

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

NEW JERSEY



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:

New Jersey

Address:

100 River View Plaza
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Clare Barrett

Telephone: (609) 292-5408

Fax: (609) 633-6874

e-mail: clare.barrett@doe.state.nj.us

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

Lucille E. Davy

Friday, March 13, 2009, 11:52:28 AM

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 Department of Education is required by state Administrative Code to review and update the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards in a five-year cycle and is currently undertaking the 2009 Standards Revision Project. The primary goal of the 2009 revision is to align state content standards with the knowledge and skills needed by all students for postsecondary education and the global workplace. In spring 2009, the New Jersey State Board of Education is scheduled to adopt revised P-12 Core Curriculum Content Standards in Language Arts Literacy, Mathematics and other content areas: Visual and Performing Arts, Comprehensive Health and Physical Education, Science, Social Studies, World Languages, Technological Literacy and Technology Education and Career and 21st Century Life Skills.

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.

In 2008, New Jersey implemented new assessments at grades 5 through 8 and established new cut scores for these grade levels. These new standards represented a raising of the bar for proficiency. The tests themselves represented some significant redesign of the previous assessments, particularly in the area of language arts. In 2009, New Jersey will be implementing similarly redesigned assessments at grades 3 and 4, and will establish new performance standards for these grade levels. The Alternate Proficiency Assessment (APA) has been redesigned as well to respond to federal peer review guidance, and it is our intention to establish new performance standards for the APA in 2009 which will reflect the assessment design endorsed by the USDOE. In addition, the state piloted an Algebra II end of course test in 2008 and will do so again in 2009, along with an Algebra I pilot end of course test. Both tests are a product of the American Diploma Project consortium coordinated by Achieve, Inc. New Jersey also field-tested an end of course biology assessment in 2008, and will set performance standards following the 2009 administration.

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.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	723,120	718,862	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	746	739	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	59,752	59,602	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	123,222	121,734	98.8
Hispanic	132,094	131,166	99.3
White, non-Hispanic	402,525	400,928	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	120,103	117,773	98.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,027	21,857	99.2
Economically disadvantaged students	205,380	203,404	99.0
Migratory students	165	162	98.2
Male	371,228	368,643	99.3
Female	351,892	350,219	99.5
Comments:			

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	15,264	13.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	94,504	80.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,005	6.8
Total	117,773	
Comments:		

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	723,982	718,155	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	748	742	99.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	59,430	58,932	99.2
Black, non-Hispanic	123,624	121,994	98.7
Hispanic	132,048	130,289	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	403,328	401,528	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	118,987	116,838	98.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,663	19,036	92.1
Economically disadvantaged students	204,418	201,697	98.7
Migratory students	161	149	92.6
Male	371,997	368,529	99.1
Female	351,985	349,626	99.3

Comments: Response to Ed review: Data still under review. Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. We are checking the participation rates for Limited English Proficient students who were less than on year in the US and who are exempted from the Reading and language arts assessment, we are also investigating the merged data from the Native language assessment which was offered for the first time in 2007-08. Any data changes would be updated when CSPR reopens in January.

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	15,266	13.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	94,464	80.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,108	6.1
Total	116,838	
Comments:		

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	209,229	207,371	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	192	188	97.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,197	17,123	99.6
Black, non-Hispanic	36,167	35,588	98.4
Hispanic	38,634	38,210	98.9
White, non-Hispanic	115,643	114,908	99.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	35,139	34,211	97.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,375	6,286	98.6
Economically disadvantaged students	61,146	60,310	98.6
Migratory students	46	43	93.5
Male	107,962	106,827	98.9
Female	101,267	100,544	99.3
Comments: Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	4,439	13.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	27,931	81.6
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	1,841	5.4
Total	34,211	
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.

1.3 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	101,925	89,233	87.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	91	77	84.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,754	8,349	95.4
Black, non-Hispanic	17,621	12,644	71.8
Hispanic	19,967	15,764	79.0
White, non-Hispanic	54,702	50,915	93.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,674	11,476	73.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,396	2,872	65.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,288	24,372	75.5
Migratory students	22	15	68.2
Male	52,159	44,812	85.9
Female	49,766	43,591	87.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.1 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	102,062	87,665	85.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	93	79	84.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,671	8,205	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	17,757	13,096	73.8
Hispanic	19,706	15,290	77.6
White, non-Hispanic	55,046	50,349	91.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,580	9,740	62.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,730	2,231	59.8
Economically disadvantaged students	31,815	23,623	74.3
Migratory students	19	12	63.2
Male	52,356	43,232	82.6
Female	49,706	44,425	89.4
Comments: Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. For the Limited English proficient, we are investigating the differences as stated in 1.2, it is possible that these are related. Any changes would be updated when the CSPR reopens in January.			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science results available for 4th and 8th grades only			

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	101,462	86,881	85.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	82	69	84.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,870	8,402	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	17,068	11,606	68.0
Hispanic	19,261	14,582	75.7
White, non-Hispanic	55,508	50,865	91.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,742	11,103	66.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,473	1,969	56.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31,270	22,486	71.9
Migratory students	16	N<12	
Male	52,265	44,221	84.6
Female	49,197	41,847	85.1
Comments: American Indian or Alaskan Native and Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation.			

