

**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 YORK



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 ED Facts 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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: New York State Education Department		
Address: 89 Washington Avenue Albany, New York 12234		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Raymond H. Kesper		
Telephone: (518) 474-8076		
Fax: (518) 473-2860		
e-mail: rkesper@mail.nysed.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Johanna Duncan-Poitier		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 12:04:39 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



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

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Learning Standards for English language arts (ELA), mathematics and science were adopted by the Board of Regents in 1996. In 2005, the NYS Learning Standard for Mathematics was reviewed and revised with a grade by grade articulation of student expectations (P-12). Also, in 2005 the English Language Arts standards were reviewed but not revised. The four ELA standards remained intact with a grade by grade (P-12) articulation of student expectations. This level of specificity was in response to the NCLB mandate for states to develop grade 3-8 content standards and related state assessments.

Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2007 of the State of New York required that the Regents periodically review and evaluate the existing learning standards to determine if they should be strengthened, modified or combined to provide adequate opportunity for students to acquire the skills and knowledge they need to succeed in employment or postsecondary education and to function productively as civic participants upon graduation from high school. Such review and evaluation shall be conducted upon a schedule adopted by the Regents, provided that a review and evaluation of the English language arts standards shall be completed as soon as possible, but no later than the end of the 2007-08 school year.

At the July 2007 Board of Regents meeting, Chancellor Bennett asked Regent Cohen to lead a Steering Committee in the review of the standards starting with ELA. The Standards Review Initiative (SRI) includes the steering committee, a research team of academic experts, and panels of content experts including teachers and administrators. In the review of the ELA standards, the research team works with the content panel and Department staff. A perpetual standards review process has been proposed to ensure that the learning standards are systemically reviewed, updated, and improved on a regular schedule.

In October 2007, the Board of Regents approved a time table for the review and revision of the learning standards starting with English Language Arts. The review of the ELA standards began in November 2007. The review and recommendations for revision of the standards was completed in the summer of 2008. The revision of the standards began in September 2008 and has not yet been completed, but is anticipated during 2009. The development of the ELA assessments is scheduled to begin during the 2009-2010 school year and be completed in the 2011-2012 school year.

The review and possible revision of the Mathematics and Science Standards is scheduled to begin in the 2011-2012 school year. The development of the assessments in Mathematics and Science is scheduled to begin in the 2013-2014 school year and be completed in the 2015-2016 school year.

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 October 2007, the New York State Board of Regents approved a time table for the review and revision of the learning standards starting with English Language Arts. The review of the ELA standards began in November 2007. The review and recommendations for revision of the standards was completed in the summer of 2008. The revision of the standards began in September 2008 and has not yet been completed, but is anticipated during 2009. Additional information associated with the revision of the ELA standards may be found in Section 1.1.1 of this report.

There have been no changes in the State's academic achievement standards for mathematics and/or English language arts. The state will be issuing an RFP for its 3-8 ELA and math; the new assessments will be administered in the 2010-11 school year. At that point New York will standard set the new assessments.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	1,434,553	1,420,393	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,553	6,458	98.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	105,549	105,039	99.5
Black, non-Hispanic	274,482	270,218	98.4
Hispanic	289,564	286,104	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	756,874	751,070	99.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	230,338	222,739	96.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	93,036	92,106	99.0
Economically disadvantaged students	664,846	659,386	99.2
Migratory students	708	697	98.4
Male	735,143	726,287	98.8
Female	699,410	694,106	99.2
Comments: Students in this group include all students that were tested however, for 1.3 a caveat is that they had to be continuously enrolled to be assigned a proficiency level. So 1.3 will have less students since it is a subset of 1.2 This is in align with how we do accountability.			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	44,386	19.9
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	165,080	74.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,273	6.0
Total	222,739	
Comments: Students in this group include all students that were tested however, for 1.3 a caveat is that they had to be continuously enrolled to be assigned a proficiency level. So 1.3 will have less students since it is a subset of 1.2 This is in align with how we do accountability.		

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	1,434,183	1,418,649	98.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,562	6,462	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	105,244	104,183	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	274,602	270,300	98.4
Hispanic	289,189	284,661	98.4
White, non-Hispanic	757,092	751,573	99.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	230,738	223,092	96.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	92,211	89,254	96.8
Economically disadvantaged students	664,795	657,806	99.0
Migratory students	709	691	97.5
Male	734,917	725,331	98.7
Female	699,266	693,318	99.2

Comments: Students in this group include all students that were tested however, for 1.3 a caveat is that they had to be continuously enrolled to be assigned a proficiency level. So 1.3 will have less students since it is a subset of 1.2 This is in align with how we do accountability.

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	45,271	20.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	164,546	73.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	13,275	6.0
Total	223,092	

Comments: Students in this group include all students that were tested however, for 1.3 a caveat is that they had to be continuously enrolled to be assigned a proficiency level. So 1.3 will have less students since it is a subset of 1.2 This is in align with how we do accountability.

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	418,481	408,990	97.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,023	1,950	96.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	30,141	29,759	98.7
Black, non-Hispanic	81,286	78,144	96.1
Hispanic	86,502	83,983	97.1
White, non-Hispanic	218,128	214,768	98.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	71,314	67,201	94.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	28,171	27,533	97.7
Economically disadvantaged students	202,329	197,518	97.6
Migratory students	201	199	99.0
Male	215,449	209,785	97.4
Female	203,032	199,205	98.1
Comments: Students in this group include all students that were tested however, for 1.3 a caveat is that they had to be continuously enrolled to be assigned a proficiency level. So 1.3 will have less students since it is a subset of 1.2 This is in align with how we do accountability.			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	31,753	47.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	30,833	45.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,615	6.9
Total	67,201	
Comments: Students in this group include all students that were tested however, for 1.3 a caveat is that they had to be continuously enrolled to be assigned a proficiency level. So 1.3 will have less students since it is a subset of 1.2 This is in align with how we do accountability.		

