

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

NEBRASKA



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:
Nebraska

Address:
PO Box 94987
Lincoln, NE

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Marilyn Peterson, Ph.D.

Telephone: 402-471-3504

Fax: 402-471-0117

e-mail: marilyn.peterson@nebraska.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Marge Harouff, Deputy Commissioner

Friday, March 13, 2009, 12:35:19 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State legislature passed LB1157 in May 2008. LB1157 requires a state assessment of Reading (Spring 2010), Math (Spring 2011), and Science (Spring 2012). Nebraska is currently in a Compliance Agreement with the U.S. Department of Education to implement LB1157 and meet NCLB requirements.

In May, 2007, the Nebraska Legislature passed LB653. Section 79,760.01 requires the State Board of Education to review and update Reading standards by July 1, 2009; Math standards by July 1, 2010; and Science and Social Studies standards by July, 2013.

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.

3.12.09 The Compliance Agreement that was signed in October, 2008 lists the following administration dates for the assessments listed:
Spring 2009: Reading Field Test Spring 2010: Reading Test, Math Field Test Spring 2011: Math Test, Science Field Test Spring 2012: Science Test DS

The State legislature passed LB1157 in May 2008. LB1157 requires a state assessment of Reading (Spring 2010), Math (Spring 2011), and Science (Spring 2012). Nebraska is currently in a Compliance Agreement with the U.S. Department of Education to implement LB1157 and meet NCLB requirements.

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.

3.12.09 Standards and Assessments are included in the Compliance Agreement which was signed on October, 2008. DS

The State legislature passed LB1157 in May 2008. LB1157 requires a state assessment of Reading (Spring 2010), Math (Spring 2011), and Science (Spring 2012). Nebraska is currently in a Compliance Agreement with the U.S. Department of Education to implement LB1157 and meet NCLB requirements.

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	143,819	142,317	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,279	2,231	97.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,793	2,776	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	11,146	11,022	98.9
Hispanic	17,976	17,813	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	109,624	108,474	99.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,815	22,182	97.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,361	7,300	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	40,615	40,005	98.5
Migratory students	944	926	98.1
Male	73,676	72,806	98.8
Female	70,140	69,508	99.1

Comments: 3.12.09 Nebraska will continue to have this problem (participation counts being lower than performance) because Nebraska's definition of participation uses "enrolled on the last day of school" as its premise. A number of students may change districts between the time assessments are finished being administered and the end of the school year. DS Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,514	55.0

Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,778	38.6
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	1,449	6.4

Total	22,741	
-------	--------	--

Comments: 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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	146,090	144,879	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,315	2,279	98.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,874	2,863	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	11,281	11,200	99.3
Hispanic	18,075	17,908	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	111,544	110,628	99.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,922	22,489	98.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,402	7,338	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	40,882	40,405	98.8
Migratory students	947	925	97.7
Male	74,874	74,193	99.1
Female	71,213	70,683	99.3

Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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	12,626	55.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,827	38.6
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	1,434	6.3
Total	22,887	

Comments: 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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	77,604	75,424	97.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,287	1,230	95.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,781	1,692	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,969	5,648	94.6
Hispanic	8,258	7,843	95.0
White, non-Hispanic	60,281	58,973	97.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,037	11,291	93.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,448	3,003	87.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20,425	19,405	95.0
Migratory students	428	401	93.7
Male	39,690	38,481	97.0
Female	37,914	36,943	97.4

Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

1.2.6 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	6,459	53.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,300	35.7
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	1,280	10.6
Total	12,039	

Comments: 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,796	19,219	92.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	377	325	86.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	472	451	95.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,709	1,452	85.0
Hispanic	3,038	2,719	89.5
White, non-Hispanic	15,200	14,272	93.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,763	3,134	83.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,729	1,480	85.6
Economically disadvantaged students	8,965	7,942	88.6
Migratory students	193	170	88.1
Male	10,696	9,848	92.1
Female	10,100	9,371	92.8
Comments: Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 3 reported prior to 2007-08. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08			

