

# 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**

**MISSISSIPPI**



**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:

Mississippi Department of Education

Address:

P. O. Box 771

Jackson, MS 39205

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Quentin Ransburg

Telephone: 601-359-3499

Fax: 601-359-2587

e-mail: qransburg@mde.k12.ms.us

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

Dr. Hank Bounds

Friday, March 13, 2009, 4:17:27 PM

Signature

Date

Several indicators will be verified, and submitted during the revision process. MDE encountered problems uploading EDEN files.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

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



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

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The revised academic content standards for language arts and math were implemented in 2007-2008.

The revised science content standards will be implemented in spring 2010-2011.

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The revised academic content standards for language arts and math were implemented in 2007-2008. The first operational tests were administered in spring 2008 and new standars were set in summer 2008.

The revised alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities will be approved and implemented in 2009.

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.

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

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

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	254,264	254,264	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	471	471	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,098	2,098	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	128,406	128,406	100.0
Hispanic	4,365	4,365	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	118,917	118,917	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,554	23,554	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,960	1,960	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	143,896	143,896	100.0
Migratory students	479	479	100.0
Male	128,242	128,242	100.0
Female	126,015	126,015	100.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. 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	8,244	35.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	12,884	54.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,426	10.3
Total	23,554	

**Comments:**

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	254,420	254,420	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	471	471	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,086	2,086	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	128,359	128,359	100.0
Hispanic	4,349	4,349	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	119,152	119,152	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	23,775	23,775	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,932	1,932	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	143,754	143,754	100.0
Migratory students	474	474	100.0
Male	128,505	128,505	100.0
Female	125,912	125,912	100.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,605	40.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	11,697	49.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,473	10.4
Total	23,775	
<b>Comments: ?</b>		

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

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	104,864	104,864	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	195	100.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	951	951	100.0
Black, non-Hispanic	53,032	53,032	100.0
Hispanic	1,766	1,766	100.0
White, non-Hispanic	48,915	48,915	100.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,822	8,822	100.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	917	917	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	57,115	57,115	100.0
Migratory students	185	185	100.0
Male	52,510	52,510	100.0
Female	52,349	52,349	100.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	3,441	39.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,755	53.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	626	7.1
Total	8,822	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

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

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

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

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

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

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

#### **1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

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

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

### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	37,843	21,751	57.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	41	55.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	309	262	84.8
Black, non-Hispanic	18,830	8,591	45.6
Hispanic	778	509	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	17,852	12,348	69.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,880	1,460	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	443	279	63.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,478	10,784	48.0
Migratory students	54	35	64.8
Male	19,270	10,546	54.7
Female	18,573	11,205	60.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	37,873	19,271	50.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	74	44	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	312	235	75.3
Black, non-Hispanic	18,838	7,114	37.8
Hispanic	778	387	49.7
White, non-Hispanic	17,871	11,491	64.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,876	1,099	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	443	198	44.7
Economically disadvantaged students	22,495	8,928	39.7
Migratory students	54	26	48.1
Male	19,296	9,132	47.3
Female	18,577	10,139	54.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.1 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
<b>Grade 3</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science Assessment is not given at grade 3.</b>			

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

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

### 1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,879	20,347	55.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	42	60.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	308	260	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,406	7,763	42.2
Hispanic	717	425	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	17,379	11,857	68.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,514	1,047	29.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	358	196	54.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21,588	9,584	44.4
Migratory students	64	28	43.8
Male	18,762	10,163	54.2
Female	18,117	10,184	56.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	36,900	18,267	49.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	69	31	44.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	307	225	73.3
Black, non-Hispanic	18,414	6,630	36.0
Hispanic	717	340	47.4
White, non-Hispanic	17,393	11,041	63.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,511	749	21.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	357	127	35.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,610	8,095	37.5
Migratory students	64	29	45.3
Male	18,778	8,559	45.6
Female	18,122	9,708	53.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