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	199,261	179,073	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	954	818	85.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,011	14,463	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	38,397	31,272	81.4
Hispanic	42,863	36,528	85.2
White, non-Hispanic	101,762	95,743	94.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	31,821	21,735	68.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	19,143	14,995	78.3
Economically disadvantaged students	102,099	86,630	84.8
Migratory students	119	98	82.4
Male	102,887	91,828	89.3
Female	96,374	87,245	90.5
Comments: data has been verified and is correct			

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	198,726	139,266	70.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	962	565	58.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,838	11,758	79.2
Black, non-Hispanic	38,347	21,721	56.6
Hispanic	42,544	22,912	53.9
White, non-Hispanic	101,767	82,100	80.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	31,841	10,830	34.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	18,630	6,355	34.1
Economically disadvantaged students	101,687	58,182	57.2
Migratory students	121	61	50.4
Male	102,596	69,249	67.5
Female	96,130	70,017	72.8
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: The science test is only given at grades 4 and 8			

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	200,715	168,275	83.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	935	728	77.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,865	14,057	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	38,748	27,913	72.0
Hispanic	42,652	32,786	76.9
White, non-Hispanic	103,266	92,585	89.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,168	18,991	55.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,549	10,569	63.9
Economically disadvantaged students	102,062	78,096	76.5
Migratory students	97	60	61.9
Male	102,873	85,850	83.5
Female	97,842	82,425	84.2
Comments: Data has been verified and is correct			

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	200,296	142,239	71.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	940	574	61.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,721	12,149	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	38,698	21,960	56.7
Hispanic	42,345	23,992	56.7
White, non-Hispanic	103,355	83,395	80.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,166	11,363	33.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,022	5,266	32.9
Economically disadvantaged students	101,636	59,367	58.4
Migratory students	95	37	38.9
Male	102,643	68,891	67.1
Female	97,653	73,348	75.1
Comments: Data has been verified and is correct			

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	199,899	170,455	85.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	921	748	81.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,896	13,563	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	38,350	27,879	72.7
Hispanic	42,468	31,210	73.5
White, non-Hispanic	103,008	96,829	94.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33,817	22,184	65.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	16,492	9,124	55.3
Economically disadvantaged students	101,331	77,170	76.2
Migratory students	100	70	70.0
Male	102,394	87,341	85.3
Female	97,505	83,114	85.2
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 831.

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	201,643	167,910	83.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	906	679	74.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,239	14,343	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	39,013	27,605	70.8
Hispanic	41,954	31,640	75.4
White, non-Hispanic	104,332	93,476	89.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,335	18,998	55.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,749	7,970	58.0
Economically disadvantaged students	100,570	75,925	75.5
Migratory students	131	86	65.6
Male	103,537	85,973	83.0
Female	98,106	81,937	83.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.3 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	201,173	155,762	77.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	904	616	68.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,079	12,843	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	38,960	25,064	64.3
Hispanic	41,679	27,050	64.9
White, non-Hispanic	104,358	90,029	86.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,375	15,076	43.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,247	4,584	34.6
Economically disadvantaged students	100,235	66,694	66.5
Migratory students	127	65	51.2
Male	103,311	78,049	75.5
Female	97,862	77,713	79.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.3 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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: The science test is only given at grades 4 and 8			

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 831.

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	204,120	162,319	79.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	914	649	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,247	14,127	92.7
Black, non-Hispanic	38,582	24,820	64.3
Hispanic	42,016	28,619	68.1
White, non-Hispanic	107,167	93,954	87.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,838	15,966	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,170	5,871	48.2
Economically disadvantaged students	99,108	68,754	69.4
Migratory students	114	71	62.3
Male	105,082	82,021	78.1
Female	99,038	80,298	81.1
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.

1.3.2.4 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	203,920	136,235	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	907	525	57.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,112	11,590	76.7
Black, non-Hispanic	38,714	19,493	50.4
Hispanic	41,787	20,047	48.0
White, non-Hispanic	107,214	84,444	78.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,954	9,638	27.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,786	2,064	17.5
Economically disadvantaged students	98,999	51,080	51.6
Migratory students	112	52	46.4
Male	105,020	66,160	63.0
Female	98,900	70,075	70.9
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.

1.3.3.4 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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: The science test is only given in grades 4 and 8			

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	211,083	166,727	79.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,023	731	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,194	13,874	91.3
Black, non-Hispanic	40,743	24,974	61.3
Hispanic	43,024	28,678	66.7
White, non-Hispanic	110,939	98,341	88.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,809	15,958	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,805	5,348	45.3
Economically disadvantaged students	100,589	68,074	67.7
Migratory students	111	79	71.2
Male	108,237	83,617	77.3
Female	102,846	83,110	80.8
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct			

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	210,838	147,575	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,028	612	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,099	12,003	79.5
Black, non-Hispanic	40,723	22,290	54.7
Hispanic	42,772	23,252	54.4
White, non-Hispanic	111,057	89,299	80.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,923	11,722	33.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,396	2,367	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	100,368	56,670	56.5
Migratory students	112	58	51.8
Male	108,098	70,260	65.0
Female	102,740	77,315	75.3
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: The science test is only given in grades 4 and 8			

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	213,146	149,214	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,059	645	60.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	15,032	13,265	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	41,253	20,161	48.9
Hispanic	42,579	23,639	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	113,096	91,399	80.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,631	12,101	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,237	4,677	41.6
Economically disadvantaged students	98,718	55,932	56.7
Migratory students	96	45	46.9
Male	109,636	74,878	68.3
Female	103,510	74,336	71.8
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct			