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

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

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	101,782	83,989	82.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	60	72.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,810	8,130	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	17,271	11,562	66.9
Hispanic	19,057	13,901	72.9
White, non-Hispanic	55,886	49,796	89.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,724	9,400	56.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,809	1,474	52.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30,890	21,185	68.6
Migratory students	13	N<12	
Male	52,543	41,568	79.1
Female	49,239	42,411	86.1
Comments: American Indian or Alaskan Native and Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. For the Limited English proficient, we are investigating the differences as stated in 1.2, it is possible that these are related. Any changes would be updated when the CSPR reopens in January.			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	102,284	86,905	85.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	83	71	85.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,931	8,245	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	17,317	11,808	68.2
Hispanic	19,421	14,043	72.3
White, non-Hispanic	55,842	52,170	93.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,639	11,919	71.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,470	1,571	45.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31,222	21,749	69.7
Migratory students	16	N<12	
Male	52,827	45,145	85.5
Female	49,457	41,760	84.4
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.3 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	102,745	79,420	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	74	67.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,821	8,128	92.1
Black, non-Hispanic	17,490	9,515	54.4
Hispanic	19,362	12,672	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	56,421	47,831	84.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,864	9,168	51.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,046	1,320	43.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31,212	18,603	59.6
Migratory students	21	15	71.4
Male	52,836	40,278	76.2
Female	49,909	38,317	76.8
Comments: American Indian or Alaskan Native and Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. Unfavorable weather conditions impacted migratory patterns with families bypassing New Jersey and going to next destination.			

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	102,342	61,530	60.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	109	49	45.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,686	6,906	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	17,431	6,420	36.8
Hispanic	19,238	7,998	41.6
White, non-Hispanic	56,338	39,815	70.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,841	4,586	27.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,674	445	16.6
Economically disadvantaged students	30,737	11,205	36.5
Migratory students	18	N<12	
Male	52,617	28,877	54.9
Female	49,725	32,606	65.6
Comments: The percent change in proficient students over the previous year's performance report is due to new 2007-2008 tests ,with more rigorous standards set by the Commissioner. American Indian or Alaskan Native and Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. Unfavorable weather conditions impacted migratory patterns with families bypassing New Jersey and going to next destination.			

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science results available for 4th and 8th grades only			

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

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	103,371	74,582	72.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	99	65	65.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,689	7,812	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	17,532	8,253	47.1
Hispanic	19,058	10,920	57.3
White, non-Hispanic	57,476	47,120	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,977	6,565	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,764	968	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	30,161	15,787	52.3
Migratory students	28	N<12	
Male	53,000	37,906	71.5
Female	50,371	36,607	72.7
Comments: American Indian or Alaskan Native and Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. Unfavorable weather conditions impacted migratory patterns with families bypassing New Jersey and going to next destination.			

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

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

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	102,988	59,120	57.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	97	45	46.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,545	6,674	78.1
Black, non-Hispanic	17,489	5,523	31.6
Hispanic	18,947	7,078	37.4
White, non-Hispanic	57,398	39,510	68.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,984	3,686	21.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,388	267	11.2
Economically disadvantaged students	30,002	9,786	32.6
Migratory students	27	N<12	
Male	52,802	28,145	53.3
Female	50,186	30,938	61.6
Comments: The percent change in proficient students over the previous year's performance report is due to new 2007-2008 tests ,with more rigorous standards set by the Commissioner. American Indian or Alaskan Native and Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. Unfavorable weather conditions impacted migratory patterns with families bypassing New Jersey and going to next destination.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science results available for 4th and 8th grades only.			

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	105,159	67,731	64.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	118	75	63.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,397	7,253	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	18,006	6,540	36.3
Hispanic	19,392	9,628	49.6
White, non-Hispanic	58,631	43,850	74.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,484	4,877	27.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,862	857	29.9
Economically disadvantaged students	30,134	13,043	43.3
Migratory students	36	N<12	
Male	54,225	34,603	63.8
Female	50,934	33,075	64.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.5 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	104,803	73,870	70.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	119	77	64.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,271	7,257	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	17,971	8,093	45.0
Hispanic	19,253	10,327	53.6
White, non-Hispanic	58,573	47,675	81.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,502	5,630	32.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,483	546	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	29,953	14,296	47.7
Migratory students	33	N<12	
Male	54,022	35,866	66.4
Female	50,781	37,931	74.7
Comments: Migratory student subpopulation is impacted by small sample fluctuation. Unfavorable weather conditions impacted migratory patterns with families bypassing New Jersey and going to next destination.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science results available for 4th and 8th grades only			

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	105,286	70,941	67.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	105	64	61.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,196	7,205	87.9
Black, non-Hispanic	18,346	6,988	38.1
Hispanic	18,847	9,492	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	59,119	46,773	79.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,651	5,012	28.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,839	726	25.6
Economically disadvantaged students	29,208	13,017	44.6
Migratory students	27	N<12	
Male	54,129	36,499	67.4
Female	51,157	34,389	67.2
Comments: Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. Unfavorable weather conditions impacted migratory patterns with families bypassing New Jersey and going to next destination.			