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

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,757	18,850	90.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	376	313	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	471	415	88.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,707	1,391	81.5
Hispanic	3,017	2,595	86.0
White, non-Hispanic	15,186	14,136	93.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,745	2,882	77.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,715	1,355	79.0
Economically disadvantaged students	8,932	7,666	85.8
Migratory students	191	162	84.8
Male	10,682	9,528	89.2
Female	10,075	9,322	92.5
Comments: Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 3 reported prior to 2007-08. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	2,602	2,255	86.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	67	53	79.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	120	107	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	257	198	77.0
Hispanic	209	159	76.1
White, non-Hispanic	1,949	1,738	89.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	604	440	72.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	220	159	72.3
Economically disadvantaged students	1,137	895	78.7
Migratory students	12	11	91.7
Male	1,334	1,140	85.5
Female	1,268	1,115	87.9

Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, districts were required to test Science in grade 4 or 5 and grade 8 and 11. Some districts opted to test in additional grades. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,656	19,537	94.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	324	282	87.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	435	412	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,674	1,465	87.5
Hispanic	2,912	2,702	92.8
White, non-Hispanic	15,311	14,676	95.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,806	3,221	84.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,562	1,390	89.0
Economically disadvantaged students	8,766	7,999	91.3
Migratory students	182	158	86.8
Male	10,607	10,038	94.6
Female	10,049	9,499	94.5

Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, all elementary data was reported at grade 4 prior to 200708. DS 12.16.08

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,610	19,220	93.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	317	275	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	439	397	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,674	1,395	83.3
Hispanic	2,894	2,541	87.8
White, non-Hispanic	15,286	14,612	95.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,796	3,016	79.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,555	1,240	79.7
Economically disadvantaged students	8,726	7,723	88.5
Migratory students	178	143	80.3
Male	10,588	9,753	92.1
Female	10,022	9,467	94.5

Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, all elementary data was reported at grade 4 prior to 200708. DS 12.16.08

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	4,478	3,942	88.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	154	139	90.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	115	97	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	289	204	70.6
Hispanic	586	473	80.7
White, non-Hispanic	3,334	3,029	90.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	993	738	74.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	398	283	71.1
Economically disadvantaged students	2,034	1,662	81.7
Migratory students	59	45	76.3
Male	2,272	2,008	88.4
Female	2,206	1,934	87.7

Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, districts were required to test Science in grade 4 or 5 and grade 8 and 11. Some districts opted to test in additional grades. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,388	18,436	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	327	255	78.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	423	395	93.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,711	1,413	82.6
Hispanic	2,820	2,481	88.0
White, non-Hispanic	15,107	13,892	92.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,478	2,612	75.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,325	1,093	82.5
Economically disadvantaged students	8,454	7,255	85.8
Migratory students	143	115	80.4
Male	10,413	9,385	90.1
Female	9,975	9,051	90.7
Comments: grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11)rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 5 reported prior to 2007-08. DS 12.16.08			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,349	18,626	91.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	324	252	77.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	421	388	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,708	1,389	81.3
Hispanic	2,799	2,408	86.0
White, non-Hispanic	15,097	14,189	94.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,478	2,612	75.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,312	1,015	77.4
Economically disadvantaged students	8,434	7,263	86.1
Migratory students	141	103	73.0
Male	10,400	9,380	90.2
Female	9,949	9,246	92.9
Comments: Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11)rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 5 reported prior to 2007-08. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	18,424	16,481	89.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	267	203	76.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	396	351	88.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,643	1,231	74.9
Hispanic	2,397	1,969	82.1
White, non-Hispanic	13,721	12,727	92.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,124	2,300	73.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,131	828	73.2
Economically disadvantaged students	7,543	6,188	82.0
Migratory students	111	78	70.3
Male	9,434	8,416	89.2
Female	8,990	8,065	89.7

Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, districts were required to test Science in grade 4 or 5 and grade 8 and 11. Some districts opted to test in additional grades. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	20,279	18,282	90.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	347	282	81.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	419	388	92.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,589	1,326	83.4
Hispanic	2,681	2,309	86.1
White, non-Hispanic	15,243	13,977	91.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,254	2,381	73.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,051	821	78.1
Economically disadvantaged students	7,994	6,771	84.7
Migratory students	125	93	74.4
Male	10,347	9,264	89.5
Female	9,932	9,018	90.8
Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 6			
All students	20,370	18,732	92.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	359	289	80.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	421	377	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,605	1,390	86.6
Hispanic	2,689	2,383	88.6
White, non-Hispanic	15,296	14,293	93.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,250	2,385	73.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,052	820	77.9
Economically disadvantaged students	8,034	7,013	87.3
Migratory students	123	93	75.6
Male	10,382	9,392	90.5
Female	9,988	9,340	93.5
Comments: Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 6 reported prior to 2007-08. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic

groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	2,718	2,361	86.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	57	42	73.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	93	83	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	234	167	71.4
Hispanic	219	176	80.4
White, non-Hispanic	2,115	1,893	89.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	553	359	64.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	120	79	65.8
Economically disadvantaged students	1,020	871	85.4
Migratory students	20	15	75.0
Male	1,393	1,202	86.3
Female	1,325	1,159	87.5

Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, districts were required to test Science in grade 4 or 5 and grade 8 and 11. Some districts opted to test in additional grades. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,568	18,571	90.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	311	244	78.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	381	363	95.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,675	1,363	81.4
Hispanic	2,601	2,197	84.5
White, non-Hispanic	15,600	14,404	92.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,022	2,192	72.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	885	677	76.5
Economically disadvantaged students	8,013	6,728	84.0
Migratory students	153	119	77.8
Male	10,564	9,475	89.7
Female	10,004	9,096	90.9

Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 7 reported prior to 2007-08. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,608	18,631	90.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	325	253	77.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	385	356	92.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,693	1,334	78.8
Hispanic	2,580	2,182	84.6
White, non-Hispanic	15,625	14,506	92.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,061	2,182	71.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	880	631	71.7
Economically disadvantaged students	8,055	6,735	83.6
Migratory students	146	110	75.3
Male	10,598	9,406	88.8
Female	10,010	9,225	92.2

Comments: Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 7 reported prior to 2007-08. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	2,785	2,390	85.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	62	40	64.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	86	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	260	189	72.7
Hispanic	206	144	69.9
White, non-Hispanic	2,163	1,931	89.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	558	358	64.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	110	76	69.1
Economically disadvantaged students	1,047	800	76.4
Migratory students	12	N<10	
Male	1,426	1,210	84.9
Female	1,359	1,180	86.8

Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, districts were required to test Science in grade 4 or 5 and grade 8 and 11. Some districts opted to test in additional grades. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,867	19,077	91.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	359	294	81.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	415	397	95.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,646	1,318	80.1
Hispanic	2,484	2,146	86.4
White, non-Hispanic	15,963	14,922	93.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,905	2,146	73.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	734	544	74.1
Economically disadvantaged students	7,809	6,663	85.3
Migratory students	146	120	82.2
Male	10,677	9,668	90.5
Female	10,190	9,409	92.3

Comments: Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 7 reported prior to 2007-08. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,988	19,641	93.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	354	297	83.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	417	396	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,662	1,453	87.4
Hispanic	2,480	2,182	88.0
White, non-Hispanic	16,075	15,313	95.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,981	2,375	79.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	734	567	77.2
Economically disadvantaged students	7,863	7,031	89.4
Migratory students	145	118	81.4
Male	10,772	9,885	91.8
Female	10,216	9,756	95.5

Comments: Prior to the 2007-08 school year, districts reported data by grade span (elementary reported at grade 4, middle reported at grade 8, and high school reported at grade 11) rather than by individual grade. Because of this, there was no data for grade 7 reported prior to 2007-08. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	20,744	18,107	87.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	356	251	70.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	413	388	93.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,618	1,019	63.0
Hispanic	2,397	1,866	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	15,960	14,583	91.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,886	1,908	66.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	625	382	61.1
Economically disadvantaged students	7,713	5,975	77.5
Migratory students	136	96	70.6
Male	10,625	9,216	86.7
Female	10,119	8,891	87.9
<p>Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, districts were required to test Science in grade 4 or 5 and grade 8 and 11. Some districts opted to test in additional grades. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08</p>			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	21,247	18,840	88.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	274	220	80.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	346	309	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,277	1,030	80.7
Hispanic	1,946	1,606	82.5
White, non-Hispanic	17,404	15,675	90.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,413	1,556	64.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	496	355	71.6
Economically disadvantaged students	5,876	4,805	81.8
Migratory students	75	46	61.3
Male	10,801	9,474	87.7
Female	10,446	9,366	89.7

Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	23,225	21,278	91.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	290	236	81.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	419	383	91.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,306	1,032	79.0
Hispanic	1,975	1,650	83.5
White, non-Hispanic	19,235	17,977	93.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,571	1,867	72.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	481	310	64.4
Economically disadvantaged students	6,067	5,116	84.3
Migratory students	76	57	75.0
Male	11,848	10,625	89.7
Female	11,377	10,653	93.6