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	213,235	120,112	56.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,060	456	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,897	10,325	69.3
Black, non-Hispanic	41,349	15,656	37.9
Hispanic	42,405	15,950	37.6
White, non-Hispanic	113,395	77,633	68.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	34,871	6,611	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,780	1,194	11.1
Economically disadvantaged students	98,576	39,252	39.8
Migratory students	97	25	25.8
Male	109,676	55,011	50.2
Female	103,559	65,101	62.9
Comments: Data have been verified and are correct			

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	209,091	153,647	73.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,029	684	66.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,863	12,241	82.4
Black, non-Hispanic	39,794	19,605	49.3
Hispanic	41,515	21,692	52.3
White, non-Hispanic	111,760	99,319	88.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	33,384	15,373	46.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,041	3,155	28.6
Economically disadvantaged students	96,187	54,609	56.8
Migratory students	99	58	58.6
Male	107,391	79,767	74.3
Female	101,700	73,880	72.6
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 831.

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	186,338	164,411	88.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	665	553	83.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,212	13,517	95.1
Black, non-Hispanic	31,981	23,872	74.6
Hispanic	30,016	23,342	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	109,219	102,912	94.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	21,594	12,034	55.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,373	4,909	66.6
Economically disadvantaged students	58,152	46,226	79.5
Migratory students	37	30	81.1
Male	92,617	80,672	87.1
Female	93,721	83,739	89.3
Comments: Data has been verified and is correct			

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	184,157	163,748	88.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	646	538	83.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,003	13,090	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	31,429	24,736	78.7
Hispanic	29,334	23,637	80.6
White, non-Hispanic	108,500	101,531	93.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	20,596	11,639	56.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,770	3,972	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	57,009	46,058	80.8
Migratory students	36	20	55.6
Male	91,023	79,039	86.8
Female	93,134	84,709	91.0
Comments: Data has been verified and is correct			

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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	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: At the High School level NYS does not give one general science assessment, instead students take a science regents exam depending on the course work they have chosen to take. Also we use graduation rate as our NCLB 3rd indicator at this level, not science.			

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

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

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

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	4,504	3,767	83.6
Districts	823	762	92.6
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	3,221	2,624	81.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,609	1,156	71.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,612	1,468	91.1
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
760	481	63.3
Comments: Data has been verified and is correct.		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))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	32
Extension of the school year or school day	72
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	4
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	18
Replacement of the principal	5
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	23
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)	6
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	40
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.

<p>NYC Schools Only:</p> <p>Of the 24 NYC schools in Restructuring Year 2 during the 2007-2008 school year, 22 implemented activities that supported other major restructuring of the school governance. The specific "other major restructuring of school governance" actions that were implemented include:</p> <p>A. School Organization Creation of "houses" or "academies" Smaller Learning Communities Change in grade configurations Change in student programming (block scheduling, self-contained, departmentalized, etc)</p> <p>B. Zoning Change in feeder patterns Change in zoning</p> <p>C. Targeted Interventions for specific identified subgroups Multi-faceted and drastic changes in the curriculum and/or delivery of the educational program for the specific subgroup(s) of students that caused the school to be designated as Restructuring Year 2</p> <p>D. Professional Development To support the educational program of the restructured school (professional development before the start of the implementation year; differentiation of professional development appropriate to the assignment of needs of staff due to the new organizational structure of new grade configurations, etc; professional development for supervisory/administrative staff due to the new structure)</p> <p>E. Changes in Resource Allocations</p> <p>F. School Support Organization/NYC Central District Support</p>

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.

Consistent with Section 6316©(10)(C)(ii) of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) requires school districts that are identified for corrective action to conduct an audit of their written, tested, and taught curriculum by an external evaluator. These districts are also required to prepare and provide NYSED with a district Action Plan that details how the recommended corrective actions identified through the audit will be implemented.

The NYSED provides these designated districts with a protocol and template, which outlines the steps that a district must undertake in order to be in compliance with this requirement. Additionally, leadership staffs from these districts are invited to a meeting during which this requirement is discussed and each of the required steps is summarized, including implementation timelines, strategies, and fiscal support. Following is a description of the format that designated districts are required to include in their audit.

NCLB DINI CORRECTIVE ACTION FORMAT FOR AUDIT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION AND PLAN OF ACTION

Required Components

The Audit of Curriculum and Instruction, unless otherwise approved by SED, will pertain only to the subject(s) in which the district has been identified for Corrective Action: English Language Arts and/or mathematics.

In instances where a district is identified for only specific subpopulations, and achievement for all other populations is strong, the Audit of Curriculum and Instruction may focus on that specific subpopulation.

The report must address the grade level(s) and subpopulations for which the district failed to make Adequate Yearly progress. To the extent appropriate, the report should include all grade levels, from Pre-K through high school and all NCLB identified subgroups, and examine the education of all district students, regardless of program placement, with particular attention to at-risk subpopulations. Additionally, the report must include an analysis of the learning environment and school culture including, policies to provide a safe, equitable and orderly learning environment.

Recommendations must meet all applicable State Education Department (SED) regulations and requirements, including addressing mastery of all learning standards in the identified area(s).

The auditors should meet early in the process with the district to determine what plans, documents, etc. should be reviewed, and who should be interviewed/observed.

Auditors must complete class visits as part of the audit.

Selected auditors are required to attend a meeting with State Education Department staff regarding the expectations for the conduct of an Audit of Curriculum and Instruction. SED may also invite to this meeting as appropriate representatives of Regional School Support Centers and other network representatives.

