

# 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**

**SOUTH CAROLINA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
**WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

### TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
South Carolina Department of Education

Address:  
1429 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Nancy W. Busbee, Ph.D.

Telephone: 803-734-8105

Fax: 803-734-3290

e-mail: nbusbee@ed.sc.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Jim Rex, Superintendent

Friday, March 13, 2009, 3:23:23 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 mathematics academic standards were revised in 2006, with final approval of the State Board of Education in February 2007. We are currently conducting a review of the math standards based on the National Math Panel Report.

The English Language Arts academic standards were revised in 2006, with the State Board of Education requesting that the Office of Academic Standards conduct a review of the standards during 2007, soliciting feedback from classroom teachers. The State Board adopted the ELA academic standards in spring 2008.

The science academic standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in November 2005, with support materials made available to teachers during the 2006-07 school year.

The protocol used to guide the writing team's work may be found on the Office of Academic Standards' Web site:  
<http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/cso/documents/ProcedureforCyclicalReviewofAcademicStandards.pdf>

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.

South Carolina legislation, amended in 2008, calls for a new assessment system for grades 3 -8 with the first administration in spring 2009. The new assessment is called the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS). PASS will include five tests: writing, ELA (reading and research), mathematics, science, and social studies. The writing test will be administered in March and the remaining tests will be administered in May. The writing test includes an extended-response item and multiple-choice writing questions. In order to attain quicker scoring, the May tests will contain multiple-choice questions only.

Achievement standards for PASS will be set in August 2009 by a separate state agency, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC). The previous test, PACT, reported four achievement levels (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced). The new legislation requires three achievement levels (Not Met, Met, and Exemplary).

The SC-Alt is a selected-response assessment based on alternate achievement standards linked to grade-level academic standards. There are no changes planned for SC-Alt.

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.

South Carolina submitted the PACT science test for Peer Review this past year. As stated in 1.1.2, the state is developing PASS that includes a new science assessment. PASS will be administered for the first time in May 2009. In order to attain quicker scoring, the science test will contain multiple-choice questions only.

Achievement standards for PASS will be set in August 2009 by a separate state agency, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC). The previous test, PACT, reported four achievement levels (Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced). The new legislation requires three achievement levels (Not Met, Met, and Exemplary).

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	367,825	366,375	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,273	1,261	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,320	5,303	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	142,143	141,440	99.5
Hispanic	17,500	17,448	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	200,174	199,513	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,493	49,946	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,053	15,009	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	194,499	193,557	99.5
Migratory students	366	362	98.9
Male	188,278	187,391	99.5
Female	179,547	178,984	99.7

**Comments: Student Group Enrolled #Participating % Participating All Students  
 367,831 366,379 Amer. Indian/Alask Nat 1,273 1,261 Asian/Pacif. Island 5,320 5,303  
 Black/Non-Hispanic 142,144 141,441 Hispanic 17,500 17,448 White/Non-Hispanic  
 200,179 199,516 Child W/Disabilities 50,496 49,948 LEP 15,053 15,009 Econ  
 Disadvantaged 194,504 193,561 Migratory 366 362 Male 188,283 187,394 Female  
 179,548 178,985**

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.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,289	36.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	29,147	58.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,512	5.0
Total	49,948	
<b>Comments: Total of 49,948 matches number of children participating in comments box of 1.2.1</b>		

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	367,843	366,046	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,273	1,261	99.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,320	5,285	99.3
Black, non-Hispanic	142,156	141,345	99.4
Hispanic	17,498	17,346	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	200,181	199,411	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,496	49,868	98.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,050	14,881	98.9
Economically disadvantaged students	194,513	193,323	99.4
Migratory students	366	359	98.1
Male	188,291	187,179	99.4
Female	179,552	178,867	99.6

**Comments: Student Group Enrolled #Participating %**  
**Participating All Students 367,849 366,051 Amer.**  
**Indian/Alask Nat 1,273 1,261 Asian/Pacif. Island 5,320 5,285**  
**Black/Non-Hispanic 142,157 141,346 Hispanic 17,498**  
**17,346 White/Non-Hispanic 200,186 199,415 Child**  
**W/Disabilities 50,499 49,870 LEP 15,050 14,881 Econ**  
**Disadvantaged 194,518 193,327 Migratory 366 359 Male**  
**188,296 187,183 Female 179,553 178,868**

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,532	37.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,819	57.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,519	5.1
Total	49,870	