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

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

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	105,129	85,235	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	107	81	75.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,075	7,392	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	18,380	11,318	61.6
Hispanic	18,775	12,688	67.6
White, non-Hispanic	59,136	53,195	90.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,725	7,992	45.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,485	700	28.2
Economically disadvantaged students	29,139	18,266	62.7
Migratory students	27	N<12	
Male	54,072	41,129	76.1
Female	51,057	44,028	86.2
Comments: Migratory impacted by small sample fluctuation. Unfavorable weather conditions impacted migratory patterns with families bypassing New Jersey and going to next destination.			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

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	105,087	85,235	81.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	105	81	77.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,192	7,392	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18,271	11,318	61.9
Hispanic	18,789	12,688	67.5
White, non-Hispanic	59,066	53,195	90.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	17,572	7,992	45.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,816	700	24.9
Economically disadvantaged students	29,088	18,266	62.8
Migratory students	27	N<12	
Male	54,000	41,129	76.2
Female	51,087	44,028	86.2
Comments:			

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

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	98,914	73,693	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	135	93	68.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,875	7,121	90.4
Black, non-Hispanic	15,671	7,038	44.9
Hispanic	15,279	8,677	56.8
White, non-Hispanic	59,071	50,159	84.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,381	5,020	32.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,477	788	31.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19,131	9,851	51.5
Migratory students	12	N<12	
Male	50,029	37,295	74.5
Female	48,885	36,389	74.4
Comments: American Indian or Alaskan Native is impacted by small sample fluctuation.			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	99,049	81,881	82.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	134	103	76.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,874	7,134	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	15,695	10,131	64.5
Hispanic	15,313	10,507	68.6
White, non-Hispanic	59,151	53,306	90.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,482	6,921	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,467	543	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19,161	12,381	64.6
Migratory students	12	N<12	
Male	50,117	39,177	78.2
Female	48,932	42,694	87.3
Comments: American Indian or Alaskan Native is impacted by small sample fluctuation.			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

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	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Science results available for 4th and 8th grades only.			

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	2,395	1,564	65.3
Districts	649	549	84.6
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,329	807	60.7
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	359	140	39.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	970	667	68.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
486	412	84.8
Comments: NJ resubmitted to Edfacts the Title I list of Districts that received Title I funds, the new total is 486.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- 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	47
Extension of the school year or school day	20
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	10
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	4
Replacement of the principal	12
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	22
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
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)	97
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	46
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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 Action²)
- 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.

Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) teams work with Title I schools and districts in need of improvement. The CAPA process includes an initial visit to schools in corrective action and benchmark follow up meetings twice each year. If the school progresses to restructuring, a shorter return benchmark visit is conducted. During a CAPA visit, district and school staff members serve as partners on the team in an effort to build local capacity to oversee their low-performing schools.

CAPA benchmark follow-up process is conducted for all districts and schools having received a CAPA visit. The purpose of the two, one-day follow up meetings is to:

1. Provide a professional learning experience by facilitating an ongoing needs assessment, data analysis, action planning, and focused walkthrough process;
2. Review the NCLB Unified Plan to determine the level of implementation of action plans or prioritized recommendations in the Benchmark Summary Form;
3. Determine the level of implementation and effectiveness of strategies in the NCLB Unified Plan, school restructuring plan, and School Improvement Allocations (SIA) Parts A and G; and
4. Determine what further assistance may be needed.

The New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (NJQSAC) is the New Jersey Department of Education's system for monitoring and evaluating school districts. NJQSAC is the process utilized for districts identified for corrective action and improvement. The system shifts the focus of NJDOE work with districts from compliance to assistance, capacity-building and improvement. NJQSAC will focus on improving district practice in five key areas:

- Instruction and Program
- Personnel
- Fiscal Management
- Operations
- Governance

Each district conducts a self-assessment of its practice in these key areas, reviewing key documents, conducting interviews and focus groups with staff, and analyzing student achievement data. The results of the District Performance Review (DPR) will be compiled in a report that will be presented to the district and its community.

As part of its support for district, NJDOE provides each district with a NJQSAC Support Team, led by a facilitator and consisting of state staff members with content-area expertise. The facilitator is the main contact person for the district and the driving force for supporting continuous improvement. The NJQSAC Support Team assists the district through a strategic mapping process including:

- Prioritizing Needs and Identifying Strategies
- Developing the District Improvement Plans
- Supporting the Implementation of the District Improvement Plans

Assisting with the evaluation and revision of the District Improvement Plans The strategic mapping process is designed to assist districts in identifying priorities and challenges that can be included in the long-term corrective action improvement plan. The mapping process helps the district committee identify existing, and perhaps overlapping, programs and resources and helps to identify successful strategies to improve student achievement. It also helps the district committee to develop measurable goals and benchmarks that will be used to assess improvement over time. The process has been developed in consultation with the Education Alliance at Brown University and the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center at George Washington University.