The report may not make recommendations that conflict with applicable State or Federal laws or regulations or with local collective bargaining agreements.

The report, while it may highlight constraints beyond district control, should include recommendations that are "actionable" and "doable" in light of the realities of district fiscal constraints.

The school district must be given at a minimum at least one opportunity to review and comment upon The Report and recommendations before the final documents are submitted to the district and the State Education Department.

The Plan of Action developed by the school district must be based on the recommendations contained in the audit and should be long-term, for at least three years, with a timeline that delineates action steps across years. Implementation of the plan of action must commence by September with the start of the XX school year.

Unless the district receives permission from the State Education Department, the district must include in its Plan of Action a strategy to fully implement each of the recommendations contained in the auditor's report.

Upon SED's approval of the district's plan of action, the district must incorporate the plan of action into the district's Consolidated Application, CDEP or DCEP, and/or partnership agreement.

Failure to complete the Audit of Curriculum and Instruction process or to successfully implement the approved Plan of Action will subject the district to additional State mandated corrective actions.

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	39
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:	

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	3	0
Schools	1	0
Comments: The appeal process is not yet complete and no decisions have been made resulting in changed AYP designations.		

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	
---	--

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	249,875	284,493
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	19,168	28,061
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	7.7	9.9
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	108,555	95,993
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	43.4	33.7
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	577	
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.

1.4.8.2 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	372
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	78
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	244
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		437	25	87	A	
2		437	25	87	A	
3		425	25	87	A	
4		432	25	87	A	
5	School Quality Review (SQR) New in 2007-08, all SINI Years 1 and 2 schools completed a self-evaluation document to assess their practices, actions and all aspects of teaching and learning. NYSED reviewed documentation and provided schools with recommendations to be incorporated in their Comprehensive Educational Plan.	145				

Comments: NYC data complete. Rest of State data drawn from 26 LEAs representing 63 schools. List of schools making AYP or exiting Improvement Status based on 2007-08 Accountability data is not yet (as of 12/17/08) available for rest of State. Column 6 caused problems due to not being able to enter multiple outcomes. For example, for Strategy #1, all four outcomes were noticed; 32 out of 64 Rest of State schools reported this outcome. For Outcome B, ROS = 18; Outcome C, ROS = 36. Outcome A was reported a the most common one for each Strategy. A list of "other" strategies and Outcomes is available in an uploadable file, should you so desire.

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.

The following strategies are being implemented to address the achievement problems of 512 schools in need of improvement, corrective action and restructuring:

- New York State has a statewide system of ongoing support for providing resources and assistance to schools identified for improvement, corrective action and restructuring. At the center of the support system are seven Regional School Support Centers (RSSCs). The RSSCs operate for the sole purpose of working with the State's lowest performing districts and schools.

Regional School Support (RSSC) Teams provide technical assistance at the school level. The RSSC services are directed to the identification and/or diagnosis of root causes of problems inhibiting student performance, and the development of appropriate interventions through comprehensive planning, coordination of network resources, technical assistance and professional development. They provide technical assistance for each of the following initiatives:

- Technical assistance on No Child Left Behind, e.g. accountability requirements, parent initiatives, using scientifically-based research for program improvement
- Districts in Need of Improvement
- Districts in Corrective Action including technical assistance with curriculum audits
- Corrective Action Schools and Planning for Restructuring Schools
- Restructuring Schools (Years 1, 2 and 3)
- Title I School Improvement Grant Applications
- Comprehensive Education Plan and District Comprehensive Educational Plan development and implementation
- Plan development and review for Corrective Action Year- 2 schools and Restructuring Schools

- assigning an SED Liaison to support schools farthest from state standards;
- providing school improvement grants to support district school improvement efforts;
- ensuring the alignment of curriculum and instruction through curriculum audits. Corrective Action Districts in Need of Improvement undergo a comprehensive Audit of Curriculum and Instruction. This comprehensive K-12 audit by a third party contractor leads to the compilation of instructional knowledge and proven practices that can be used to support achievement problems;
- using consultants to target the specific content area of identification, including the specific subgroup(s) not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP);
- targeting professional development through Reading and Mathematic Institutes and Summer Science Discovery Institutes; and
- providing Urban Forums for districts to focus on increasing graduation rates.

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.

No funds were used under Section 1003(g) during 2007-08. Those efforts commenced in 2008-09 and will be reported next year.

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.

During 2007-08 New York State committed approximately 2 million dollars to support the implementation of our State sponsored Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) process. SURR schools are the lowest performing schools in our state and once identified they are subjected to a comprehensive external review by a team of educators and administrators which culminates in a detailed set of recommendations that they must implement. These LEAs are assigned a State Education Department liaison that monitors them throughout the process to insure that the recommended corrective actions are being implemented. These LEAs are given priority and technical assistance in accessing professional development opportunities and in preparing applications for competitive grants.

During the 2007-08 legislative session the state provided funding under Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2007 for the State Education Department to make funds available to low performing LEAs/schools through Contracts for Excellence (C4E). These funds are provided to targeted LEAs to assist them with implementation of school improvement efforts that are reviewed and approved by the NYSED for implementation. Additionally, NYSED has staff that are designated as liaisons to these LEAs who work closely with them on their implementation plans and assisting them with accessing support services through our statewide networks of Regional School Support Services.

State law requires that these districts - those that have at least one school in need of improvement and received an increase in State Foundation Aid above a threshold - enter into "Contracts for Excellence." Contract districts must spend a portion of their Foundation Aid increase on programs and activities that have been shown to improve student achievement and that are focused primarily on students with the greatest educational needs. These districts may use funds for class size reduction; increased time on task; teacher/principal quality initiatives; middle school/high school restructuring; model programs for English language learners; full day pre-kindergarten/kindergarten; and experimental programs.