**Comments: Totals in 1.2.4 match data entered in comments section of 1.2.3.**

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	210,491	209,986	99.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	773	768	99.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,068	3,061	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	81,178	80,924	99.7
Hispanic	10,450	10,430	99.8
White, non-Hispanic	114,176	113,958	99.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	29,463	29,292	99.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,355	9,337	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	113,854	113,488	99.7
Migratory students	228	226	99.1
Male	108,354	108,025	99.7
Female	102,137	101,961	99.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,133	38.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,628	56.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,531	5.2
Total	29,292	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	53,576	25,438	47.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	95	45.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	851	584	68.6
Black, non-Hispanic	20,205	5,800	28.7
Hispanic	2,943	1,038	35.3
White, non-Hispanic	29,098	17,775	61.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,941	1,881	23.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,997	1,121	37.4
Economically disadvantaged students	30,202	10,043	33.3
Migratory students	75	26	34.7
Male	27,433	13,086	47.7
Female	26,143	12,352	47.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	53,335	35,209	66.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	137	66.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	831	667	80.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,155	10,473	52.0
Hispanic	2,851	1,540	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,024	22,194	76.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,891	2,653	33.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,875	1,544	53.7
Economically disadvantaged students	30,056	16,259	54.1
Migratory students	74	40	54.1
Male	27,292	16,492	60.4
Female	26,043	18,717	71.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	26,862	10,288	38.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	107	46	43.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	436	238	54.6
Black, non-Hispanic	10,214	1,980	19.4
Hispanic	1,441	306	21.2
White, non-Hispanic	14,535	7,659	52.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,025	840	20.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,483	336	22.7
Economically disadvantaged students	15,111	3,628	24.0
Migratory students	33	12	36.4
Male	13,675	5,509	40.3
Female	13,187	4,779	36.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 4</b>			
All students	52,635	27,718	52.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	96	51.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	751	573	76.3
Black, non-Hispanic	20,080	6,595	32.8
Hispanic	2,826	1,181	41.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,560	19,142	67.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,686	1,875	24.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,673	1,144	42.8
Economically disadvantaged students	29,361	11,192	38.1
Migratory students	91	29	31.9
Male	27,100	14,310	52.8
Female	25,535	13,408	52.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 4</b>			
All students	52,480	28,332	54.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	94	50.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	737	543	73.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,054	7,397	36.9
Hispanic	2,756	1,145	41.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,522	19,002	66.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,661	1,597	20.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,571	1,038	40.4
Economically disadvantaged students	29,261	11,647	39.8
Migratory students	90	37	41.1
Male	26,997	12,940	47.9
Female	25,483	15,392	60.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,529	19,446	37.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	70	37.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	750	418	55.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,035	3,632	18.1
Hispanic	2,818	710	25.2
White, non-Hispanic	28,509	14,524	50.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,624	1,317	17.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,666	671	25.2
Economically disadvantaged students	29,292	6,629	22.6
Migratory students	91	19	20.9
Male	27,034	10,479	38.8
Female	25,495	8,967	35.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	51,592	25,538	49.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	188	100	53.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	768	567	73.8
Black, non-Hispanic	19,617	6,248	31.8
Hispanic	2,597	1,083	41.7
White, non-Hispanic	28,228	17,438	61.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,192	1,312	18.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,478	1,054	42.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,070	9,864	35.1
Migratory students	83	31	37.3
Male	26,553	13,052	49.2
Female	25,039	12,486	49.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>Grade 5</b>			
All students	51,455	23,394	45.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	187	81	43.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	753	517	68.7
Black, non-Hispanic	19,596	5,663	28.9
Hispanic	2,528	908	35.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,200	16,130	57.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,175	1,003	14.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,377	833	35.0
Economically disadvantaged students	27,972	8,533	30.5
Migratory students	81	33	40.7
Male	26,470	10,511	39.7
Female	24,985	12,883	51.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	25,825	8,908	34.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	92	32	34.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	379	207	54.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9,849	1,535	15.6
Hispanic	1,315	288	21.9
White, non-Hispanic	14,092	6,813	48.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,650	504	13.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,286	302	23.5
Economically disadvantaged students	13,992	2,758	19.7
Migratory students	46	N<10	
Male	13,354	4,863	36.4
Female	12,471	4,045	32.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,586	25,730	49.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	82	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	740	549	74.2
Black, non-Hispanic	19,566	5,998	30.7
Hispanic	2,442	1,037	42.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,493	17,963	63.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,825	1,018	14.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,078	802	38.6
Economically disadvantaged students	27,338	9,621	35.2
Migratory students	37	13	35.1
Male	26,625	12,757	47.9
Female	24,962	12,973	52.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	51,475	24,346	47.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	75	46.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	722	512	70.9
Black, non-Hispanic	19,552	5,800	29.7
Hispanic	2,386	890	37.3
White, non-Hispanic	28,480	16,973	59.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,818	712	10.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,991	630	31.6
Economically disadvantaged students	27,254	8,638	31.7
Migratory students	36	N<10	
Male	26,557	1,054	4.0
Female	24,918	13,799	55.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	25,886	9,054	35.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	85	36	42.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	408	226	55.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9,805	1,522	15.5
Hispanic	1,218	276	22.7
White, non-Hispanic	14,274	6,963	48.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,508	419	11.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,061	209	19.7
Economically disadvantaged students	13,720	2,757	20.1
Migratory students	15	N<10	
Male	13,278	4,938	37.2
Female	12,608	4,116	32.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,668	23,448	44.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	87	41.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	748	521	69.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,613	4,943	24.0
Hispanic	2,506	930	37.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,384	16,852	59.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,100	926	13.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,007	675	33.6
Economically disadvantaged students	27,874	8,059	28.9
Migratory students	28	N<10	
Male	27,218	12,233	44.9
Female	25,450	11,212	44.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,565	19,747	37.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	59	28.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	735	462	62.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,606	4,605	22.3
Hispanic	2,438	679	27.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,375	13,842	48.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,100	540	7.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,909	429	22.5
Economically disadvantaged students	27,805	6,394	23.0
Migratory students	27	N<10	
Male	27,153	8,255	30.4
Female	25,412	11,492	45.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,517	18,031	34.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	63	29.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	745	437	58.7
Black, non-Hispanic	20,536	3,587	17.5
Hispanic	2,500	647	25.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,318	13,204	46.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,004	650	9.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,998	432	21.6
Economically disadvantaged students	27,770	5,663	20.4
Migratory students	28	N<10	
Male	27,125	9,529	35.1
Female	25,395	8,502	33.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,692	15,359	29.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	46	28.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	703	400	56.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,890	2,875	13.8
Hispanic	2,248	469	20.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,514	11,500	40.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,835	403	5.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,666	312	18.7
Economically disadvantaged students	27,154	4,368	16.1
Migratory students	31	N<10	
Male	26,879	7,992	29.7
Female	25,813	7,367	28.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	52,601	19,883	37.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	161	63	39.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	687	406	59.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20,892	4,392	21.0
Hispanic	2,189	594	27.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,503	14,348	50.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,827	432	6.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,578	303	19.2
Economically disadvantaged students	27,102	6,111	22.5
Migratory students	28	0	0.0
Male	26,832	8,393	31.3
Female	25,769	11,490	44.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	26,358	8,595	32.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	88	30	34.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	341	191	56.0
Black, non-Hispanic	10,485	1,467	14.0
Hispanic	1,133	277	24.4
White, non-Hispanic	14,228	6,592	46.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,481	359	10.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	835	167	20.0
Economically disadvantaged students	13,598	2,419	17.8
Migratory students	13	0	0.0
Male	13,554	4,840	35.7
Female	12,804	3,755	29.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