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

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

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	36,438	18,986	52.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	84	44	52.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	323	260	80.5
Black, non-Hispanic	18,169	7,183	39.5
Hispanic	671	382	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	17,191	11,117	64.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,469	733	21.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	295	146	49.5
Economically disadvantaged students	20,976	8,601	41.0
Migratory students	63	32	50.8
Male	18,548	9,252	49.9
Female	17,890	9,734	54.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	36,465	17,412	47.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	85	39	45.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	326	245	75.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18,177	6,108	33.6
Hispanic	670	316	47.2
White, non-Hispanic	17,207	10,704	62.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,473	581	16.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	295	105	35.6
Economically disadvantaged students	20,987	7,341	35.0
Migratory students	63	24	38.1
Male	18,563	8,153	43.9
Female	17,902	9,259	51.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.3 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
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	36,317	14,890	41.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	38	45.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	337	206	61.1
Black, non-Hispanic	18,083	3,797	21.0
Hispanic	744	268	36.0
White, non-Hispanic	17,070	10,413	61.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,454	691	20.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	404	97	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,995	5,459	26.0
Migratory students	68	11	16.2
Male	18,540	8,158	44.0
Female	17,777	6,755	38.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	36,381	18,893	51.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	35	55.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	298	257	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18,225	6,975	38.3
Hispanic	657	384	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	17,138	11,242	65.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,650	512	14.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	277	125	45.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20,851	8,338	40.0
Migratory students	81	38	46.9
Male	18,637	9,472	50.8
Female	17,744	9,421	53.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	36,383	16,387	45.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	63	21	33.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	297	209	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,228	5,774	31.7
Hispanic	659	313	47.5
White, non-Hispanic	17,136	10,070	58.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,648	369	10.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	277	85	30.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,857	6,848	32.8
Migratory students	81	26	32.1
Male	18,638	7,629	40.9
Female	17,745	8,758	49.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.4 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
<b>Grade 6</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science assessment is not administered in grade 6.</b>			

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

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

### 1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	38,030	19,101	50.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	72	38	52.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	238	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	19,667	7,627	38.8
Hispanic	582	314	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	17,419	10,884	62.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,687	462	12.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	227	98	43.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,776	8,607	39.5
Migratory students	103	48	46.6
Male	19,157	8,817	46.0
Female	18,873	10,284	54.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -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
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	38,006	16,338	43.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	72	40	55.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	290	213	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	19,638	5,799	29.5
Hispanic	579	246	42.5
White, non-Hispanic	17,427	10,040	57.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,682	308	8.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	227	62	27.3
Economically disadvantaged students	21,753	6,602	30.3
Migratory students	103	29	28.2
Male	19,148	7,359	38.4
Female	18,858	8,979	47.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.5 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
<b>Grade 7</b>			
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science assessment is not administered in grade 7.</b>			

