# 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 2008-09

## ARKANSAS



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009**
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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:

   X  Part I, 2008-09                    ___Part II, 2008-09

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Arkansas

Address:
#4 Capitol Mall, Rm 401A
Little Rock, AR 72201

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jim Boardman

Telephone: 501-371-5005

Fax: 501-371-5010

e-mail: Jim.Boardman@arkansas.gov

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

_____      ___Thursday, March 11, 2010, 12:39:28 PM___

     Signature                                           Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT**
**PART I**


For reporting on
# School Year 2008-09


NoChild
LeftBehind


**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009**
**5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) 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 <u>not</u> made or is <u>not</u> planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

| |
|---|
| Arkansas is one of 48 states signed up to be a part of the common core standards currently under development. Additional revision of state academic content standards is on hold until we have had the opportunity to review the final document. |

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 <u>not</u> 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.

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

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

**1.1.4 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 4,000 characters.

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

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

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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 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 withESEA. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.*

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 289,753 | | N<10 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2,098 | | N<10 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 4,632 | | N<10 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 64,651 | | N<10 |
| Hispanic | 24,128 | | N<10 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 193,818 | | N<10 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 31,863 | | N<10 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 16,106 | | N<10 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 167,462 | | N<10 |
| Migratory students | 2,621 | | N<10 |
| Male | 147,526 | | N<10 |
| Female | 142,225 | | N<10 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 9,264 | 29.8 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 16,790 | 54.1 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 5,000 | 16.1 |
| Total | 31,054 | |
| **Comments: A few records were not coded correctly as a child with a disability although the child participated in the alternate portfolio assessment. The information was corrected by the special education unit for reporting of N/X093 and N/X003. Jody Fields called Victoria Hammer at USDOE on this matter on 3/8/10.** | | |

**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 reading/language arts assessment.

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 247,090 | | N<10 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,785 | | N<10 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 3,952 | | N<10 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 54,660 | | N<10 |
| Hispanic | 20,306 | | N<10 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 166,017 | | N<10 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 28,642 | | N<10 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 13,632 | | N<10 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 143,326 | | N<10 |
| Migratory students | 2,220 | | N<10 |
| Male | 125,644 | | N<10 |
| Female | 121,446 | | N<10 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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 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 (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 8,302 | 29.5 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 16,470 | 58.6 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 3,340 | 11.9 |
| Total | 28,112 | |
| **Comments: A few records were not coded correctly as a child with a disability although the child participated in the alternate portfolio assessment. The information was corrected by the special education unit for reporting of N/X093 and N/X003.** | | |

**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 science assessment.

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 106,892 | | N<10 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 789 | | N<10 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,711 | | N<10 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 24,240 | 23,212 | 95.8 |
| Hispanic | 8,358 | | N<10 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 71,632 | | N<10 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 12,498 | 12,074 | 96.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5,295 | | N<10 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 60,372 | 58,360 | 96.7 |
| Migratory students | 911 | | N<10 |
| Male | 54,288 | | N<10 |
| Female | 52,604 | | N<10 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

**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 science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> include students only 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 | 1,005 | 8.3 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 10,114 | 83.8 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 955 | 7.9 |
| Total | 12,074 | |
| **Comments: Arkansas does not currently use the Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards or Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards** | | |

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

**1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). 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.

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

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 36,157 | 29,196 | 80.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 266 | 211 | 79.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 650 | 523 | 80.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,982 | 5,162 | 64.7 |
| Hispanic | 3,410 | 2,574 | 75.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,785 | 20,679 | 86.9 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,032 | 2,159 | 53.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,783 | 1,995 | 71.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,568 | 16,779 | 74.4 |
| Migratory students | 402 | 310 | 77.1 |
| Male | 18,407 | 14,536 | 79.0 |
| Female | 17,750 | 14,660 | 82.6 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 36,107 | 24,059 | 66.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 266 | 164 | 61.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 633 | 436 | 68.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,982 | 3,849 | 48.2 |
| Hispanic | 3,380 | 1,879 | 55.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,782 | 17,695 | 74.4 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,033 | 1,209 | 30.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,735 | 1,353 | 49.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,527 | 12,907 | 57.3 |
| Migratory students | 385 | 195 | 50.6 |
| Male | 18,382 | 10,953 | 59.6 |
| Female | 17,725 | 13,106 | 73.9 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| **Comments: The state does not assess science at grade 3.** | | | |

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.

| | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 36,069 | 27,988 | 77.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 244 | 186 | 76.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 590 | 460 | 78.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 8,002 | 4,839 | 60.5 |
| Hispanic | 3,234 | 2,347 | 72.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,933 | 20,101 | 84.0 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,305 | 1,876 | 43.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,527 | 1,698 | 67.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,373 | 15,767 | 70.5 |
| Migratory students | 355 | 245 | 69.0 |
| Male | 18,423 | 14,045 | 76.2 |
| Female | 17,646 | 13,943 | 79.0 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,992 | 25,354 | 70.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 243 | 166 | 68.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 572 | 414 | 72.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,999 | 4,187 | 52.3 |
| Hispanic | 3,183 | 1,877 | 59.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,932 | 18,665 | 78.0 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,305 | 1,248 | 29.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,453 | 1,227 | 50.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 22,311 | 13,741 | 61.6 |
| Migratory students | 365 | 211 | 57.8 |
| Male | 18,382 | 11,882 | 64.6 |
| Female | 17,610 | 13,472 | 76.5 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| **Comments: The state does not assess Science at grade 4.** | | | |

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.

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

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,602 | 25,056 | 70.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 264 | 198 | 75.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 598 | 432 | 72.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 8,039 | 4,015 | 49.9 |
| Hispanic | 3,103 | 1,987 | 64.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,537 | 18,381 | 78.1 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,108 | 1,384 | 33.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,294 | 1,310 | 57.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 21,657 | 13,320 | 61.5 |
| Migratory students | 333 | 213 | 64.0 |
| Male | 18,145 | 12,470 | 68.7 |
| Female | 17,457 | 12,586 | 72.1 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,540 | 24,073 | 67.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 264 | 195 | 73.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 582 | 399 | 68.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 8,039 | 3,775 | 47.0 |
| Hispanic | 3,058 | 1,757 | 57.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,536 | 17,902 | 76.1 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,108 | 1,063 | 25.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,234 | 1,073 | 48.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 21,602 | 12,466 | 57.7 |
| Migratory students | 320 | 161 | 50.3 |
| Male | 18,108 | 11,278 | 62.3 |
| Female | 17,432 | 12,795 | 73.4 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,608 | 15,522 | 43.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 264 | 119 | 45.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 598 | 264 | 44.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 8,041 | 1,369 | 17.0 |
| Hispanic | 3,104 | 877 | 28.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,540 | 12,876 | 54.7 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,148 | 850 | 20.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,295 | 465 | 20.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 21,662 | 6,959 | 32.1 |
| Migratory students | 327 | 86 | 26.3 |
| Male | 18,151 | 8,378 | 46.2 |
| Female | 17,457 | 7,144 | 40.9 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

| | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|

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

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,511 | 27,919 | 78.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 266 | 220 | 82.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 584 | 483 | 82.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,868 | 4,796 | 61.0 |
| Hispanic | 3,005 | 2,233 | 74.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,742 | 20,150 | 84.9 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,091 | 1,517 | 37.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,935 | 1,272 | 65.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 21,021 | 14,950 | 71.1 |
| Migratory students | 348 | 257 | 73.8 |
| Male | 18,111 | 13,743 | 75.9 |
| Female | 17,399 | 14,175 | 81.5 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,447 | 23,736 | 67.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 265 | 190 | 71.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 563 | 418 | 74.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,868 | 3,462 | 44.0 |
| Hispanic | 2,967 | 1,692 | 57.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,740 | 17,945 | 75.6 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,091 | 916 | 22.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,878 | 804 | 42.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 20,975 | 11,843 | 56.5 |
| Migratory students | 351 | 182 | 51.8 |
| Male | 18,086 | 10,917 | 60.4 |
| Female | 17,361 | 12,819 | 73.8 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| **Comments: The State does not assess science at grade 6.** | | | |

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.