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	51,627	34,483	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	148	99	66.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	742	645	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	20,469	10,136	49.5
Hispanic	1,886	1,102	58.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,237	22,404	79.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,368	1,508	23.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,110	534	48.1
Economically disadvantaged students	23,559	12,448	52.8
Migratory students	17	N<10	
Male	25,584	16,869	65.9
Female	26,043	17,614	67.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 1.3.2.7 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	51,654	35,900	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	149	94	63.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	740	600	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	20,486	10,955	53.5
Hispanic	1,876	1,103	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,259	23,044	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,389	1,602	25.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,095	430	39.3
Economically disadvantaged students	23,570	12,943	54.9
Migratory students	17	N<10	
Male	25,602	16,462	64.3
Female	26,052	19,438	74.6
<b>Comments: Black, non-Hispanic Reading # students who completed the assessment and proficiency level was assigned for 2006-07 was misreported as 203,889 and should have been 20,388. This was a miskey in data provided to CSPR Coordinator adding a 9 as last figure inadvertently. The 2007-08 calculation is representative of the black, non-hispanic group.</b>			

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

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

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0

**Comments: The high school assessment is not available at this time. The vendor working with the department is still analyzing and updating data. This information will be submitted with the updates to CSPR Part I as the USDOE opens EDEN up for updates in the near future.**