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	38
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: Updated as of 2/17/09	

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	2	2
Schools	9	1
Comments: Updated as of 2/17/09		

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

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	143,958	142,712
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	84,594	92,858
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	58.8	65.1
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	84,292	86,861
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	58.6	60.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	375	
Comments: Response to Ed review: Redone to Ed specification. The SY 2006-07 column includes only data for schools that recieved funds during SY 2007-08. Per Edfacts direction, Report the total number of students enrolled in grades that were assessed under section 1111 of ESEA.		

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

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

831.

1.4.8.2 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	141
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	86
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	234

Comments:

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

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
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.
1	N/A	25	1	7	D	Coaching and networking
2	N/A	23	0	5	D	Common planning time Differentiated planning and instruction
3	N/A	21	0	8	D	Benchmark testing; Lesson modeling Data analysis Additional teacher resources
5	Teachers-leadership, collaborative problem solving and planning, peer coaching, teaching rounds, student work & action research, integration of technology, leadership, mentoring and supporting beginning teachers. Students-increased learning time, develop improved self esteem and character development, inclusion classes in all academic subjects. Principals-coaching and mentoring, leadership focusing on data analysis, building a climate of trust and respect, professional learning communities.	10	1	2	D	More accountability opportunity for professional growth data driven instruction; customized technical assistance small learning communities; Positive behavior program Improvement in leadership council functioning

	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A
	N/A	0	0	0		N/A

Comments:

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Effective strategies for districts and schools identified in 1.4.8.3 were shared during workshops, conferences, technical assistance sessions and while conducting Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA visits and meetings. Below is a description of some of these activities.

The CAPA process which includes an initial visit to schools in corrective action and benchmark follow up meetings twice each year. If the school progresses to restructuring, a shorter return benchmark visit is conducted. During a CAPA visit, district and school staff members serve as partners on the team in an effort to build local capacity to oversee their low-performing schools. Their participation serves as a tool for professional learning to introduce and reinforce successful research-based practices.

A CAPA consultant learning community was formed with the following purpose: 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 that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures. CAPA consultants are knowledgeable about NJDOE policies, procedures and initiatives as well as experts and leaders in school improvement and the CAPA process. Each learning community agenda includes one or more research-based practices.

The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center assisted in developing a case study project from identified schools with established effective practices in key areas in addition to making significant gains in student achievement. These schools represented an important opportunity to learn how the leadership in these schools was able to implement effective practices under challenging circumstances (pressure from being identified for improvement for several consecutive years, high poverty student populations, high mobility, etc.). The case studies have been documented with evidence that is shared with schools in advanced levels of status.

Three regional one-day workshops entitled "Digging Deeper--Using Data to Inform and Inspire Instructional Improvement" were presented by a leading expert in the field. The workshop assisted teachers and school/district leaders on how to be educated consumers and users of data in order to evaluate students' progress and performance, establish goals, mobilize efforts, leverage resources and inform practice, guide decision-making and market result

Eighteen workshops for these schools and districts were conducted to assist in the development of a school improvement plan (Title I Unified Plan) to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the school, so that greater numbers of students achieve proficiency in the areas of language arts literacy and mathematics. The agenda included how to conduct annually a comprehensive needs assessment based upon most recent achievement goals and actual performance.

Operationalizing Systems Thinking was the theme of a three-day workshop sponsored in partnership between the NJ Department of Education and the Newark Public Schools. The kick-off day featured national practitioner of systems thinking, Mike Miles who is superintendent of Harrison School District Two in Colorado Springs, CO. According to Miles, "Training leaders to operationalize systems thinking is the reform element most needed today." In systems thinking, the district and school are viewed as a system with a group of elements and parts that are interrelated. Systems thinking integrate the various parts of the system in a way that maximizes organizational effectiveness. The purpose of the workshop included the practicing of new habits of mind using a systems model and the creation of action plans by each school team. After the development of 1 to 3 action plans that are related to the Title I Unified Plan, school teams conducted a peer review of the plans receiving critical feedback and suggestions while building a network of support among the school leaders and teams. Peer review is a requirement of NCLB for schools in need of improvement (SINI). Newark Public Schools and NJDOE are committed to providing on-going follow up and support to the Part (g) Newark SINI schools in the coming year.

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.

Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) teams work with Title I schools and districts in need of improvement. The activities below outline the evaluation and technical assistance provided.

Ongoing technical assistance is provided to schools and districts receiving Part (g) funds to aid them in the conducting of data analysis, needs assessment and creation of the unified school improvement plan. This technical assistance is provided directly by NJDOE staff and the CAPA teams.

The NCLB school support team process, Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement (CAPA), provides on-the-scene review, consultation and follow-up to schools. <http://www.nj.gov/njded/capa/>.