Examples of specific programs to be implemented by the designated districts include:

Class Size Reduction: Research has shown that reductions in class size, particularly in the early grades, can improve student achievement. More than three-quarters of the approved Contract for Excellence districts will use at least part of their fund allocations to support these efforts.

Yonkers is adding certified teaching assistants in 15 schools to reduce student:teacher ratios and provide more intensive, personalized instruction.

Schenectady City School District will reduce class size at the middle and high school to a student:teacher ratio of 18:1.

Albany City School District is continuing their commitment to maintain smaller class sizes with a teacher funded through C4E at the Arbor Hill and Giffen elementary schools and an additional teacher at the high school.

Increased Time on Task:

Schenectady City School District will use Contract funds to:

Implement an arts program to provide increased student time on task and enhance outcomes in English language arts, literacy and mathematics by writing and performing poetry; learning the basic operations of filming, editing and producing video and film; and improvisational theater; reduce the case load for academic intervention services teachers enabling students to receive at least one hour per day in English language arts and math. Add 30 minutes to each school day providing an additional 90 hours of direct instruction to students over the school year.

Middle and High School Restructuring:

Yonkers is continuing its Middle School strategy of restructuring PK-7 to PK-8 grade spans in five schools with high numbers of students living in poverty and/or English language learners.

In an effort to connect students to their own learning, Albany City School District's Philip Schuyler Middle School will reconfigure its math program and enable students to use online programs, making learning more relevant to their interests, and supporting the district's quest to more fully involve and motivate all students.

Teacher and Principal Quality Initiatives: Research shows that improving teacher preparation is one of the strongest policy levers that schools have to improve achievement, and a number of districts are making significant efforts in this area.

The Albany City School District hired a literacy coach, to mentor teachers in reading instruction, to be shared by three elementary schools.

The Albany City School District will provide targeted professional development for high school faculty that will stress effective urban education teaching models; engaging students who have not previously been active participants by identifying and building on their strengths and nurturing their potential and intellectual interests. The district believes this approach is key to reaching urban youth and will improve teaching and learning, reduce the performance gap and increase high school completion.

The Schenectady City School District will design and implement a three-day professional development institute in the fall and follow this up with regularly scheduled professional development opportunities in the areas of differentiated instruction and teaching literacy across the content areas.

Full-Day Pre-K and Kindergarten:

The Albany City School District's Contract for Excellence will support two additional full-day pre-Kindergarten classes.

Model Program for English Language Learners:

Yonkers is implementing a Model Program for English language learners at Roosevelt High School that introduces non-native English speakers to the rigors of the International Baccalaureate program as part of college preparation.

Next Steps

Additionally, the Department will continue to monitor the implementation of the Contracts for Excellence and will use what was learned from the first year of Contract implementation and monitoring to assist districts this year. Building upon that knowledge, the Department will, among other things, continue to meet with Contract districts to offer technical assistance; provide the Regents with analyses of broad trends in student performance in C4E districts, once a full set of test results are available; and report to the Regents on the degree to which schools were successful in meeting performance targets.

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

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

1.4.9 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	314,436
Applied to transfer	9,884
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	4,090

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	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

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	\$ 12,802,671
Comments: NYC only. No LEA in the Rest of the State reported any School Choice - Transportation expenses paid out of Title I funds; they used their own monies for this purpose.	

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

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	44
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.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	251,240
Applied for supplemental educational services	92,378
Received supplemental educational services	87,579
Comments: NYC only.	

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	\$ 100,736,973
Comments: Of the 50 LEAs required to offer SES in 2007-08 29 reported a non-zero expenditure figure (total above), 5 reported no SES expenses, and 16 have not filed their report as of 3/12/09.	

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	776,511	746,536	96.1	29,975	3.9
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	101,625	96,355	94.8	5,270	5.2
Low-poverty schools	81,834	81,196	99.2	638	0.8
All elementary schools	330,228	321,867	97.5	8,361	2.5
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	64,555	56,712	87.9	7,843	12.1
Low-poverty schools	136,032	133,990	98.5	2,042	1.5
All secondary schools	446,283	424,669	95.2	21,614	4.8
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.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

An elementary teaching assignment can be reported as either one self-contained full-day class or as multiple departmentalized classes. To ensure that these options are equivalent, the State applies a weight to each self-contained full-day elementary class assignment to equate it to an equivalent number of departmentalized elementary class assignments.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	16.4
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	0.9
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	82.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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)	6.1
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.7
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	93.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	77.2	17.7
Poverty metric used	Percent K-12 Free and Reduced price lunch	
Secondary schools	77.2	17.7
Poverty metric used	Percent K-12 Free and Reduced price lunch	
Comments: The current data collection method under represents the count of students at the secondary level for this reason the state makes the assumption that if the student was free or reduced price lunch at the elementary level they still are at the secondary level. We are working to develop a different means to collect these data.		

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
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish, Haitian Creole, French, Chinese
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish, Haitian Creole, French, Chinese, Korean
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual	Spanish, Haitian Creole, Russian, Chinese, Yiddish
<u>No Response</u>	Developmental bilingual	
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Spanish, Haitian Creole, French, Chinese, Russian, Polish
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>Yes</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>No Response</u>	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	208,848
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.

1.6.2.2 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.	195,062
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	143,633
Chinese	6,299
Arabic	5,507
Bengali	4,656
Haitian Creole	3,997

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Russian n=3288 Urdu n=3280 French n=2029
--

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	197,896
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,023
Total	198,919
Comments: The 1,023 ELLs were tested, however, they missed one or more modalities. Consequently, this number reflects the number of students without complete ELP data from all four modalities.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	27,186
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	13.7
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.

