplies	367
Referral to other programs and services	276
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	426
Other (optional – in comment box below)	44
Other (optional – in comment box below)	15
Other (optional – in comment box below)	15

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Other categories above are for Housing, Food, and Graduation caps & gowns, respectively. Other options are: Recreation Activities (15), Personal Hygiene Items (15), Auto Repair (15), and Credit Recovery Support (15).

Significant increases in numbers reported in this section represent the inclusion of data from ALL of the 453 reporting LEAs represented by the 31 subgrantees in MI.

Other services provided include housing crisis support, food assistance, graduation caps & gowns, sports/recreational activity fees, personal hygiene items, transportation assistance (auto repair), and credit recovery support.

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	161
School Selection	117
Transportation	278
School records	88
Immunizations	73
Other medical records	29
Other Barriers – in comment box below	161

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Significant increases in numbers reported in this section represent the inclusion of data from ALL of the 453 reporting LEAs represented by the 31 subgrantees in MI.

Eight (8) of the 31 subgrantees reported "No barriers" were faced in their LEAs by homeless children and youth, and indicated that their EHCY programs had worked to eliminate these, so they reported "0." Five (5) other LEAs reported only "Transportation" remained a barrier for homeless children and youth in their districts. It may be that the definition of this category needs clarification to subgrantees, or that their programs have actually eradicated the other barriers for such students. A narrative will be added to subgrantee report categories for the 2008-09 grant year.

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	523	401
4	626	388
5	588	334
6	577	315
7	646	293
8	704	302
High School	909	401
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	613	436
4	647	379
5	606	274
6	581	231
7	647	275
8	606	223
High School	881	356
Comments: There is still a gap between the number of homeless children and youth reported and the number of same taking the State Reading and Math assessments. The SRSD system was to have required a data submission for the "Homeless" field, but subgrantees report that numerous districts resist identifying students as homeless at the families' request to avoid stigma of such classification. More specific training needs to be implemented for district liaisons in subgrantee districts (and non-subgrantees), as well as better data coordination at the SEA level for the current 2008-09 grant cycle. Grade level data do not match the nighttime residence count totals or achievement totals due to inadequacies of the student data system and inconsistencies in reporting by district personnel. A new data system will begin for the 2009-10 school year. With a full-time EHCY State Coordinator now employed by the SEA, LEA training and technical assistance will become a priority task.		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,181
K	605
1	586
2	536
3	460
4	444
5	440
6	405
7	424
8	354
9	395
10	283
11	233
12	112
Ungraded	240
Out-of-school	272
Total	6,970
Comments: xx	

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.

A survey of Michigan's local Migrant Programs identifies the following reasons for a decline in numbers of eligible migrant students for 2007-2008. These are listed in order of decreasing impact:

- Migrant families settling out of the migrant stream
- Decreasing number of farms that employ migrant labor
- Farmers hiring single men and not families
- Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids
- Unavailability of migrant housing
- Farmers switching to crops that do not require manual labor
- Migrants finding better paying jobs away from agriculture
- Infestations and weather affecting crops
- Farms converting to "Pick Your Own"
- Less migrants working longer hours
- Secondary students staying at home base to maintain credits
- Re-Interview process is intimidating
- Gasoline prices
- Unavailability of contracted workers from Mexico
- Dairy farms affected by Bovine TB quarantine
- Smaller migrant families

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	668
K	388
1	385
2	358
3	303
4	280
5	256
6	208
7	199
8	130
9	128
10	87
11	67
12	N<10
Ungraded	127
Out-of-school	39
Total	3,631
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The same reasons apply as in 1.10.1.1.

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.

Michigan used the Migrant Education Database System (MEDS) to generate the 2007-2008 Category 1 child count and Category 2 child count. The MEDS is an online web-based custom system. This system replaces one used by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) for the seven years prior to 2005-06.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MDE uses the same system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

Each local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries to identify and recruit new families. In areas of the state where there are no local migrant programs, the MDE funds four state-wide identification and recruitment projects to survey those areas.

In all cases, the recruiter interviews the families to determine eligibility. If the family is deemed eligible, a paper Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for that family. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The local migrant program director, or state-wide area director, review the COE for accuracy and completeness. The director signs the form if s(he) finds that the COE is accurate and the family is eligible.

The 2007-2008 MEDS data was collected between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008. The MEDS consolidates data from the individual programs. Data are now collected on an on-going basis. Since the MEDS is web-based, data are entered real-time. Data are organized in a relational database.

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.

Once eligibility is verified, data-entry personnel enter the data from the paper COE into the MEDS. This electronic version of the COE is sent to the local migrant director. The local migrant director reviews the electronic COE and forwards it to the MDE for approval. At the MDE, one of two contracted staff reviews the electronic COE for accuracy and eligibility. This is their primary job responsibility. If the electronic COE is incomplete or inaccurate it is returned to the local migrant program for corrections. Once the electronic COE is deemed complete and accurate it is approved by the MDE.

Enrollment and attendance data is updated on the MEDS if a student moves before the end of the term or school year. Typically, regular term enrollment/attendance information is obtained from the attendance office at the school where the migrant student attends. Summer term enrollment/attendance information is generated by the summer migrant program. In both instances, migrant staff enters the data into the MEDS.