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	1,110	217	19.6
Districts	89		
<b>Comments: Entity Total # Made AYP % Made AYP Schools Districts 85 0</b>			

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

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

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

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	500	84	16.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	488	79	16.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	12	5	41.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
85	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

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

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	20
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	2
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	5
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

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

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	3
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	28
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District Oversight Committee Replace school leadership team Hire additional staff Implement a lateral governance structure Hire principal mentor, use data-driven decision making Implement Anderson 5 Curriculum Implement Teacher Advancement Program Hire principal mentor and curriculum facilitator Implement Making Middle Grades Work, single gender classes, use a Middle Schools Learning Committee Instructional Support Team as an oversight committee Implement High Schools That Work Implement an internal instructional review process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Twenty-two school districts in South Carolina are identified in the improvement stage of Corrective Action. Initial technical assistance training was provided to superintendents and district level personnel to explain the state mandated corrective action process. The state required the districts to conduct a self-evaluative needs assessment process by performing and submitting an academic review that included examining its data, programs and personnel in order to assist the state in determining the most appropriate option for corrective action. A variety of options were selected for implementation including deferring programmatic funds for curriculum support, extended day academic assistance, targeted reading approaches and district oversight actions. Another option was the replacement of relevant personnel. Two districts were selected to implement a new curriculum. The diversity of corrective actions created challenges and opportunities for the state to offer targeted technical assistance. District contacts were established and utilized to maintain communication and collaboration with the state throughout the corrective action implementation process. Input was sought by the state to plan for technical assistance and support aligned to the district needs assessment and designated Corrective Actions. Preparations were made to provide a two day curricular based training for the newly identified districts in the fall of 2008. Seven of the twenty-two districts were continuing in Corrective Action. The state action for all of these districts was the implementation of a new curriculum based on state standards. Technical assistance and support was provided with the assistance of the regional comprehensive center, the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). A two day leadership training retreat was provided for district and school teams in the fall of 2007 with a follow up session in the spring of 2008 to support the ongoing curriculum implementation process. Each of the seven districts was assigned a curricular facilitator to work with the district contact to assess district technical support needs and provide ongoing assistance for ten or more visits throughout the school year based on the assessment of needs. The state education associate met and maintained regular monthly contact with the curricular facilitators to reinforce the fidelity of the state technical assistance efforts. Support for the districts in Corrective Action was networked through the district contact, curricular facilitator, state education representatives and the regional comprehensive center.

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	9
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	12
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	1
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

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

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
<b>Comments: No districts or schools have "appealed" the overall AYP determination; however, some have made corrections to student-level data.</b>		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	1/15/09
---	---------

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	56,391	58,627
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	19,633	20,250
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	34.8	34.5
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	21,422	21,507
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	38.0	36.7
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	211	
<b>Comments: Only grades assessed reported.</b>		

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

##### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	9
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	0
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	200
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		133	4	12	B	
2		92	1	7	A	
3		30	0	2	B	
4		39	0	3	A	
5	Principal Mentor Materials for parenting program. Compass Learning Odyssey Consultants Provide academic intervention to students in small groups Technology professional development Curriculum Specialist	36	1	3	B	
<b>Comments:</b>						

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in</p>

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.

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

#### 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.

Strategies were shared in statewide technical assistance trainings and through on-site monitoring and project review process.

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.

**Evaluation:**

Program Manager at SCDE to oversee school activity  
Electronic template for reporting of implementation of activities (1st report due January 2009)  
On-site visits for review of data and revision of needs assessment and planned activities

**Technical Assistance:**

SC Best Practices Seminars (Differentiated Instruction, Understanding by Design, Cooperative Learning, Classroom Instruction that Works, Results Now)  
SIM Professional Developer training  
Partnership with Teacher Advancement Program (TAP)  
Literacy coaches and SC Reading Initiative Consultants  
Planning TA video series on needs assessment, data analysis, root cause analysis  
Planning and investigating logistics statewide classroom PD model for teachers

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

School improvement guidelines require the newly identified schools to utilize a planning process to involve stakeholders in developing a school improvement plan targeted toward the areas leading to its identification. The plan is subject to peer review and must be accepted by the LEA prior to submission to the Office of Federal and State Accountability. The plan should be fully implemented by the beginning of the next school year and should include strategies and activities based on a needs assessment process. The plan encompasses a two year time span. As part of this process, districts may receive school improvement grant allocations and are provided flexibility in funding and professional development choices to individual schools. The office of Federal and State Accountability provides technical assistance and support through its monitoring process. External providers and state department personnel may assist with programmatic, assessment and professional development activities. The schools in improvement status must utilize the plan in the second year as outlined. State School improvement allocations are determined for individual schools at the district level and technical assistance efforts continue in this stage of improvement.