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

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

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 8</b>			
All students	37,110	18,035	48.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	57	29	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	288	249	86.5
Black, non-Hispanic	19,358	6,676	34.5
Hispanic	563	338	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	16,844	10,743	63.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,635	376	10.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	202	101	50.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,812	7,601	36.5
Migratory students	75	30	40.0
Male	18,856	8,598	45.6
Female	18,254	9,437	51.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.6 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
<b>Grade 8</b>			
All students	37,093	16,367	44.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	58	25	43.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	288	206	71.5
Black, non-Hispanic	19,351	5,701	29.5
Hispanic	564	256	45.4
White, non-Hispanic	16,832	10,179	60.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,634	267	7.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	202	53	26.2
Economically disadvantaged students	20,806	6,519	31.3
Migratory students	75	28	37.3
Male	18,856	7,628	40.5
Female	18,237	8,739	47.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 8</b>			
All students	37,067	14,450	39.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	62	26	41.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	299	212	70.9
Black, non-Hispanic	19,290	3,858	20.0
Hispanic	628	264	42.0
White, non-Hispanic	16,788	10,241	61.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,615	362	10.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	371	111	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	20,830	5,208	25.0
Migratory students	81	19	23.5
Male	18,876	7,928	42.0
Female	18,191	6,549	36.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>High School</b>			
All students	31,583	18,161	57.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	52	34	65.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	282	246	87.2
Black, non-Hispanic	15,751	6,895	43.8
Hispanic	397	265	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	15,094	10,720	71.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,719	402	23.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	158	100	63.3
Economically disadvantaged students	15,415	7,249	47.0
Migratory students	39	29	74.4
Male	15,012	8,383	55.8
Female	16,564	9,777	59.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>High School</b>			
All students	31,700	15,936	50.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	26	52.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	266	192	72.2
Black, non-Hispanic	15,713	5,073	32.3
Hispanic	382	202	52.9
White, non-Hispanic	15,286	10,443	68.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,951	199	10.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	131	31	23.7
Economically disadvantaged students	15,246	5,298	34.8
Migratory students	34	20	58.8
Male	15,226	7,014	46.1
Female	16,471	8,922	54.2
<b>Comments: The large increase in the number of children with disabilities is accurate. The State has placed greater emphasis on ensuring that all students are tested, including students with disabilities. This increased emphasis has resulted in greater numbers of children with disabilities being included in statewide assessments.</b>			

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

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>High School</b>			
All students	31,480	20,777	66.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	50	33	66.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	315	284	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	15,659	7,516	48.0
Hispanic	394	284	72.1
White, non-Hispanic	15,057	12,497	83.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,753	508	29.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	142	78	54.9
Economically disadvantaged students	15,290	7,951	52.0
Migratory students	36	21	58.3
Male	15,094	10,264	68.0
Female	16,381	10,320	63.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	893	768	86.0
Districts	152	74	48.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	695	621	89.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	667	594	89.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	28	27	96.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
152	74	48.7
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	2
Extension of the school year or school day	8
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	3
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	3
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	5
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does Not Apply.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2007-2008 school year, the state of Mississippi had 5 districts identified for improvement. As a result of their identification, these districts were required to reserve 10% of their Title I allocations toward professional development. Professional development strategies that were provided and implemented by the identified districts are as follow:

Training on scheduling to ensure all students with disabilities are enrolled in appropriate classes and tested properly;

Employment of Educational Consultants, additional teachers, additional administrators and School Coordinators, to assist with improving classroom instruction and ongoing systemic support in the quest to improve the culture and climate for teaching and learning;

Instructional support to principals and teachers in the areas of data analysis and formal and informal observations, best practices that lead to increased student achievement;

Implementation of Extended Day/Year Classes, after school tutorial services and supplemental educational services for at-risk students that are failing or scoring below the proficient level of achievement on state academic assessments; and

Provisions of on-going and targeted professional development that had exhibited a proven record of effectiveness in increased student achievement.

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

### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

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

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

### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments: The NCLB appeals and request for review process (following review of the preliminary accountability reports) is a data cleanup task. It includes districts and schools that were identified for improvement as well as others that were not identified. The final accountability run incorporates all appropriate data corrections.</b>		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	09/29/08
---	----------

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

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

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

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

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

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

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	27,905	29,456
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	8,009	10,781
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	28.7	36.6
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	10,045	15,641
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	36.0	53.1
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	68	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.4.8.2 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	44
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	18
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	7
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		8	1	2	B	
6 = Combo 1	1,2,3 and 4	13	1	7	C	
7 = Combo 2	1, 2, and 4	3	1	0	C	
2		5	1	3	A	
8 = Combo 3	1,2, and 3	5	3	2	A	
8 = Combo 3	1,3 and 4	4	0	2	A	
<b>Comments:</b>						

#### Column 1 Response Options Box

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

831.