Comments: Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	24,768	21,154	85.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	321	226	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	483	426	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,437	923	64.2
Hispanic	2,050	1,397	68.1
White, non-Hispanic	20,477	18,182	88.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,822	1,756	62.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	462	232	50.2
Economically disadvantaged students	6,580	4,808	73.1
Migratory students	78	48	61.5
Male	12,596	10,789	85.7
Female	12,172	10,365	85.2

Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, districts were required to test Science in grade 4 or 5 and grade 8 and 11. Some districts opted to test in additional grades. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates will be calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. The count of not assessed students will be subtracted from the total of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year. 2007-08 was the first year of implementation of the NSSRS (Nebraska Student and Staff Record System). Although every effort was made to get correct data, we know that because it was new and the learning curve was high, some data may not be 100% accurate. We continue working with school personnel to provide training and technical assistance regarding the NSSRS. DS 12.17.08

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	994	797	80.2
Districts	254	167	65.8
Comments: Following the USDE Monitoring visit in May, 2007, Nebraska was required to change the way AYP was calculated. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates are calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. DS 12.18.08			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	457	353	77.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	205	144	70.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	252	209	82.9
Comments: Following the USDE Monitoring visit in May, 2007, Nebraska was required to change the way AYP was calculated. Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, participation rates are calculated based on all students, not just those who were enrolled a full academic year. DS 12.18.08			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
250	164	65.6
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

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

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	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
Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, there were no schools in restructuring year 2.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 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

2
Action)

- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were no districts identified for improvement for the 2007-08 school year.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: For the 2007-08 school year, Nebraska had no districts identified for Title I School Improvement.	

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	1	0
Schools	11	0
Comments: All appeals addressed the AYP Safe Harbor decision. Based on Nebraska's approved AYP workbook, which includes changes required by USDE, non of the appeals resulted in changes to the AYP decisions. DS 12.17.08		

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	12/16/08
---	----------

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	1,856	1,851
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	890	823
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	48.0	44.5
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	808	647
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	43.5	35.0
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	6	
Comments: 3.12.09 The numbers entered above include only students from the schools that were identified for Title I School Improvement during the 2007-08 school year. DS		

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	5
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	0
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	1
Comments:	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 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
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1 & 2 were used.	2	0	0	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 1, 2, 3, & 4 were used.	1	0	1	C	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 1, 2, & 3 were used	1	0	1	A	
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1, 2, & 4 were used.	1	0	1	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 1,2,3,4 & 5 were used. The additional strategy included professional development on data analysis.	1	0	1	D	Increased teacher involvement and collaboration toward reaching the school improvement goals.
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies</p>

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.

NDE staff had ongoing discussions with each identified school's Accountability Compact Team (ACT). This included both face-to face conversations and conference calls.

Identified schools were encouraged to use the NDE Continuous Improvement Process Toolkit (<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/CIPtoolkit/index.html>) to provide resources.

In April, a "System Thinking" workshop was held. Each school identified for School Improvement was required to have a team attend. This conference provided ideas for looking at the school's "system," and strategies to begin implementing change.

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.

NDE staff had ongoing discussions with each identified school's Accountability Compact Team (ACT). This included both face-to face conversations and conference calls.

Identified schools were encouraged to use the NDE Continuous Improvement Process Toolkit (<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/CIPtoolkit/index.html>) to provide resources.

In April, a "System Thinking" workshop was held. Each school identified for School Improvement was required to have a team attend. This conference provided ideas for looking at the school's "system," and strategies to begin implementing change.

Evaluation included looking at AYP data.

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.

NA

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	1,856
Applied to transfer	14
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	14

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	No
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments: Only two of the schools identified for School Improvement have multiple buildings at the same or similar grade spans within the district.	

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

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 0
Comments: The district offered to pay for transportation. The parents chose to transport their children without requesting reimbursement for transportation.	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	4
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	351
Applied for supplemental educational services	0
Received supplemental educational services	0
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 0
Comments: No parents elected to have SES provided for their eligible students. Many students were already participating in after school programs provided by the districts and/or 21st Century Learning Community programs.	