The schools in corrective action must notify the Office of Federal and State Accountability of the identified action selected to target the school's areas of need. The office provides assistance through its monitoring efforts to ensure school accountability. The Title I plan reflects strategies designed to implement the reforms necessary to increase student achievement. The state may provide additional funds for district determination for Corrective Action schools identified for technical assistance with the LEA option for selection of personnel such as External Review Liaisons, Teacher Specialists, Principal leaders, specialists and mentors or financial backing for district or school based initiatives. Utilizing community and parental resources is also expected throughout the planning and implementation process.

The schools in restructuring must develop an alternative governance plan to submit to the Office of Federal and State Accountability. The schools seek input from stakeholders and conduct meetings to examine data and resources through a planning process in order to select an action. The office again provides assistance through its monitoring efforts to ensure school accountability. The Title I plan also reflects strategies that complement the restructuring efforts and highlight the more rigorous reforms required to increase student achievement. The state may provide additional funds for district determination for restructuring schools in order that they may utilize the services of external providers, state department personnel, External Review Liaisons, Teacher specialists, Principal leaders, specialists and mentors or state financial incentives for district or school based initiatives. Utilizing community and parental resources is also expected throughout the planning and implementation process.

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

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

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

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	103,053
Applied to transfer	2,667
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,047

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

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

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

### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,313,196
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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	22
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### FAQs about public school choice:

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

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

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

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

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

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	58,470
Applied for supplemental educational services	8,762
Received supplemental educational services	6,627
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 5,982,516
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

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

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	213,015	206,064	96.7	6,951	3.3
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	24,653	23,596	95.7	1,057	4.3
Low-poverty schools	40,177	39,723	98.9	454	1.1
All elementary schools	128,389	125,942	98.1	2,447	1.9
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	15,481	13,909	89.8	1,572	10.2
Low-poverty schools	30,437	29,579	97.2	858	2.8
All secondary schools	84,626	80,122	94.7	4,504	5.3
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

Yes

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

The state inadvertently included Grades 7 and 8 in the elementary level in the 2006-07 CSPR report. Therefore, comparison of elementary totals from year-to-year or secondary level totals from year-to-year will appear to have large increases or decreases.

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.

South Carolina uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught.

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	20.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	28.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	37.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

HQ special education teachers who are instructing students with disabilities out of area, such as HQ LD teaching EMD (6%) or HQ elementary teachers (31%) who are teaching special subjects, such as Spanish, art, or music to elementary students.

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

	<b>Percentage</b>
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)	34.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	28.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	38.0
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	91.3	61.1
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or Medicaid.	
Secondary schools	82.2	51.7
Poverty metric used	Percent eligible for free or reduced price lunch or Medicaid.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	29,907
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	27,244
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	26,186
Russian	779
Vietnamese	593
Portuguese	327
Arabic	319

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

When counting languages, English was shown as the second most spoken language by LEP at 2,202. This was a coding error and edits are now in place to prevent this from happening again. "Other" was the third most spoken language at 1,820, but because this is an aggregate of all languages not listed in our State data collection program, it is not being reported as one of the top five languages spoken in the State.

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	28,359
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	143
Total	28,502
<b>Comments: Data was verified.</b>	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

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

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	2,212
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	7.8
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	28,129
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	138
Total	28,267
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

	<b>Results</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	7,391	37.2
ELP attainment	2,194	7.8
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

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

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

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b>

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
54	582	636
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
635	414	65.2	221
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

#### Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
635	402	63.3	233
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

#### Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
309	138	44.7	171
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	44
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	44
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	44
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	42
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	2
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

#### Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
6,183	1,107	3

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.	519
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	207

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	62	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	59	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	48	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	43	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	42	
Other (Explain in comment box)	25	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	56	15,573
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	60	2,059
PD provided to principals	47	717
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	995
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	46	2,414
PD provided to community based organization personnel	18	704
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>22,462</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other PD was conducted as follows: Intro to ESOL, SIOP graduate class, ELL Workshop, Writing for ELLs, MAP testing to inform instruction, integrating instruction for ELLs, accommodations and modifications for ELLs.

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.