#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) Office of Innovative Support (OIS) has developed a Statewide System of Support designed to provide "intensive and sustained" technical assistance for improving local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools identified as in need of improvement. In order to achieve this goal, OIS established School Support Teams (SST), consisting of highly qualified retired educators and administrators, to offer onsite expert assistance through the school support program to help schools build capacity in the areas of curriculum, instruction, school management, and leadership. Throughout the 2007-2008 school year, School Support Teams assisted a total of 21 school improvement schools with analyzing district/school accountability results using the Mississippi Statewide Accountability Model and helped targeted schools use this data in developing/modifying their school improvement plans.

School Support Teams aided schools in developing a roadmap for the next steps in their continuous school improvement process by collaborating with administrators and staff, conducting interviews, reviewing and analyzing data, monitoring progress, and reporting to the MDE Division of School Improvement on the school's progress and by providing recommendations of assistance in increasing academic achievement.

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: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) utilizes Section 1003(g) funds under the constraints of its Statewide System of Support. Under this system, schools identified for corrective action and restructuring planning, which were a total of 21 schools for the 2007-2008 school year were offered onsite expert technical assistance through the School Support Team program. Members of the school support teams were selected by the state from a pool of MDE service providers, which consists of lead teachers/teachers, principals, and administrators that were trained in developing, implementing, and monitoring the school improvement plan and process. MDE staff and the Southeast Comprehensive Center (SECC) provided support for School Improvement Teams assigned to each of the LEAs with schools identified for improvement. SECC provided targeted training identified by the MDE for the School Support Teams (SST) and MDE monitored the implementation of the training in identified schools. Teams were deployed to schools based upon their area(s) of expertise and the identified needs of schools. With the use of section 1003(g) school improvement funds, schools identified for improvement were assisted in researching data-driven improvement models, scientifically research-based instructional strategies, highly-effective staff development trainings, as well as with the reallocation of resources, in an effort to effectively promote student achievement.

The State Board of Education has identified five strategies to improve schools in Mississippi, one of which is to increase the quantity and quality of school leaders and teachers. During the 2007-2008 school year, MDE utilized a portion of its section 1003(g) funds to support the advancement of these efforts. Support included providing technical assistance and proven effective professional development for teachers and administrators in schools identified for corrective action and restructuring. Efforts focused on implementing strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicated strategies likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools, as well as to increase student achievement. Strategies included the participation of school leaders in Leadership Academies that focused on Leadership Development, Curriculum Instruction and Assessment, School Improvement and increased Student Achievement.

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.

No additional actions were taken by the state of Mississippi by funds outside of the realm of Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement of problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

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

#### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	39,364
Applied to transfer	125
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	100

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

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

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

### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 251,213
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	21
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school<sup>3</sup> that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	18,662
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,070
Received supplemental educational services	2,819
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 3,001,199
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

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

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	135,864	127,354	93.7	8,510	6.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	17,564	15,672	89.2	1,892	10.8
Low-poverty schools	29,389	28,707	97.7	682	2.3
All elementary schools	97,003	92,148	95.0	4,855	5.0
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	6,663	5,524	82.9	1,139	17.1
Low-poverty schools	11,984	11,302	94.3	682	5.7
All secondary schools	38,648	35,010	90.6	3,638	9.4
<b>Comments: The CSPR, Part I only asks for disaggregation of core academic classes between elementary and secondary. A few schools in Mississippi do not fall into either category accounting for the discrepancy between the sum of the elementary total and secondary total and the total for all schools.</b>					

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All course/class counts are based on course codes, NCLB core area flags, and instructional periods appearing on each teacher's daily schedules.
---

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	1.9
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	19.4
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	44.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	34.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Currently, Mississippi has a shortage of teachers in geographical areas and certain subject areas. Many of our districts in rural areas have trouble finding and keeping highly qualified core subject teachers. The state is not producing enough teachers to keep up with the demand. The Mississippi Teacher Center is working with those districts to shore up their recruitment efforts and to provide resources and technical assistance as needed.

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)	11.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	77.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	10.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Currently, Mississippi has a shortage of teachers in geographical areas and certain subject areas. Many of our districts in rural areas have trouble finding and keeping highly qualified core subject teachers. The state is not producing enough teachers to keep up with the demand. The Mississippi Teacher Center is working with those districts to shore up their recruitment efforts and to provide resources and technical assistance as needed.