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

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	70,744	69,631	98.4	1,113	1.6
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	6,495	6,462	99.5	33	0.5
Low-poverty schools	3,700	3,643	98.5	57	1.5
All elementary schools	20,744	20,573	99.2	171	0.8
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	13,990	13,670	97.7	320	2.3
Low-poverty schools	14,246	14,008	98.3	238	1.7
All secondary schools	50,000	49,058	98.1	942	1.9
Comments: 3/12/2009 The data are correct. In 2007-08 the percentage of highly qualified teachers in high poverty elementary schools (99.5%) was greater than the percentage of highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools (98.5%). This was also true in 2006-07 with the percentage of highly qualified teachers in high poverty elementary schools (98.6%) exceeding the percentage of highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools (96.9%). DS & SK This data is based on preliminary information and may need to be updated at a later date. DS 12.12.08					

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state counts elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class. DS 12.12.08

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	21.6
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	76.6
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This data is based on preliminary information and may need to be updated at a later date. DS 12.12.08

	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)	54.3
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	41.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	4.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This data is based on preliminary information and may need to be updated at a later date. DS 12.12.08

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	53.1	19.4
Poverty metric used	(free lunch + reduced lunch) / membership	
Secondary schools	41.4	19.1
Poverty metric used	(free lunch + reduced lunch) / membership	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	20,095
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	19,022
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	15,038
Vietnamese	610
Arabic	493
Nuer	454
Somali	344

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	16,870
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,653
Total	18,523
Comments: 3.12.09 Data provided in 1.6.2.2 covers the entire reporting year. Data in 1.6.3.1.1. are "one point in time" which is during the ELDA testing. High student mobility accounts for the difference. NR & DS This number reflects the number of students present during the ELDA testing window. DS 12.12.08	

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	4,626
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	25.0
Comments:	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	16,854
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,651
Total	18,505
Comments: This number reflects the number of students present during the ELDA testing window. This accounts for the discrepancy between 1.6.3.2.1 and 1.6.2.2. DS 12.12.08	

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

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

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	976	5.7
ELP attainment	4,626	27.4
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
3,639	0	3,639
Comments: 3.12.09 Nebraska has a new student record system that was just implemented during 2007-08. Two year's of data will be available for the 2008-09 CSPR. NR & DS		

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
2,717	2,420	89.1	297
Comments:			

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,712	2,409	88.8	303
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,147	851	74.2	296
Comments:			

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	23
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	11
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	18
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	15
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	22
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)	4
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: AMAO I 2007 = 91.2 pts 2008 Target = 94.04 pts AMAO I 2008 = 90.7 pts with CI = 91.6 AMAO I = NOT MET AMAO II 2007 = 29.8% 2008 Target = 27.8% AMAO II 2008 = 28.3% AMAO II = MET	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

Comments:

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
3,609	448	9

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.	414
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	200

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students		
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students		
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards		
Subject matter knowledge for teachers		
Other (Explain in comment box)		
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers		
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals		
PD provided to administrators/other than principals		
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative		
PD provided to community based organization personnel		
Total		

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

3.12.09 Data is not collected at this time. NR & DS The SEA is unable to collect this data at this time. DS 12.12.08

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	9/10/08	72
Comments:		

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

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

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

The SEA is working toward providing tentative allocations in the spring of each year to districts in order for the Grants Management System to be open as soon as final Grant Award Notifications are received from the U.S. Department of education. This will tentatively be accomplished during the 2009-10 grant year. DS 12.12.08

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	60.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	70.8
Hispanic	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	92.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	86.8
Female	90.0
Comments: Nebraska does not currently disaggregate graduation information for Children with disabilities, LEP, Economically disadvantaged, or migratory students. DS 12.16.08	

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	1.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5.6
Hispanic	3.9
White, non-Hispanic	1.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	2.2
Female	1.7
Comments: Nebraska does not currently disaggregate dropout information for Children with disabilities, LEP, Economically disadvantaged, or migratory students. DS 12.16.08	

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	246	246
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	254	254
Comments:		