The CAPA process (the initial visit, governance visit, and benchmark meetings) is designed to assist schools as follows: ? Conducting an initial comprehensive review and needs assessment of all facets of a school's operation. District operations are also evaluated during the initial visit.

? Review state-issued AYP and three-year trend data charts along with other school portfolio information to inform the CAPA team during the school review effort, also known as the scholastic audit.

? Issue a report to the district that identifies findings and recommendations at the conclusion of the on-site visit. The district presents this report to the school staff and the public at a School Board meeting. The NJDOE posts all the CAPA reports on its Web site.

? After the CAPA report is issued, the school/district update the Title I Unified Plan, incorporating its prioritized CAPA recommendations and action plans to address the identified issues. The prioritized issues are specified and an action plan and budget are developed that includes student achievement data, benchmarks and targets, as well as a plan of action using scientifically based research models.

? Two Part (g) technical assistance sessions were provided to 39 schools eligible to receive the grant to review expectations and present a showcase of effective practices.

? With the assistance of the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center, an evaluation document was developed as a a guideline for reviewing the implementation and impact of the services delivered by school and district staff members and providers to schools receiving a School Improvement Part (g) grant. The standards describe four levels of performance in several areas of support for schools along with examples of indicators and evidence for assessing each area. These standards are intended to be comprehensive and may include practices that are not provided by all programs/providers. The expectations of the providers and programs are that the providers will work collaboratively with the schools to build their capacity to implement and sustain the effective practices using school resources. The assessment will be based upon evidence provided by the provider or district and school. Examples of possible evidence are listed in each section. In the case that the service or strategy in the area is not provided, the area will receive a "DNA", which indicates "does not apply."

? Providers, districts and schools are charged with collecting and maintaining evidence of activities in the nine standard areas. A self assessment is completed by the provider and district/school to determine the initial status. Rubrics are used as a resource to complete the evaluation. The provider and school/district should separately complete the assessment of practice tool at the six month period and at the end of the grant program. The provider and the district/school should meet to discuss their results at each period. The results of the assessment should be submitted to NJDOE for review.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Collaborative Assessment and Planning for Achievement (CAPA) was offered to non-Title I high schools using state funds. As part of the Department of Education's continuing effort to provide professional learning experiences, six districts were offered the opportunity to participate in a scholastic audit using the process for a high school(s). CAPA has been used by the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) for the past four years to meet the requirements of NCLB for Title I schools.

CAPA is as a professional learning opportunity for district and school staff members who participate as members on the CAPA team. The CAPA team membership usually includes NJDOE staff, outside experts, the principal from the school and district and school representatives from language arts literacy and mathematics. Special education and bilingual education team members are added if indicated. A thoughtful, systematic and evidence-based approach is used to reach agreement about the strengths and the changes needed to make a positive difference in teaching and learning. At the conclusion of the visit, the entire team develops a report of findings and recommendations that will be provided to the district and school.

In its reorganization, the NJDOE established the Office of District and School Improvement (DSIS). The mission of DSIS is to provide guidance, support and resources to assist districts and schools meeting the high-quality standards established by the New Jersey State Board of Education. Our scope centers on improvement in the five key areas of school district effectiveness identified in the New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (QSAC) as: Instruction and Program, Personnel, Operations Management, Fiscal Management and Governance, as well as the school-level standards established by the Collaborative Assessment for Planning and Achievement (CAPA) process.

The Office of DSIS works collaboratively with other department program offices, county offices of education and external organizations to deliver high-quality supports and resources to districts and schools. Efforts are aligned with the paradigm shift of the department's work with districts from compliance to assistance, building capacity and improvement. Specific activities of involvement include providing professional development and technical assistance to schools and districts in need of improvement, developing and implementing efficient methods of communicating improvement activities, establishing a resource of materials to prepare schools and districts for monitoring, and assisting with the continuous improvement of the QSAC and CAPA monitoring

Title I SINIs have access to the expertise provided by The Turnaround Leadership Professional Learning Community Network, a professional development initiative to create collegial networks for school leaders across the state. The initiative fosters the abilities of educational leaders by providing opportunities to enhance and hone leadership skills. Through an established partnership with Montclair State University (Northern Region), The College of New Jersey (Central Region), and Rowan University (Southern Region), the network works to assist new and veteran educational leaders, as well as those in schools in years three to five of NCLB corrective action status. Partnering with these universities, members of the network discuss theoretical concepts of leadership, as well as practical applications with their fellow administrators in the field.

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	146,002
Applied to transfer	1,402
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	957

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	No
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
Comments: Updated as of 2/17/09	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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	\$ 139,749
Comments: In reponse to ED review: Data adjusted due to district reporting error.	