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	86.0	47.0
Poverty metric used	Free Lunch Percentage	
Secondary schools	80.0	41.0
Poverty metric used	Free Lunch Percentage	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Two districts use submersion programs for grades 9-12. Three districts use state approved ESL courses in grades 9-12. One district uses an inclusion program.

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

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	5,428
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	4,664
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	4,758
Vietnamese	389
Arabic	137
Cantonese	60
Chinese	51

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

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

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,902
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	4,902
<b>Comments: The English Language Proficiency test is administered in Mississippi during the month of February. The discrepancy is the result of students who enter the LEP program after the State ELP assessment in February.</b>	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	2,743
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	56.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,683
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	0
Total	2,683
<b>Comments: The English Language Proficiency test is administered in Mississippi during the month of February. The discrepancy is the result of students who enter a Title III LEP program after the State ELP assessment in February.</b>	

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

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

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

#### **Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

	<b>Results</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	978	36.5
ELP attainment	1,476	55.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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

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

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
<b>Comments:</b>

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

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
<b>Comments:</b>

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

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

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

Language(s)
Not Applicable
<b>Comments:</b>

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.6 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
309	233	542
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

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

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
332	232	69.9	100
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
325	183	56.3	142
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
130	55	42.3	75
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	23
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	19
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	23
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	19
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	23
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)	1
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> State did not meet AMAO 1.	

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

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

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

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

#### Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,844	369	6

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

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

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	288
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	81

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.**

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	19	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	18	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	14	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	16	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	21	3,381
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	19	198
PD provided to principals	18	283
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	20	149
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	16	264
PD provided to community based organization personnel	5	245
<b>Total</b>		<b>4,520</b>

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
7/12/07	12/01/07	126
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

The state will start the application approval process earlier for the next funding cycle. This action will allow the distribution of funds in a more timely manner. We propose to receive application by June 15, 2009 and review/approve all applications by July 30, 2009; thus making funds available to all eligible LEAs on or before August 1, 2009.

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

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	87.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
<b>Comments: Graduation rate cannot currently be disaggregated.</b>	

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

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

## 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1.2
Hispanic	0.6
White, non-Hispanic	0.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	1.2
Female	0.7
<b>Comments: Disaggregated dropout rates are not currently available for students with disabilities, limited English proficiency, economically disadvantaged, and migratory.</b>	

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

### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.*

### 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	134	33
LEAs with subgrants	18	18
Total	152	51
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12	108
K	486	399
1	574	432
2	585	426
3	526	415
4	395	426
5	430	442
6	397	404
7	328	434
8	319	397
9	289	364
10	248	236
11	184	192
12	151	188
Ungraded	36	103
Total	4,960	4,966
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	652	986
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,553	2,304
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	484	335
Hotels/Motels	11	50
Total	4,700	3,675
<b>Comments: LEAs have not been accurately tracking the primary nighttime residence of homeless students.</b>		

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

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	97
K	278
1	361
2	371
3	376
4	400
5	400
6	376
7	401
8	376
9	350
10	227
11	179
12	184
Ungraded	165
Total	4,541
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	373
Migratory children/youth	83
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	742
Limited English proficient students	191
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	16
Expedited evaluations	7
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	5
Assistance with participation in school programs	10
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	10
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	10
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	8
School supplies	13
Referral to other programs and services	9
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	12
School Selection	9
Transportation	13
School records	12
Immunizations	10
Other medical records	8
Other Barriers – in comment box below	2

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

One subgrantee reported students being unaccompanied as a barrier to their success. Another subgrantee reported that our State's law that requires each child to have a record of immunization as a requirement to enroll into a school as another barrier to the enrollment process.