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	37
K	18	110
1	14	114
2	12	116
3	N<10	111
4	10	92
5	N<10	89
6	N<10	91
7	N<10	83
8	N<10	90
9	18	147
10	N<10	124
11	N<10	83
12	13	84
Ungraded	N<10	19
Total	140	1,390
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	11	719
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	113	599
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	0	12
Hotels/Motels	16	60
Total	140	1,390
Comments:		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	37
K	110
1	114
2	116
3	111
4	92
5	89
6	91
7	83
8	90
9	147
10	124
11	83
12	103
Ungraded	19
Total	1,409
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	196
Migratory children/youth	31
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	327
Limited English proficient students	183
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	7
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	7
Early childhood programs	4
Assistance with participation in school programs	8
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	7
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	4
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	6
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
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	0
School Selection	1
Transportation	2
School records	4
Immunizations	4
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	102	81
4	80	69
5	83	63
6	80	64
7	70	48
8	75	60
High School	53	44
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	103	90
4	80	69
5	83	59
6	82	71
7	65	45
8	71	55
High School	55	35
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	171
K	276
1	235
2	253
3	231
4	197
5	175
6	172
7	176
8	176
9	159
10	136
11	92
12	63
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	644
Total	3,157
Comments: 3.12.09 In addition to the numbers listed above, 227 children Age Birth through 2 are included in our counts for "12-Month count of eligible Migrant Children who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes." LR & DS	

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.

Nebraska recruiters have been trained and provided staff development and are being monitored in the field. However, Nebraska continues to experience problems in identification and recruitment as a result of statements from the Office of Inspector General (OIG) regarding fines or possible imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C.1001. Recruiters continue to approach Identification and Recruitment with reluctance.

Due to the economic downturn and the continued uncertainty of foreign markets, some producers continue to limit their employment of seasonal and temporary workers. This has continued to lead producers to lay off workers and/or close plants which make employment of workers uncertain. This limits the worker mobility.

During the 2007-2008 counting period the national political issues dealing with immigration had an adverse effect on ID&R in the State of Nebraska. As our migrant recruiters make interpretations of U.S. laws regarding immigration and immigrant workers, they continue to show doubt in working with these families. Many of these families may be migrant and have been overlooked due to the political climate on immigration.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	91
K	77
1	78
2	72
3	79
4	63
5	54
6	39
7	36
8	26
9	21
10	16
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	663
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reduction in summer program numbers is a direct reflection of the reduction in Category 1 count and the decrease in worker mobility.

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 MIS2000 database system was used to compile and generate the 2007-2008 child count as well as the last count period.

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 data collected and entered into MIS2000 was from all approved COE's as well as updated information from the projects throughout the year. The data collected for the State of Nebraska: child's name, parents, guardians, address, gender, date of birth, birth city, birth state, birth country, race, school building number, type of enrollment, enrollment date, grade, withdrawal date, withdrawal code, residence only verification date, move from, move to, qualifying arrival date, residency date, priority for service, COE number, project name, project identification code.

The Migrant recruiter interviewed potential eligible migrant families. During the interview, the recruiter completed a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) which included a parent signature. Once the recruiter completed the COE, it was submitted to the LEAs Migrant project director, for review and approval. The COE's were then submitted to the state migrant office for review and approval. After the COE is approved at the state level, the initial information is entered into the MIS2000 state database system. Once the initial information is entered into MIS2000, districts are responsible for updating school history data, enroll and withdrawal data, program supplemental codes and priority for service data.

The data collection is an ongoing process. MIS2000 training is provided to the LEA's on procedures for entering data and the requirements for doing so. LEA's have access to MIS2000 and continually update data to ensure enrollment data, priority for service, and all pertinent education data is current.

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.

The SEA and LEA's enter the child's data into the MIS2000 system. The state migrant education program staff generates child count reports from the MIS2000 system. Preliminary reports are made available to the LEA's to re-assess the data for updates and/or corrections. The data is organized through various reports that can be generated by inputting certain parameters (e.g., dates, names, enrollments, etc.). The system is continually monitored for duplication of records, data, etc.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The report generated is set up in a way that it automatically calculates eligibility based on age 3-21, QAD, and/or residency dates, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, within the 36 month period to assure that only children meeting these criteria are included. When a child is entered into the MIS2000 system, each child is assigned a unique student identification number assigned by MIS2000 which assures that the child is only counted once in both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Nebraska continues to operate a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) approval process in which no COE documenting new Qualifying Arrival Dates (QAD) is entered into the Nebraska MIS2000 state database until it has been approved by the state COE approval team. A state recruiter assists the LEA's to ensure that all eligible migrant children are being identified and recruited within the state of Nebraska. COE's written by the local migrant projects are signed only by recruiters who have received a minimum of 20 hours of state approved Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) training.