<b>Date State Received Allocation</b>	<b>Date Funds Available to Subgrantees</b>	<b># of Days/\$\$ Distribution</b>
7/1/07	10/30/07	121
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

There are now two Title III people in the SCDE to speed up the award process. We are now able to process grants in groups rather than wait for LEAs who are slow to send us their budget reports, for example, before processing awards all at once. This has speeded up the process for those LEAs who provide the items necessary to the SCDE in order for us to then distribute their funds to them.

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

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments: No schools are currently identified as persistently dangerous by the state.</b>	

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

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	75.1
Black, non-Hispanic	64.9
Hispanic	58.3
White, non-Hispanic	77.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	38.9
Limited English proficient	50.1
Economically disadvantaged	62.0
Migratory students	71.4
Male	66.0
Female	77.1
<b>Comments: American Indian/Alaska Native population was statistically insignificant.</b>	

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

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	3.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4.2
Hispanic	5.0
White, non-Hispanic	3.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.2
Limited English proficient	1.2
Economically disadvantaged	4.7
Migratory students	6.0
Male	4.4
Female	3.2
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### **FAQ on dropout rates:**

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

### 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	73	73
LEAs with subgrants	12	12
Total	85	85
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	135	330
K	209	489
1	253	500
2	218	452
3	192	441
4	193	439
5	199	428
6	191	341
7	184	350
8	189	306
9	225	316
10	135	198
11	86	158
12	85	163
Ungraded	0	N<10
Total	2,494	4,919
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	498	970
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,412	3,193
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	180	310
Hotels/Motels	404	446
Total	2,494	4,919
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

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

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	269
K	401
1	452
2	432
3	407
4	416
5	392
6	293
7	313
8	287
9	266
10	159
11	117
12	128
Ungraded	27
Total	4,359
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	155
Migratory children/youth	21
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	407
Limited English proficient students	143
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	12
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	12
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	10
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	9
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	9
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	12
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School Selection	4
Transportation	7
School records	3
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	3
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	295	184
4	273	136
5	265	125
6	212	85
7	227	85
8	203	72
High School	94	62
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	296	143
4	275	131
5	258	112
6	213	90
7	228	92
8	204	60
High School	97	60
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	122
K	77
1	62
2	47
3	25
4	28
5	32
6	22
7	19
8	10
9	12
10	N<10
11	0
12	N<10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	493
Total	960
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

There was no increase or decrease greater than 10%.

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

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

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

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	87
K	63
1	53
2	42
3	17
4	20
5	19
6	19
7	17
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	191
Total	543
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### **1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There was no increase or decrease greater than 10%.

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.

To ensure accuracy and eliminate duplication in the child count process, the MIS2000 electronic data system for both Category 1 and Category 2 child counts is used for migrant program data management. The data were input from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) required by the South Carolina migrant program. The COE is compliant with the COE form issued within the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance of October 23, 2003.

The data review process at the state level was ongoing throughout the reporting year, with thorough review of data presented on each original, completed COE. The manual count with review of COE data served to verify the accuracy of the information put into the MIS2000 system by participating electronic sites and the state site. MIS2000 will continue in use for the next reporting year. Accuracy of data input for each COE will continue to be verified with an additional manual count and review of data for all COEs presented from all sources.

Last year's child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 were generated by MIS2000 data system use, with a manual count and review of data for each COE presented from all sources.

The state will continue to use the same systems (electronic and manual) to generate the 2008-2009 Child Count. The MIS2000 data system will continue in use. A manual count with review of data for each COE presented from all sources will be performed at the state level.

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.

Data that serves to verify the Category 1 and Category 2 counts were collected using the same procedures for the time period of 9/1/07-8/31/08. Migrant recruiters and school districts enrolling migrant students completed a COE documenting the student's name, gender, ethnicity, date and place of birth with verification, and name of parent or guardian. Additionally, the COE requires listing qualifying move and activity, qualifying arrival date and previous residence, along with information from any prior school enrollment. For this year now concluded, the COE provides line space to describe principal means of livelihood and line space for supporting information for temporary or seasonal work. The COE requires the address of residence within the specified school district, the date of enrollment in school and program in which the student participated. Schools in participating districts for summer programs provided data through completed COEs, MIS2000 data entry and school district enrollment data reports. Additionally, COE data were completed and input for all out-of-school youth (OSY) identified and those identified and served through state recruiters and local summer programs.