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

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	259	111
4	236	89
5	259	95
6	214	53
7	301	114
8	256	69
High School	155	18
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	259	119
4	235	96
5	257	116
6	214	99
7	301	129
8	256	87
High School	131	27
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	101
K	56
1	57
2	46
3	52
4	44
5	26
6	36
7	32
8	28
9	15
10	10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	152
Out-of-school	29
Total	699
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count has decreased by over ten percent as a result of the impact of Hurricane Katrina. Although the state has made positive strides in rebounding from this horrible natural disaster, the repercussions are widespread and have and continue to adversely affect agricultural industries particularly in the coastal region. Limited fishing and shriming work has caused many workers who were migrant to take jobs with rebuilding and construction efforts.

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

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	30
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child count has decreased by over ten percent as a result of the impact of Hurricane Katrina. Although the state has made positive strides in rebounding from this horrible natural disaster, the repercussions are widespread and have and continue to adversely affect agricultural industries particularly in the coastal region. Limited fishing and shriming work has caused many workers who were migrant to take jobs with rebuilding and construction efforts.

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

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA used MIS2000 to generate this report and child counts from the last reporting period. The SEA's category 1 and category 2 child counts were generated using the same system, MIS2000

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 child count data was collected using information from COEs, and school records and/or data. Recruiters at the regional migrant education service centers recruited migrant children/families during face-to-face interviews with families, school personnel and other stakeholders in order to complete an official COE on each child/family. The data elements collected were: names, ages, dates of birth, grades, family information, and addresses. Additional information included family history of migrancy, and the kind(s) of worked performed. The data is collected upon identification and recruitment of the students and their families. Existing data on COEs is updated and verified by recruiters via face-to-face visits, local school district records, telephone interviews and through the Mississippi Students Information System (MSIS).

Students' demographics and eligibility information is recorded on the original, official, standard paper COE. Information is input into MIS2000 by the data coordinator; the system generates an electronic COE and other reports/demographics as needed.

Information from the original COE is input into MIS 2000 by the regional data coordinator.

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.

There are three regional locations within the state, and each site is assigned data entry personnel who input and update student data in the MIS 2000 system. The information from these three regional sites is uploaded to the central state MIS 2000 system, and the state maintains MIS 2000 for all students.

#### Category 1 Count

Staff of the migrant education service center conducts interviews with families at the end of the second (spring) semester to update student information and eligibility information. Records are reviewed and families are contacted on as needed basis. COE data is updated and verified by comparison to school information, MIS2000 data and MSIS data, as well as through conversations with the families.

Staff reviews student lists for accuracy monthly. Data entry changes are made on a daily basis if necessary. The regional center uploads to the state system twice per month on the 5th and 20th.

Mass enrollment procedures are used.

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.

There are three regional locations within the state, and each site is assigned data entry personnel who input and update student data in the MIS 2000 system. The information from these three regional sites is uploaded to the central state MIS 2000 system, and the state maintains MIS 2000 for all students.

#### Category 2 Count

Staff of the migrant education service center conducts interviews with families at the end of the summer (July, August, and September) to update student information and eligibility information. Records are reviewed and families are contacted on as needed basis. COE data is updated and verified by comparison to school information, MIS2000 data and MSIS data, as well as through conversations with the families. If there are differences and discrepancies in the records, families are contacted and information is corrected in MIS2000 and at the school level, by the data coordinator and other data records personnel.

Staff reviews student lists for accuracy monthly. Data entry changes are made on a daily basis if necessary. The regional center uploads

to the state system twice per month on the 5th and 20th.

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.

Information for the child count is input into MIS2000 at our three regional sites, the sites input demographics from the COEs of those students/families that are determined to be eligible for the MEP by regional recruiters. Staff confirms the residency of each child by telephone, as well as, the data of the COE by reviewing official school records and health/work records, where applicable and when available. Below are the criteria used for our Category 1 Report and Category 2 Report. Each report counts the student in the grade assigned to the most recent enrollment meeting the report criteria. The StartDate and EndDate represent the beginning and end of the reporting period, respectively.