There are five copies to the Nebraska COE. The blue copy is retained at the project site for their records before submitting the other copies to the state for review. The pink, green, yellow and white copies are submitted to the state migrant office for review, correction if necessary, and approval. The approved COE is signed and dated by a designated state migrant staff member and submitted to the MIS2000 program analyst for entry into the MIS2000 system. Once the COE data has been entered into the MIS2000 system, the COE is signed and dated by the MIS2000 program analyst. The MIS2000 program analyst keeps the pink copy, and sends the signed green and yellow copy to the project, and the white copy is sent to the state migrant office. If the COE is not approved by the designated state migrant staff member, the COE is returned to the project to be corrected or rewritten. Otherwise, the family does not qualify. Errors on COE's are recorded and used in training sessions with recruiters.

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.

3.13.09 The Rolling Re-Interview procedure has been adopted to insure the integrity of the Identification & Recruitment process in the State of Nebraska. A formal document including description, procedures, and sampling determinations has been written and is used in the field. Families are re-interviewed within ten days of the COE being approved by the Approval Team in the State, insuring those students identified receive no migrant funded services until the secondary verification (Rolling Re-Interview) is completed.

Number of eligibility determinations sampled: 50
Number for which a test was completed: 50
Number found eligible: 50

This process guarantees that ineligible students are not formally included in the Migrant Education Program. SH

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.

3.13.09 Nebraska has revised its Identification and Recruitment Plan for the State. The revised plan indicates improvement made by the State in staff development, technical assistance, and reorganization of the state recruiting plan. The plan has had a positive impact on the accuracy of eligibility determinations of migrant children. Implementation of the plan has decreased the number of COE's returned to recruiters due to eligibility issues.

State Identification and Recruitment Plan

Finding and enrolling eligible migrant children is a cornerstone of the Nebraska Migrant Education Program (MEP) and its importance

cannot be overemphasized. The Nebraska MEP is responsible for the proper and timely identification and recruitment of all eligible migrant children and youth in the State. This includes securing pertinent information to document the basis of a child's eligibility. Ultimately, it is the state's responsibility to implement procedures to ensure that migrant children and youth are both identified and determined to be eligible for the MEP.

Nebraska has revised its Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Plan for the State. The revised plan indicates improvements made by the State in staff development and reorganization of the State recruiting plan. The revision of the recruitment plan takes into consideration the changing federal non-regulatory guidance, shifting migrant populations, and changing service needs.

The majority of migrant recruiters in the State of Nebraska are hired by local school districts or projects where migrant recruitment is only a part of their job. These recruiters will be referred to as project recruiters. The primary focus of the project recruiter is the mission of the district; priority is given to meeting educational needs of the migrant students in a K-12 setting. Their scope of service is limited to the district. The revised ID&R plan includes three additional recruiters referred to as regional recruiters. The State has a need to recruit in areas outside current projects and to address the needs of migrant children who may not currently be enrolled in school districts or other educational settings. To meet this need the State is divided into three regions covering the central, northeastern, and southeastern parts of the state. This system requires the regional recruiters to have a state-wide perspective with an emphasis on migrant children from birth to five years of age and those that are outside current K-12 educational settings in project areas. In non-project areas regional recruiters will recruit families with children birth through 21 years of age and/or out of school youth. Regional recruiters may also assist any district if needed.

This revised ID&R plan is cost effective, but extends recruitment services through the summer months as well as filling geographic gaps currently not being addressed. A referral network is developing between the project recruiters and the regional recruiters. The network increases the likelihood of addressing family needs with support services outside the realm of the school district. The revised ID&R plan will continue to advocate a state-wide perspective in the supervision and staff development of project and regional ID&R personnel.

The Plan will have a State ID&R Coordinator located at the Nebraska State Department of Education. The State ID&R Coordinator will be responsible for the coordination of all recruitment efforts of the project and regional recruiters. The responsibilities of the State ID&R Coordinator will include:

- Directing the identification and recruitment efforts for the State of Nebraska
 - Collaboration with the Regional Recruiter Coordinator
 - Development of and presentation of Fall and Spring statewide ID&R meetings
 - Identification of training/mentor needs of individual recruiters
 - Develop and provide training for all new and seasoned recruiters
 - On-site visitation with each recruiter and address the specific training needs of the recruiter
 - Review of qualifying activities
 - Review recruitment logs of all recruiters
 - Evaluation of the quality of recruiter performance, and
 - Evaluation of the effective use of staff development
 - The responsibilities of the Regional Recruiter Coordinator includes:
 - Identify training needs of the regional recruiters
 - Collaborate with the State ID&R Coordinator with the development of and presentation of the Fall and Spring ID&R meeting
 - Provide staff development at the Hispanic/Latino Summit
 - Coordination of activities of the regional recruiters
 - Review recruiting effort logs of the regional recruiters
 - Identify the needs of migrant students and youth in the non-project areas
- The revised ID&R Plan will: a) blend local and statewide perspectives, b) provide year-round recruitment and c) provide ID&R coverage for the entire state with a focus on all demands of the migrant lifestyle. S.H.