1.6.3.2.1 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	194,075
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	987
Total	195,062
Comments: The 987 ELLs were tested, however, they missed one or more modalities. Consequently, this number reflects the number of students without complete ELP data from all four modalities.	

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

Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 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	127,646	65.4
ELP attainment	26,515	13.6
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>No</u>
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>Yes</u>
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<u>Yes</u>
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)
Chinese (Traditional)
Haitian Creole
Korean
Russian
Spanish
Comments:

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

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
22,992	26,478	49,470
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
32,601	28,828	88.4	3,773
Comments:			

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

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
32,688	24,104	73.7	8,584
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
9,297	7,956	85.6	1,341
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.

1.6.4 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	190
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	125
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	174
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	163
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	148
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	5
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	39
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	77
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	25
Comments:	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> 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
98,797	28,596	77

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 *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* 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.	5,484
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,000

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.

These figures represent 2005-06.

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	476	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	401	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	322	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	259	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	264	
Other (Explain in comment box)	238	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	502	6,557
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	813	17,089
PD provided to principals	286	7,906
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	382	1,378
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	276	1,647
PD provided to community based organization personnel	233	996
Total		35,573

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other PD Activities; Using the native language as a support for English, State and Federal Policy, Preparation for the State ELP Assessment (NYSESLAT), Title III Application, and Understanding AMAOs.

Note: District do more than one PD activity in their districts which increases the number of activities.

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	09/01/07	61
Comments:		

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

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For 2007-08 Title III grants, NYSED for the 2nd straight year have continued with the review process where the LEA's-allocated the majority of the State's Title III funds-that submitted a substantially approved budget received automatic initial payments of 20% of their budgeted amounts. This initial step provides LEA's with initial payments more quickly than in previous years. LEA's can continue to receive funds up to 50% of their budgets prior to full approval by NYSED.

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	19
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	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	79.0
Black, non-Hispanic	55.0
Hispanic	53.0
White, non-Hispanic	88.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	50.0
Limited English proficient	40.0
Economically disadvantaged	60.0
Migratory students	
Male	
Female	
Comments: We do not have data broken out by migratory students, or by gender	

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:
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

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

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5.1
Hispanic	5.2
White, non-Hispanic	1.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	
Limited English proficient	
Economically disadvantaged	
Migratory students	
Male	3.6
Female	2.8
Comments: NYS does not have data broken out by other categories.	

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	766	766
LEAs with subgrants	68	68
Total	834	834
Comments: Includes seven(7) Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES - IEOs) that are funded as Consortia for component LEAs. The nonfunded BOCES (N= 31) are not included in the nonfunded count.		

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)	327	1,828
K	2,176	3,627
1	2,101	3,773
2	1,944	3,248
3	1,740	2,942
4	1,590	2,748
5	1,731	2,815
6	1,631	2,794
7	1,502	3,086
8	1,634	3,329
9	3,030	5,306
10	3,535	4,025
11	1,457	2,481
12	1,523	2,109
Ungraded	1,085	101
Total	27,006	44,212

Comments: NYC identifies all their ungraded students in a particular grade level.

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	9,384	14,190
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,881	8,089
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	3,294	3,838
Hotels/Motels	762	3,519
Total	20,321	29,636

Comments: The totals in Tables 1.9.1.1 and 1.9.1.2 do not agree because there are several cases for which the Primary Nighttime Residence was not available for input into the system.

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,040
K	1,925
1	2,330
2	2,072
3	1,854
4	1,768
5	1,664
6	1,584
7	1,487
8	1,551
9	2,069
10	1,389
11	933
12	770
Ungraded	70
Total	22,506
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	11,817
Migratory children/youth	33
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,947
Limited English proficient students	5,480
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	58
Expedited evaluations	17
Staff professional development and awareness	60
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	35
Transportation	52
Early childhood programs	20
Assistance with participation in school programs	57
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	55
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	48
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	58
Coordination between schools and agencies	58
Counseling	54
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	52
Clothing to meet a school requirement	53
School supplies	64
Referral to other programs and services	41
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	51
Other (optional – in comment box below)	36
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	15
School Selection	13
Transportation	32
School records	24
Immunizations	29
Other medical records	
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

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	1,802	753
4	1,656	686
5	1,586	809
6	1,529	556
7	1,418	580
8	1,354	364
High School	528	384
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	1,836	1,342
4	1,702	1,058
5	1,604	973
6	1,535	775
7	1,445	667
8	1,370	465
High School	558	391
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)	601
K	229
1	215
2	184
3	183
4	131
5	128
6	122
7	122
8	101
9	131
10	95
11	47
12	26
Ungraded	10
Out-of-school	3,334
Total	5,659

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.

Not applicable.

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)	423
K	163
1	161
2	132
3	130
4	91
5	98
6	84
7	76
8	76
9	92
10	69
11	33
12	8
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	1,626
Total	3,270
Comments:	