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	176
Comments: In response to ED review: Updated as of 2/17/09	

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?*
 1. 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:
 2. 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
 3. 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
 4. Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- 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	124,304
Applied for supplemental educational services	24,342
Received supplemental educational services	17,283
Comments: Updated as of 2/17/09	

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	\$ 16,551,656
Comments: Updated as of 2/17/09	

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	326,413	322,859	98.9	3,554	1.1
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	47,721	46,183	96.8	1,538	3.2
Low-poverty schools	52,291	52,041	99.5	250	0.5
All elementary schools	206,992	204,553	98.8	2,439	1.2
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	28,680	27,922	97.4	758	2.6
Low-poverty schools	30,715	30,659	99.8	56	0.2
All secondary schools	119,421	118,306	99.1	1,115	0.9
Comments:					

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A full-day self-contained elementary classroom equals one class.
--

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	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	0.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Response to Ed review: Does the state have the data that was to be collected in fall 2008? No. The fall data collection is not complete at this time. We anticipate that these data can be provided for the next consolidated report.

Data on reasons classes are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified were not collected by the state in the 2007-2008 data collection. The state will collect these data in fall 2008 through the state's data system which includes the names of all teachers who are not highly qualified in the area(s) they are teaching.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	0.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Response to Ed review: Does the state have the data that was to be collected in fall 2008? No. The fall data collection is not complete at this time. We anticipate that these data can be provided for the next consolidated report.

Data on reasons classes are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified were not collected by the state in the 2007-2008 data collection. The state will collect these data in fall 2008 through the state's data system which includes the names of all teachers who are not highly qualified in the area(s) they are teaching.

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	58.0	6.0
Poverty metric used	Response to ED review: State did not specify the poverty metric. Free and reduced lunch is the poverty metric for elementary and secondary schools. The State of New Jersey rank-ordered the elementary schools (K-8) and the secondary schools (9-12) separately and identified the break points for the high poverty and low poverty quartiles.	
Secondary schools	37.0	5.0
Poverty metric used	Response to ED review: State did not specify the poverty metric. Free and reduced lunch is the poverty metric for elementary and secondary schools. The State of New Jersey rank-ordered the elementary schools (K-8) and the secondary schools (9-12) separately and identified the break points for the high poverty and low poverty quartiles.	
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, Korean, Polish, Turkish, Hindi, Mandarin
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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	54,503
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.	52,766
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	42,367
Korean	1,550
Arabic	1,439
Portuguese	1,288
Gujarati	1,072

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

Haitian Creole-1047 Mandarin-941 Polish-713 Urdu-618 Tagalog-532 Vietnamese-437

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	54,331
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	172
Total	54,503
Comments:	

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

CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	15,378
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	28.2
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	52,598
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	168
Total	52,766
Comments: Reponse to ED review: Total tested/non tested is equal to the total in 1.6.2.2.	

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	19,393	82.2
ELP attainment	45,365	95.8
Comments: In response to ED review: Making Progress measure: The number tested is 52,598, however, 23,606 students have two data points used to determine making progress. ELP attainment measure: The number tested is 52,598, however, 47,342 students have enrollment data available to accurately determine length of time in program. The number reported under ELP attainment includes the number of students who have attained ELP and exited language assistance programs plus the students who are still enrolled in programs within the four or five-year timeframe defined in the State Consolidated Application.		

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).	Yes
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
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 83I.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish
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)
Spanish
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)
Spanish
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
5,031	3,770	8,801
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,770	5,818	66.3	2,952
Comments: Response to ED review: The number not tested includes students who did not participate or did not have a valid proficiency level assigned.			

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
8,769	5,053	57.6	3,716
Comments: Response to ED review: The number not tested includes students who did not participate or did not have a valid proficiency level assigned.			

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
2,666	1,842	69.1	824
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	197
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	184
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	184
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	197
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	197
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	
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)	
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	1
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 200708)	
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 200708)	0
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments: Response to ED review: NJ reported 93.4% of all subgrantees met all three Title III AMAO's therefore the state met AMAO.	

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
36,614	11,746	62

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.	3,571
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	138	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	172	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	138	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	138	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	60	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	210	16
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	210	248
PD provided to principals	210	22
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	210	266
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	210	32
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	210	584

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	10/17/07	107
Comments: Response to ED review: Dates corrected and days revised. The Department of Treasury approved all set-up documents on 9/4/07. We were able to begin spending funds on that date. The FY 2008 applications were due 10/5/07 and the first one was approved on 10/17/08. About 75% of the applications were approved within 90 days of the due date. It usually takes 30 -60 days from the date of approval for districts to submit their Grant Acceptance Certificates (GACs) which verify that the board of education accepts the funds. Some submit in less time and other much longer. We processed the first set of Title III payments on February 1, 2008. The reason the number of days for the distribution of funds is high is due to the time gap between the date of approval of applications and the date when the districts return their GACs.		

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

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

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

The state can expedite the distribution of Title III funds by encouraging districts to return the Grant Acceptance Certificate within 60 days of receiving notice that their NCLB application has been approved.