The identification and recruitment of migrant families, their children and OSY generated the data collected for this child count. The identification and recruitment process was ongoing throughout this child count period. District summer program recruiters were trained in ID&R procedures by the state. Two additional state recruiters were employed and trained for the summer crop season to assist the state migrant recruiter. Migrant recruiters visited migrant camps and quarters, local tiendas and migrant health service centers, contacted and visited schools, conferred with district migrant recruiters and used referrals from multiple state and community sources. The other referral and information sources may include all other school district programs such as adult education, and other grant programs such as Migrant Head Start, South Carolina Migrant Health Program, outreach organizations, communities of faith, crew chiefs, other migrant workers and educational referrals from the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT). Data collection, input, and review were ongoing during the period of 9/1/07-8/31/08.

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 data were collected from the completed individual COE. Data generated from each completed COE were input into the MIS2000 system by five program sites and the state site. This data then became part of the state data collection within the MIS2000 system. The original hard copy COE was forwarded to the state for the data review and manual count that all COEs are given. The original hard copy COE data were individually reviewed and matched to the uploaded data to ensure accuracy. The state migrant recruiters, a pilot summer program, and school districts not having a migrant summer program or MIS2000 site submitted all original hard copy COEs to the state office for manual count, data review and input into the MIS2000 system. Each COE is coded in the system for type of service that determines child count category assignment and is reviewed for positive identification of eligibility and accuracy of service. Update of eligible migrant information for a COE or in MIS2000 is done on an individual basis. South Carolina does not use mass enrollment or mass withdrawal.

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.

Both Category 1 and Category 2 Counts are made with the same procedures as described.

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.

All electronic and original, hard copy COE data were required to be provided to the state migrant education office. COE hard copy data not previously input and uploaded by participating program sites were input into the MIS2000 state database by state staff. The COE student data were organized by school district for regular school year enrollment or migrant summer program enrollment, then by grade. From this data input, lists of participants with pertinent, qualifying information were generated. The resultant data count for summer program service was checked against school district summer program enrollment data reports. OSY that were identified as eligible and received service were input with the local school district of residency.

The MIS2000 consolidated database was used for the student information system for child count purposes at the state level. In addition, a manual file system of original, hard copy COEs was maintained, organized by school district.

All COEs and participating districts' enrollment data were reviewed during October and November of 2008. Electronic data entered for all district program sites were examined for accuracy by review of supporting data on the COE's and school district enrollment data. Queries and reports were run on the MIS2000 system at the state level to ensure accuracy of data entered for the five program sites, pilot project and OSY. Queries were run to filter out any student not meeting the required criteria of 3-21 years of age, within three years of a last qualifying move or resident at least one day for a qualifying activity. To prevent duplication, reports were run that identify students who have matching date of birth and last or first name. Duplicate student information was printed and reviewed, then the data were combined so that students were counted only once within the A-1 and A-2 child counts. To verify accuracy of information provided, participating school districts provided original, hard copies of COEs. These were checked for completion, accuracy, duplication, qualifying activity, qualifying arrival date, residency within three years of a qualifying move, district residency, age eligibility (between 3-21 years of age), and any summer participation. Therefore, through these procedures, confirmation to ensure accuracy in the child counts for both Category 1 and Category 2 was performed.

Only those migrant students and OSY fully documented as eligible, during the twelve-month period of September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2008, were included in the 2007-2008 Child Count. Since the MIS 2000 system was implemented in the fall of 2000, manual checks and direct review of all information were implemented annually to verify the accuracy of the data presented. Both original and electronic copies of COEs were thoroughly reviewed and checked.

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 Count is generated from the same procedures and software as Category 1.

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.

Training sessions were held as requested throughout the year to assist district program directors, district recruiters and the state recruiters. Eligibility requirements were provided in written guidance to all involved in the recruiting process. Overall issues related to eligibility of migrant children, principal means of livelihood and temporary or seasonal employment continued to be strongly addressed in state training. New district recruiters received training and support immediately upon notice to the state. Ongoing software support to school district sites was provided this year by MIS2000 support personnel, with technical support and a training workshop provided by the state office for new data entry personnel at participating sites. An annual training is held by the state for all district migrant program personnel prior to the summer program.

To ensure that each child in the child count was eligible for inclusion, the use of a standard COE is required statewide. In addition to available training and direct school district support, the state provided eligibility information and the required COE form on the Migrant Program Web page within the South Carolina Department of Education Web site. This ensured public availability of necessary information and documents. District personnel, district migrant recruiters or the state migrant recruiter conducted a personal interview with OSY or the responsible party for each child identified. Signatures were required for the interviewer, the parent or guardian, and the person certifying the eligibility of the child(ren). All hard copy COEs were reviewed by the state's migrant recruiter for accuracy in determining eligibility. Questioned eligibility was referred to the state level for final determination of eligibility. Site visits and monitoring of district programs provided further opportunity to review COE data or resolve eligibility questions.