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

Not applicable.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Migrant Education Program has been using the Management Information Systems-2000 (MIS-2000) since 1997. This system tabulates the Category 1 & 2 counts.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category one migrant child count was based solely on certificate of Eligibility's(COE's)completed on migrant children that qualified and arrived in New York State between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008 by the migrant education recruiters. Recruiters go to farms, agribusinesses, neighborhoods, rural and schools, human services agencies, local Migrant Education Outreach Program, etc. to obtain leads on individual and families who may be eligible for the New York State Migrant Education Program. They then locate and interview individuals and families to ascertain if they moved for qualifying temporary or seasonal qualifying agricultural/fishing activities within the past 36 months across school district lines, that the move was not for permanent relocation, that the qualifying work obtained was an important part of their livelihood, and that they or their families are between 3 and twenty-two years of age and not high school graduates or have obtained their GED. These interviews by the recruiters are conducted in person, face-to-face. At that point the recruiter will complete a certificate of eligibility if the family/individual is eligible, obtaining the following information: name, address (current and prior), homebase address, present school district, children's names, sex, date of birth, age, place of birth, present grade, last school attended, (if still in school), their native language, their race code (observed), from what school/town/state they came from/to, where in New York State they arrived, their arrival date in New York State, if their children traveled with them joined them or on their own and on what dates, the name of the qualifying person they traveled with or to join, if they sought temporary or seasonal work in a qualifying activity and the specific activity they applied for or work at, their residency date in the current district, and their signature on the form. The recruiters have been trained to recognize all qualifying activities areas, such as but not limited to fruit and vegetable farms, dairy farms, nurseries, logging (the felling, trimming and skidding of trees/logs on site), food processing (vegetables, fruits, poultry, meat), apiaries, making sure to note specific activities done (e.g. picking and packing hydroponic tomatoes, etc.). Recruiters complete the COEs and send them to the ID/R office as well as a copy to the local MEOP (Migrant Education Outreach Program) as they are completed for the ID/R office to review and certify as eligible. Children who have been identified in a prior year and are still eligible and still reside in New York State must have their residency verified by one of 21 recruiters across New York State using sources such as the families themselves, local school personnel and regional MEOPS service records, by stamping a copy of the family's COE with a date still here, their signature, what source told them they were still here, and send that copy to the MEOP's and the Identification/Recruitment office as a validation copy. This process of verification begins each year in November and concludes the following November. The category 2 count was done on the MIS-2000 data system utilizing the following records COEs -- supplemental services records and summer enrollment/withdrawal dates/records. The State will determine the dates of enrollment for the summer program which cannot occur before the last day of the regular school year. For the 9/1/07-08/31/08 period the summer start date could be no earlier than 6/27/08 and no later than 8/31/08. Each of the 11 local Migrant Education Programs (MEOP) use a State approved and developed summer enrollment form which must contain the necessary state mandated instructional and support service codes for the summer period as required by the State Migrant Education Program. Each MEOP conducts an in-service to train their tutor/advocate on the correct completion of this form. When the tutor/advocate begins providing services they start documenting their activities on the student summer enrollment record forms. Forms are submitted throughout the summer period through early September. When the local MEOP data specialist receives the summer enrollment form he/she adds a new school history line for each migrant student receiving services. These enrollment lines are added as an "S" type of enrollment and have to contain the supplemental program services that were provided. If no supplemental services are listed for a "S" type of school history line, the migrant student will not count towards the category 2 count. No instructional bag drop off is counted as a supplemental service for the summer term. The summer enrollment forms are kept in hard copy at the local level.

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

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The local MEOPs (eleven) data entry specialists input all information related to regular year and summer services and upload this information to the state computer server located in the State ID/R & MIS-2000 office. The MIS-2000 coordinator monitors the MIS-2000 system weekly throughout the year. All data is checked for completeness and accuracy, and the MIS-2000 coordinator accesses all data inputted on MIS-2000 and compiles the information necessary to obtain the category 2 count. Local sites will notify the State MIS-2000 coordinator of possible duplicate students. The statewide coordinator will merge duplicate records which can only be merged on the state server by the coordinator. COE's completed on the MIS-2000 system are compared against COE's that arrive in the ID/R office by the MIS-2000 coordinator to insure both accurate data entry and that the COE's appear on the State server. The State server computer is responsible for producing the Category 1 and 2 counts. Additionally, local MEOP's receive reports listing eligible migrant children from the State server to compare against their local data counts. Data specialists then insure that eligible migrant children appear on the State lists.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 numbers were also collected using MIS-2000.

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.

Through programming, our system only allows specific qualifying arrival dates, valid age ranges (3-21) as well as a child's eligibility expiration dates. Every time a child is entered on the computer system, a program checks to make sure that the child's age or grade status is eligible to be counted. If not, the computer refuses further data entry by relaying that the information is out of the range of acceptability. This also happens with eligibility expiration dates, residency dates and Qualifying Arrival Dates. Another check to insure an accurate child count is late name/first name matching. When a new Certificate of Eligibility is reviewed for eligibility, that name is then entered as a query of similar last/first names is made to ascertain if the spelling could be different (e.g. Hernandez vs. Hernandes). This activity is even more intensely engaged in when a child has made a move from another residence in the State to the current residence in New York State. If there is a close match, the date of birth, parents' names and other data are compared. If the information still continues to match somewhat closely, the recruiter is asked to revisit and determine if the person is the same. If the two separate children are the same person their records are merged to create one unique student. This insures the accuracy of the Category 1 count along with the Category 2 count. Safeguards for valid qualifying activities are taken by the Identification and Recruitment coordinator and assistant coordinator on each and every Certificate of Eligibility received and inputted in New York State. They both individually review each COE for completeness and validity, returning those to the recruiter when not acceptable. Every child that is entered onto the MIS-2000 database is assigned a unique number. Every time a data entry specialist at any of the MEOP sites enters a child's name, they must do a query based on child's unique number, last and first name and date of birth. If a match is found, then a new number is not reated, thus ensuring only unique students are counted. If a match is not found, the child is assigned a unique number. Through programming, our system only allows specific Qualifying Arrival Dates, valid age ranges (ages 3-21) as well as child eligibility expiration dates. If a child graduates or receives their GED the expiration date is manually changed to the date of graduation or the day they receive their GED by the regional data entry specialist. This information is collected by the tutor/advocate. Every time a child's data are entered on MIS-2000, a program checks to make sure that the child's age and grade status is eligible to be counted. If not, the program refuses further data entry as out of the range of acceptability. This also happens with eligibility expiration dates, residency dates and Qualifying Arrival Dates. Safeguards for valid qualifying activities are taken by the Identification and Recruitment coordinator and assistant coordinator on each and every Certificate of Eligibility received and inputted in New York State. They both individually review each Certificate of Eligibility for completeness and validity, returning those deemed unacceptable to recruiters stating why those COE's were rejected.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 numbers were also collected using MIS-2000.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Migrant Education Programs Identification and Recruitment Project is a separate and independent entity not related to local MEOP's. All recruiters in New York State are hired, trained, and monitored by the Identification and Recruitment Program not the local MEOP. This quality control measure insures objectivity and impartiality in this process. The New York State Identification and Recruitment Office reviews every COE completed in the State. If approved the date of approval is entered onto the MIS-2000 computer system. If not acceptable, it is returned to the recruiter to complete, update, correct or to invalidate. If not approved, the local site is notified not to provide service to the migrant children until further information is obtained by the ID/R office. If the COE is not approved after further investigation, no services will be provided and no enrollment lines will be entered into MIS-2000.