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	1
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	92.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	88.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	97.8
Black, non-Hispanic	88.0
Hispanic	85.1
White, non-Hispanic	95.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	78.3
Limited English proficient	0.0
Economically disadvantaged	0.0
Migratory students	0.0
Male	92.0
Female	93.7
Comments: Graduation rate is not collected for the following subgroups, Limited English proficient, Economically disadvantaged, migratory students.	

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 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:*
 1. 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,
 2. 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
 3. 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.

Co

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	2.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.5
Black, non-Hispanic	3.7
Hispanic	3.9
White, non-Hispanic	1.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0.4
Limited English proficient	0.1
Economically disadvantaged	0.4
Migratory students	0.0
Male	2.3
Female	1.7
Comments: Will be collecting the migrant information for 2007-2008 school year. The data is accurate as reported by the school districts.	

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	664	600
LEAs with subgrants	8	8
Total	672	608

Comments: In response to ED review: Non reporting LEAs will be subject to greater oversight via the program office, the county offices of education and the SEA during regular NCLB compliance monitoring. Further, non reporting LEAs will be contacted and mandated to submit delinquent reports.

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)	246	71
K	463	121
1	411	109
2	468	135
3	384	121
4	327	96
5	296	91
6	342	112
7	316	102
8	364	98
9	371	93
10	277	71
11	225	53
12	200	55
Ungraded	N<12	N<12
Total	4,698	1,335
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	1,322	520
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,569	652
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	152	54
Hotels/Motels	655	109
Total	4,698	1,335
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)	71
K	121
1	109
2	135
3	121
4	96
5	91
6	112
7	102
8	98
9	93
10	71
11	53
12	55
Ungraded	N<12
Total	1,335
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	N<12
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	75
Limited English proficient students	N<12
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	8
Expedited evaluations	8
Staff professional development and awareness	8
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	8
Transportation	8
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	7
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	8
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	8
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	8
Coordination between schools and agencies	8
Counseling	8
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	7
Clothing to meet a school requirement	7
School supplies	8
Referral to other programs and services	8
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	7
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

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	1
School Selection	0
Transportation	1
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	1
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	35	31
4	40	24
5	32	28
6	38	28
7	29	19
8	18	N<12
High School	51	15
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	84	38
4	82	39
5	93	34
6	71	26
7	88	31
8	93	18
High School	37	12
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	127
K	123
1	114
2	112
3	106
4	94
5	84
6	64
7	58
8	49
9	36
10	39
11	29
12	20
Ungraded	N<12
Out-of-school	1,036
Total	2,093
Comments:	

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.

N/A

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)	85
K	91
1	67
2	60
3	59
4	54
5	49
6	26
7	34
8	19
9	18
10	15
11	14
12	N<12
Ungraded	N<12
Out-of-school	584
Total	1,180
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.

N/A

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.

COEStar was used to compile and generate New Jersey's Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for both 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 reporting periods.

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.

Response to ED Review: New Jersey (NJ) stated how child count data is inputted and organized, but did not state how the data is updated

i.e. who is responsible for updating the child count data at the State Level and how often updates are conducted?

Response:

The state MEP coordinator, Danielle Anderson Thomas, is responsible for updating the child count data. Updates are conducted annually.

Data collected relevant to the Childcount includes: the COE (4 specific elements: the QAD residency, date, current address/state and student's date of birth); school or program enrollment including the school term school year enrollment and withdrawal dates from the program; LEP assessment needs assessment and graduation/termination data; and instructional and supportive services program data including the type of program and funding source.

Recruiters collect data at the time a new COE is completed. Formal mailings are made to the school districts requesting additional information such as enrollment verification supplemental program participation special education data updated health records test scores promotion data completion of at-risk surveys etc. For students entering the area after mass enrollment is completed in the fall the local regional projects contact school districts to verify enrollment For pre-schoolers not attending a school or program and for non-attending young adults lists are generated by district and are given to the appropriate recruiter for verification. The recruiter then calls or visits the homes of the children/youth in order to verify that they still reside in the area. All data relating to summer services are documented through daily attendance records tutor logs nurse's health logs reports and receipts for services staff monthly reports and activity logs health referral forms pre-and post-test records summaries of student progress instructional service according to what each site provided and what each child actually received. Site directors student records clerks nurses recruiters teachers and other summer staff are involved in collecting maintaining and forwarding these data to the data management specialist for recording in the database.

COEstar is an integrated component of our data collection system and data is collected throughout the entire year.

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.

COEstar is our primary filing system for student information from the COE to the collection of services. Although data are inputted both manually and through electronic COEs no data is entered into our database until the COE is verified by the regional migrant education project director. COEstar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to provide the Childcount and additional reports for the Performance Report submitted by the New Jersey Department of Education.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children who were between age 3 through 21

As a result COEstar's ability to keep electronic copies of the official state Certificate of Eligibility all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the accounts are performed. Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edits checks on data as it is entered the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of test on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source.

As COEstar keeps a copy of the actual COE calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he/she can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility).

By virtue of completing a COE the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulations. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.

COEstar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.

-Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were within 3 years of a last qualifying move had a qualifying activity);

The information collected by the recruiter through the interview process and recorded on the COE is verified by the program director prior to being entered in the COEstar database and monitored by TROMIK.

-Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);

TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to confirm that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would verify that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the school year listed on the school enrollment records QAD dates residency dates enrollment dates withdrawal dates departure dates needs assessment and graduation/termination dates special services dates and health record dates performed in this state during the period.

-Children who in the case of Category 2-received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Entry of this data means that the State served during the summer/intersession term. Additionally services information can be added to indicate the nature of services; however the summer/intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service begins.

-Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

COEstar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state region county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level eligible children are counted only once statewide in each eligible category. Upon the process of data entry at the regional level the data specialist scans the consolidated data base to look for duplicates. Prior to student information being added to the COEstar system a search is conducted to determine whether the student record already exists. In the instance a duplicate is found the record is not entered into the data base. Additionally all COEs are thoroughly inspected and reviewed by the regional program director as an ongoing practice to ensure quality assurance.

Performance Reporter also provides unique counts of children in School wide programs and TAS programs funded by MEP in both regular and summer/intersession terms for the Consolidated Performance Report.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to verify that children included in the two Childcounts meet the eligibility criteria (according to 34 CFR22.40) all COEs are reviewed and approved by regional project directors before data is entered into the student information system. For children enrolled in a prior year but still eligible to be counted safeguards are built into the COEstar system to ensure that no child is counted who reached end of eligibility prior to the beginning of the service period. As part of mass enrollment lists of preschoolers and nonattending young adults are generated and recruiters must verify by home visit or telephone that these children and youth are still residing in the area as of September 1. Training is provided to data managers/specialists by their respective program directors. In addition the New Jersey Department of Education's contract with TROMICK Technology includes extensive and ongoing training and technical assistance to the regional subgrantees in the area of data collection. The COE is a standard document used by our MEP subgrantees in both the northern and southern regions of the state which allows a level of conformity between the two regions and throughout the state. Finally the state has provided written guidance on eligibility; which is reviewed annually and reinforced during trainings and monitors the regional migrant programs which includes conducting random audits of COEs and migrant lists for eligibility determinations.

*We should note that COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Once verified each COE can be marked as verified and locked; invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process.

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.

Follow up data question:

NJ doesn't state that re-interviews were conducted during the reporting period. Re-interviews were not conducted because NJ needed to determine a sufficient sample number that would allow for a statistically accurate defect rate. Instead, NJ provided an outlined plan for the New Jersey MEP Re-Interview Team. Therefore, NJ is unable to provide a direct response to this request/question (i.e. 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. Please confirm if my understanding is correct.

Response:

The NJ MEP did not conduct prospective re-interviews for the 2007-2008 reporting period.

The New Jersey Department of Education submitted a final report to the USDOE Office of Migrant Education in April of 2008.

(Subsequent communication with Aguirre International point to the sample size being insufficient in applying a statistically accurate state defect rate).

In this report, the New Jersey MEP Re-Interview Initiative Team reviewed the re-interview initiative process and identified during the reporting period and has begun to implement procedures and activities to ensure optimal quality control central to the accuracy of eligibility decisions.

These procedures and activities include the following:

- An annual sample review conducted by the NJ MEP
- An annual process for peer review between the two in-state Regional MEPs
- Scheduled turn key training and "debriefing" activities after attendance at National ID&R Conferences and/or National Migrant Education Conference
- Annual Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) trainings
- Providing the opportunity for recruiters to "shadow" their peers and to collaboratively critique the recruiting process
- Have administrators to accompany recruiters in the field to more actively assess performance and offer guidance in ID&R
- Extensive training to address:
 - o Interpersonal skills and communication;
 - o Cultural sensitivity;
 - o Interviewing protocol and strategies;
 - o Eligibility determination process (including the interpretation of complex scenarios); and
 - o Recording and maintaining appropriate documentation

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are

inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New Jersey Department of Education is committed to ensuring that its system of data collection is reliable and accurate. Measures to ensure the integrity of data collection for the Migrant Education Program specifically the Childcount Data will be scrutinized at the highest level. Checks and balances have and will continue to be incorporated into this process through a comprehensive system to include: appropriate ID&R training random audits of COEs and the quarterly review of all regional MEP data by the migrant director and state coordinator.

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.

As mentioned previously New Jersey uses TROMIK Technology Corporation's Performance Reporter to process the annual performance report. Although COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and reliable numbers are double checked concurrently by state staff regional project staff and TROMIK against other sources to ensure accuracy. Potential errors are identified investigated and corrected as needed. In addition reports are run throughout the year to monitor Childcounts as part of the quality control process. Finally SFA staff review and verify all counts with the regional project directors/project staff and TROMIK for accuracy prior to submission to ED.

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

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP

eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The corrective actions that will be made to improve the accuracy of New Jersey's MEP eligibility determinations include: utilizing the comments section to provide additional information which will enable those reviewing the COE to have information necessary in making eligibility information and ensuring a more thorough review of QADs.

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.

N/A

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