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.

Preliminary child count reports for the regular 12-month and the summer session are submitted to each project site for them to review and to verify that the child continues to reside in the project area, and/or was in school at least one day during the reporting period, and/or

provide any other information for that child.

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.

3.13.09 Nebraska has revised its Identification and Recruitment Plan for the State. The revised plan indicates improvement made by the State in staff development, technical assistance, and reorganization of the state recruiting plan. The plan has had a positive impact on the accuracy of eligibility determinations of migrant children. Implementation of the plan has decreased the number of COE's returned to recruiters due to eligibility issues.

State Identification and Recruitment Plan

Finding and enrolling eligible migrant children is a cornerstone of the Nebraska Migrant Education Program (MEP) and its importance cannot be overemphasized. The Nebraska MEP is responsible for the proper and timely identification and recruitment of all eligible migrant children and youth in the State. This includes securing pertinent information to document the basis of a child's eligibility. Ultimately, it is the state's responsibility to implement procedures to ensure that migrant children and youth are both identified and determined to be eligible for the MEP.

The majority of migrant recruiters in the State of Nebraska are hired by local school districts or projects where migrant recruitment is only a part of their job. These recruiters will be referred to as project recruiters. The primary focus of the project recruiter is the mission of the district; priority is given to meeting educational needs of the migrant students in a K-12 setting. Their scope of service is limited to the school district or the project with little or no ability to recruit outside defined boundaries, school hours, or school calendar. The state currently has eighteen migrant projects and each has a project recruiter.

The revised ID&R plan includes three additional recruiters referred to as regional recruiters. The State has a need to recruit in areas outside current projects and to address the needs of migrant children who may not currently be enrolled in school districts or other educational settings. To meet this need the State is divided into three regions covering the central, northeastern, and southeastern parts of the state. This system requires the regional recruiters to have a state-wide perspective with an emphasis on migrant children from birth to five years of age and those that are outside current K-12 educational settings in project areas. In non-project areas regional recruiters will recruit families with children birth through 21 years of age and/or out of school youth. Regional recruiters may also assist any district if needed.

This revised ID&R plan is cost effective, but extends recruitment services through the summer months as well as filling geographic gaps currently not being addressed. A referral network is developing between the project recruiters and the regional recruiters. The network increases the likelihood of addressing family needs with support services outside the realm of the school district. The revised ID&R plan will continue to advocate a state-wide perspective in the supervision and staff development of project and regional ID&R personnel.

The Plan will have a State ID&R Coordinator located at the Nebraska State Department of Education. The State ID&R Coordinator will be responsible for the coordination of all recruitment efforts of the project and regional recruiters.

The responsibilities of the State ID&R Coordinator will include:

- Directing the identification and recruitment efforts for the State of Nebraska
- Collaboration with the Regional Recruiter Coordinator
- Development of and presentation of Fall and Spring statewide ID&R meetings
- Identification of training/mentor needs of individual recruiters
- Develop and provide training for all new and seasoned recruiters
- On-site visitation with each recruiter and address the specific training needs of the recruiter
- Review of qualifying activities
- Review recruitment logs of all recruiters
- Evaluation of the quality of recruiter performance, and
 - •Evaluation of the effective use of staff development
 - The responsibilities of the Regional Recruiter Coordinator includes:
- Identify training needs of the regional recruiters

- Collaborate with the State ID&R Coordinator with the development of and presentation of the Fall and Spring ID&R meeting
- Provide staff development at the Hispanic/Latino Summit
- Coordination of activities of the regional recruiters
- Review recruiting effort logs of the regional recruiters
- Identify the needs of migrant students and youth in the non-project areas The revised ID&R Plan will: a) blend local and statewide perspectives, b) provide year-round recruitment and c) provide ID&R coverage for the entire state with a focus on all demands of the migrant lifestyle.

S.H.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

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