The New York State Migrant Identification and Recruitment Program, in 99 percent of all cases, requires all newly identified migrant children/families census forms to have a parent/guardian signature. Exceptions are made, for example, for those individuals who cannot write or who give verbal concurrence over the phone. This process helps assure that we receive the most accurate information possible on a child/family to determine eligibility. This combined with over 54 years of administrative identification and recruitment experience assures our MEP accuracy and efficiency in all Identification and Recruitment matters. The New York State Migrant Identification and Recruitment Office conducts one statewide and two regional trainings for recruiters. All new recruiters receive extensive Identification and Recruitment training by the Migrant Identification and Recruitment office staff and then are individually field trained by an experienced field recruiter for several weeks (2-4 weeks). The training consists of providing the Regulatory and Non-Regulatory Guidance to the new recruiter and explaining each.

The Buckley Act of 1974 (privacy) is explained to them, mock ID/R interviews conducted and training done on how to fill out all documents related to eligibility (COEs, etc). Qualifying agricultural industries are described along with qualified activities deemed acceptable. The New York State ID/R training manual is reviewed and explained to new recruiters. All recruiters are regularly visited in the field by the identification/Recruitment staff (ID/R Coordinator, Associate ID/R Coordinator, Veteran Recruiters) for quality control and recruiter effectiveness. A dedicated migrant recruiter statewide toll free 800 number is available to all recruiters to ask eligibility questions from the field regarding the eligibility of newly located children. E-mail access is also available along with electronic reports which list migrant children by MEOP, county and school districts. The New York State Migrant Education ID/R Program continues its recruiter skills self evaluation during 2007/08 based on the CONQIR model; a test evaluating their knowledge of various eligibility areas (e.g. "to join" issues). Based on their answers, the ID/R Coordinator and Associate Coordinator modify their training content to address these perceived weaknesses.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The New York State Migrant Education ID/R Program launched a re-interview initiative beginning in late 2007 by creating and refining re-interview instruments followed by a rolling re-interview. This was a phone re-interview model that included all of the Certificates of Eligibility (C.O.E.'s) completed in a four week period by two of the twenty-one Migrant Education Recruiters in New York State. The re-interviews were conducted by two independent reviewers; the Migrant ID/R Coordinators of Tennessee and South Carolina.

Results: Seventeen C.O.E.'s were completed by the two New York State Recruiters during the designated four week period. Re-interviews were conducted the following two weeks. Six C.O.E.'s were re-interviewed and confirmed as eligible; three by one re-interviewer, four by the other. Two re-interviewees (C.O.E.'s) were non-cooperative; two had their cell phones expire and the remaining seven did not have phone and/or refused to give their phone numbers at the time of the initial interviews.

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.

In New York, two statewide staff members are responsible for the quality control and management of the student count. Two annual two-day statewide trainings are hosted for the 11 regional MIS-2000 data entry specialists. The following are some of the topics included in the trainings:

- Proper school history enrollment by type (Academic, Summer, Residency Only);
- Definition of supplemental services;
- Needs assessment documentation/Priority of Service;
- Possible duplicate student canned reports;

Reporting for academic and school year programs;
Designing Reports to eliminate data entry errors;
Health screen/Immunizations; and,
Testing information.

In addition, at least one on-site training per data entry specialist is conducted each year. Additional training is available upon request. The New York MIS-2000 director reviews each site individually to insure accuracy of information that is transferred to the New York State Server which serves as the statewide database. A toll free number is also available to data entry specialists for technical assistance.

In the 2007/08 school year a State specific data entry manual was updated by the MIS-2000 director, 3 MEOP Directors, and 3 data entry specialists. This manual is now available on the New York State Migrant Programs web-site. This manual contains snapshots of different screens to visually provide proper enrollment techniques. This has been well received state wide. This manual is continuously changing to keep up with the ever changing needs of migrant children along with the new Migrant Student Information Exchange(MSIX) initiative.

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.

One of the final processes to insure a unique student count in New York State is running reports which are generated using Soundex. Soundex reports compare similar names, and dates of birth. Other fields utilized to insure uniqueness are parents names, place of birth,current addresses and MEOP student service records. The ID/R director and the MIS-2000 director are the individuals responsible for comparing these reports. These records are merged insuring the child will only count once for the Category 1 & 2 counts.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since no ineligibility cases were found as a result of New York States Migrant Education ID/R Programs prospective rolling re-interview initiative, no corrective actions were needed or taken.

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.

The New York State Migrant Education program has no concerns regarding the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying determinations on which the counts are based.

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