#### Category 1 Report

- EnrollDate, FundingDate, LQMDate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between StartDate and EndDate (This verifies that the student had activity during the reporting period.)
- LQM3Date >= StartDate (This verifies that the student is within 3 years of their LQM at the beginning of the reporting period.)
- DomID = MS (This verifies that the school history line is a MS enrollment.)
- TwentySecondBDay >= StartDate and ThirdBDay <= EndDate (This verifies that the student is between the ages of 3 and 21 during the reporting period.)

#### Category 2 Report

- EnrollDate, FundingDate, LQMDate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate is between StartDate and EndDate (This verifies that the student had activity during the reporting period.)
- DomID = MS (This verifies that the school history line is a MS enrollment.)
- Type = S or Type = I (This verifies that the enrollment type is Summer or Intersession.)
- Twentysecondbday >= StartDate and Thirdbday <= EndDate (This verifies that the student is between the ages of 3 and 21 during the reporting period.)
- Twentysecondbday >= FundingDate (This verifies that the student turns 22 after their FundingDate.)
- LQM3Date >= StartDate (This verifies that the student is within 3 years of their LQM at the beginning of the reporting period.)

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA's category 1 and 2 child counts are generated using the same data criteria which is part of the MIS2000 system.

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.

All children are determined to be migrant and eligible for services via the Migrant Education program before information is input into MIS2000. The information that is input into MIS2000 comes from COEs that are completed on each migrant family. The SEA's COE is standard and contains the following documentation: father/mother's legal name, current male/female guardian's name, current address, all children's names, grades, birth dates, gender, birthplace, date of school enrollment, student number, school district of origin, current school district, qualifying arrival date, residency date, type of move and with whom, type of employment (seasonal/temporary), qualifying activity/employment and person verifying information, i.e., parent, guardian, etc. The COE's information is verified by trained recruiters. All COEs contain the signature of the interviewee, the interviewer/recruiter, the program coordinator (who verifies the content and eligibility of the family). If there is a question regarding eligibility the COE is forwarded to the state for a final determination. All migrant recruiters are trained and certified by the SEA, ESCORT and national ID & R experts. Recruiters attend formal trainings, workshops and conferences at least three times per year they are required to maintain copies of ID & R guidelines/eligibility standards and the non-regulatory guidance along with other relative educational/reference material. Recruiters are required to visit schools, attend parent meetings and community activities in order to identify and recruit migrant families, they also do home visits on a regular basis. The SEA meets with regional personnel monthly at statewide meetings, technical assistance visits and monitoring/audit visits.

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 SEA did not conduct re-interviews for the reporting period of September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007; therefore, we have no re-interview data to report for the specified time referenced in this question.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA and regional site representatives meet at least three times per year to discuss, data, data input and using the MIS2000 system; training of data personnel is conducted by MSED during these meetings, also new employees are trained as a part of their orientation and on-the-job training. The LEAs have full time data personnel who constantly update information, check for errors and input COE's. They work with the ID & R specialists and school districts to ensure accuracy of information, via the SEA's data system MSIS. All data personnel and state personnel have been trained on the use of MSIX, MIS2000 and the SEA's MSIS. The SEA checks data in MIS2000 on a regular basis for accuracy and coordinates with MSED to ensure efficiency and accuracy of data as a part of the overall quality control. The SEA in conjunction with outside ID & R specialists, ESCORT conducts random audits of files annually at each regional site; this includes a review of COEs, student records and other relative documentation.

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.

State staff runs reports at the state level and checks the state report against information that has been input at the three regional levels. Counts are also checked by MIS2000 personnel for accuracy and to ensure that the proper counts are documented and reported as requested by the USDE in the required format.

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 SEA did not conduct re-interviews for the period of September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007; however, the SEA has contracted with

ESCORT to aid in refining the prospective re-interviewing process and to provide training for Mississippi consortia.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has no questions or concerns about the accuracy of the child counts or underlying eligibility determinations. All information has been validated by regional and state personnel using the MIS2000 system, Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), COEs, parental/guardian interviews, school records, and other relative documentation.

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