New COE information is entered into the MEDS every time a family makes a new qualifying move.

For families that did not move during the year, recruiters visit the family and complete COE every 365 days. The new COE includes updated information for the family and a new parent signature. The updated information includes students' new grade levels, as well as, the names of children who may have moved to join or are a new addition to the family. Also noted are the names of children who have moved away. The up-dated COE is stapled to the previous COE.

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.

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 MEDS includes reporting functions that are programmed to count only those children who meet eligibility criteria. For 2007-2008 only those children who:

- had an enrollment/identified date between 9.1.07 and 8.31.08
- had a birth date at least three years before their withdrawal/moved date
- had a birth date less than 22 years before their enrollment/identified date
- had not yet graduated or received a GED, and
- had a qualifying move within three years of their enrollment/identified date,

were included in Category 1 child counts. Documentation of a qualifying activity is a prerequisite for the completion of a COE. The family's eligibility is verified by the recruiter and the local migrant director. On 8.31.07, all previously identified migrant children were withdrawn and had to be identified as residing in Michigan between 9.1.07 and 8.31.08 in order to be included on any 2007-2008 reports.

The Category 2 child count report is programmed to count only those children, who in addition, to the five criteria listed above, were enrolled in a migrant summer program between 6.16.07 and 8.31.08 and had at least one day of attendance. Both the Category 1 and Category 2 MEDS child counts are unduplicated reports run with state-wide data.

The latest enhancement to the MEDS checks specifically for duplicates. The system does a pair-wise comparison of each student in the system. The system compares the first four letters of the last name and the first three letters of the first name. This generates a source student that is compared against all possible matches. If additional examination is required to eliminate possible duplications the names of parents, the birth date, the birth place and, the names of siblings are also compared. The MEDS also assigns a unique student identification number to every student in the database. In addition, we have established a process whereby students in the MEDS are matched to students in Michigan's Single Record Student Database (SRSD) for the purpose of assigning a Unique Identifier Code (UIC).

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.

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.

Each local migrant program employs recruiters to survey the area within their school district boundaries to identify and recruit new families. In areas of the state where there are no local migrant programs, the MDE funds four state-wide identification and recruitment projects to survey those areas. In all cases, the recruiter interviews the families to determine eligibility. If the family is deemed eligible, a paper Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is completed for that family. The interviewee and the recruiter sign the COE. The local migrant program director, or state-wide area director, review the COE for accuracy and completeness. The director signs the form if s(he) finds that the COE is accurate and the family is eligible.

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 Re-Interview process for 2007-2008 is a continuation and an improvement of the re-interview process begun in 2003-2004. The training for the re-interviewers has been on-going and more focused. An analysis was done of the COEs recommended for disqualification during the 2003-2006 school years. The most common reasons for disqualification were qualifying moves older than 36 months, no qualifying activity, and no Principal Means of Livelihood. The training focused on these areas and the re-interviewers report a clearer understanding of these specific eligibility criteria. The defect rate for Michigan for 2003-2004 was 7.91%. The defect rate for 2004-2005 was 2.77%, and for 2005-2006 it was 3.16%. The defect rate for 2006-2007 is 2.66%. The defect rate for 2007-08 is 1.87%.

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.

At the MDE, one of two contracted staff reviews the electronic COE for accuracy and eligibility. This is their primary job responsibility. If the electronic COE is incomplete or inaccurate it is returned to the local migrant program for corrections. Once the electronic COE is deemed complete and accurate it is approved by the MDE.

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.

All of our student data is collected in the MEDS, and that is used to run separate reports for our Category 1 and Category 2 student counts. Each of these reports contains enrollment date and QAD parameters to insure accurate and unduplicated student counts. These reports are run for each local migrant program. As a final step to insure accuracy, the reports are sent to each local migrant program for verification of student counts. If there are differences between the local migrant count and the state count, these differences are resolved on a program by program basis. Once the differences are resolved, MDE requests a statement from each local program that the local counts and the state counts match. At this point the local migrant program counts are included in the state counts.

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

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The training for re-interviewers has also been given to recruiters, data-entry personnel, secretaries, and migrant directors. The training curriculum is based on:

- an on-line assessment conducted by ESCORT in spring 2006
- training conducted by ESCORT in summer of 2006
 - on Draft Migrant Education Program Identification and Recruitment Manual and Appendices developed by the Office of Migrant Education (OME)
 - on information from the National ID&R Forums (2007,2008)
- with input from Michigan State-Wide ID&R Directors
- and specifically tailored for Michigan by the Michigan Migrant Education program staff

Training sessions were held December 7, 2007; March 14, 2008; May 14, 2008; and May 15, 2008. Additional training sessions are scheduled for March 9 and 10, 2009. The intent is that the training will lead to the certification of recruiters, re-interviewers, data-entry personnel, and local migrant directors. Given the changes in the Migrant Program Regulations and the pending new Non-Regulatory Guidance we have had to postpone our certification process. This will assure that the Migrant Program staff in Michigan is current on eligibility criteria. The training in May of 2008 and in March of 2009 is provided by staff from the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC).

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.

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