The annual re-interview process assisted in verification for accuracy of information received and entered on the COEs. Re-interviewing activity to assess COE information data for newly identified migrant children was performed by the state migrant recruiters. A random sample was determined for the re-interviewing activity.

The COEs were checked against the enrollment lists provided by the districts. COEs from other sources are reviewed, then input at the state site. Checks for duplication were ongoing. Only eligible students and youths for the 2007-2008 reporting period were entered into the MIS2000 database for this child count period.

A review team in the state office ensured that duplications and students no longer eligible were eliminated from the database. Any COE that was incomplete or showed error was returned to the school district immediately for clarification. If clarification or necessary information could not be provided, that COE was omitted from the child count report data and was maintained separately. Any COE resulting from duplication or ineligibility of the student was archived in a separate manual file for any necessary reference. Summer program participants received immediate review of COE data such that only eligible children were served.

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 quality control re-interview process for this year was based on the Rolling Re-interview as developed by the ConQIR Consortium. The re-interview was to be performed before the identified children were enrolled in the summer program, and before any COE data were input into MIS2000. For small states with less than 1,000, it was recommended to re-interview at least 10% of those identified. This process was used for small state South Carolina. Additionally, several initial COE's completed by new recruiters were reviewed and re-interviewed to ensure that new recruiters were conducting interviews properly.

#### Rolling Re-Interview (Quality Control) School Year 2007-08

South Carolina's quality control process for this year was based on the Rolling Re-Interview model. The 90 children were randomly selected throughout the state. Each of the summer program sites was visited by state migrant recruiters for the re-interview process. COEs from districts without a program were compiled as one district, using the same re-interview process.

The goal of the re-interview process was to re-interview the original person identified as having been interviewed on the completed COE. The re-interview was structured not to simply verify information on the COE but to conduct a second interview, then compare the results. If discrepancies were found, effort was made to determine the actual facts at re-interview rather than visiting the family a third time. An additional goal was to conduct the re-interviews face to face with the person who signed the COE within the original interview. If the

person wasn't available, contact by phone was attempted before the alternate was used.

All districts with summer program participated in Re-interview process. State recruiters visited LEAs and followed the process of random selection. COEs were shuffled and then every 10th child was selected to be re-interviewed (counting 10, 20, 30, 40, 3tc). Additionally, every 10th child was selected as alternate (counting 5, 15, 25, 35, etc).

With increased focus on quality control and training only one district had discrepancies. Also, to ensure only eligible children were enrolled, Approximately 10% of identified children were re-interviewed.

#### 07-08 Re-Interview Results

District

# Sampled

# Re-interviewed

# OK

# DNQ

Confidence  
Level

Aiken	10	10	10	-100%		
Beaufort	32	23	23	-100%		
Charleston	10	5	5	-100%		
Clarendon	3	16	6	-100%		
Colleton	32	15	15	-100%		
Spartanburg	2	20	17	15	2	89%
others	14	14	14	-100%		

134			
90	88	2	98%

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.

South Carolina does not merge data. All original COEs were provided to the state office. Each COE was reviewed for completion and accuracy. When the data were input electronically and uploaded to the MIS2000 software, the COE data were compared for completion and accuracy of input at the state level, using the original COE as reference. All COEs supporting the reported data were either newly completed ones or updated ones, and were completed or updated as identification was made during this reporting year.

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

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All data information had comparison review of the original COE data with that of electronic input. MIS2000 reports are run to eliminate duplicates by focusing on elements such as first name, last name, date of birth and varied spelling of names. Any possible duplicates have comparison information reviewed such as parent's name, place of birth, school history or other eligibility data. This is performed for both Category 1 and Category 2 counts. Seven duplicates were found and removed within these ongoing reports run throughout the reporting year. All features of Potential Duplicate Students in the MIS2000 software were also utilized, but none were found within this process step, after all other reports were run throughout the year.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The purpose of the re-interviewing process for quality control has been strongly emphasized to all recruiters and district personnel.

Additional training and ongoing review for the critical elements of eligibility should continue to be the focus for improvement. The training in Districts were also strongly encouraged to use their access to the state student data base of the district to verify any regular year enrollment, as another check for residence and qualifying arrival dates.

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.

Human error continues to be an abiding concern relative to accuracy of information received by the recruiters in the identification and recruitment process.

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