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,160 | 23,724 | 67.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 229 | 157 | 68.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 516 | 403 | 78.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,697 | 3,588 | 46.6 |
| Hispanic | 2,889 | 1,741 | 60.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,788 | 17,805 | 74.8 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 3,960 | 908 | 22.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,821 | 902 | 49.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 20,240 | 11,577 | 57.2 |
| Migratory students | 331 | 192 | 58.0 |
| Male | 17,890 | 11,585 | 64.8 |
| Female | 17,270 | 12,139 | 70.3 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,073 | 22,058 | 62.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 228 | 159 | 69.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 496 | 366 | 73.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,697 | 3,190 | 41.4 |
| Hispanic | 2,825 | 1,545 | 54.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,786 | 16,771 | 70.5 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 3,960 | 762 | 19.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,746 | 733 | 42.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 20,166 | 10,456 | 51.8 |
| Migratory students | 330 | 157 | 47.6 |
| Male | 17,838 | 9,613 | 53.9 |
| Female | 17,235 | 12,445 | 72.2 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 35,167 | 11,656 | 33.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 229 | 83 | 36.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 516 | 209 | 40.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,698 | 906 | 11.8 |
| Hispanic | 2,889 | 583 | 20.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,794 | 9,866 | 41.5 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4,004 | 557 | 13.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,823 | 199 | 10.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 20,246 | 4,439 | 21.9 |
| Migratory students | 340 | 70 | 20.6 |
| Male | 17,897 | 6,241 | 34.9 |
| Female | 17,270 | 5,415 | 31.4 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 34,715 | 21,249 | 61.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 252 | 161 | 63.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 513 | 351 | 68.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,631 | 2,729 | 35.8 |
| Hispanic | 2,782 | 1,484 | 53.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,496 | 16,501 | 70.2 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 3,991 | 741 | 18.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,613 | 626 | 38.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19,488 | 9,605 | 49.3 |
| Migratory students | 309 | 144 | 46.6 |
| Male | 17,796 | 10,626 | 59.7 |
| Female | 16,918 | 10,623 | 62.8 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 34,648 | 24,724 | 71.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 250 | 191 | 76.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 502 | 379 | 75.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,629 | 3,916 | 51.3 |
| Hispanic | 2,734 | 1,783 | 65.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 23,493 | 18,427 | 78.4 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 3,991 | 951 | 23.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,551 | 781 | 50.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19,436 | 11,893 | 61.2 |
| Migratory students | 291 | 168 | 57.7 |
| Male | 17,755 | 11,334 | 63.8 |
| Female | 16,893 | 13,390 | 79.3 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| **Comments: The State does not assess Science at grade 8.** | | | |

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

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

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 71,354 | 49,096 | 68.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 542 | 396 | 73.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1,118 | 841 | 75.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 15,771 | 6,948 | 44.1 |
| Hispanic | 5,428 | 3,209 | 59.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 48,399 | 37,647 | 77.8 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 6,560 | 3,000 | 45.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2,922 | 1,259 | 43.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 36,592 | 21,506 | 58.8 |
| Migratory students | 503 | 278 | 55.3 |
| Male | 35,832 | 24,283 | 67.8 |
| Female | 35,522 | 24,813 | 69.8 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 31,496 | 17,980 | 57.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 250 | 152 | 60.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 565 | 335 | 59.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 6,700 | 2,065 | 30.8 |
| Hispanic | 2,024 | 836 | 41.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 21,900 | 14,563 | 66.5 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 3,622 | 655 | 18.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 953 | 147 | 15.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 14,467 | 6,037 | 41.7 |
| Migratory students | 162 | 43 | 26.5 |
| Male | 15,545 | 7,797 | 50.2 |
| Female | 15,951 | 10,183 | 63.8 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 33,086 | 13,889 | 42.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 276 | 137 | 49.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 556 | 295 | 53.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 7,473 | 1,340 | 17.9 |
| Hispanic | 2,187 | 622 | 28.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 22,534 | 11,471 | 50.9 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 3,922 | 966 | 24.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,066 | 140 | 13.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 16,452 | 4,845 | 29.4 |
| Migratory students | 222 | 44 | 19.8 |
| Male | 16,604 | 7,171 | 43.2 |
| Female | 16,482 | 6,718 | 40.8 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

**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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09 | Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Schools | 1,080 | 586 | 54.3 |
| Districts | 261 | 236 | 90.4 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> 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 2008-09 | Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09 |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Title I schools | 812 | 462 | 56.9 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 687 | 382 | 55.6 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 125 | 80 | 64.0 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

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

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. 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 2008-09 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09 |
|---|---|---|
| 260 | 231 | 88.8 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

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

**1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

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

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

| Corrective Action | # of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09 |
|---|---|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 11 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | 2 |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | 1 |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | |
| Replacement of the principal | 1 |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 6 |
| **Comments:** | |

**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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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) | |
| Reopening the school as a public charter school | |
| Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school | 2 |
| Take over the school by the State | 8 |
| Other major restructuring of the school governance | 10 |
| **Comments: Other major restructuring actions implemented must be approved by the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE).** | |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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'ts 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 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action [2] )
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

---

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) has thirteen (13) districts listed as being in school improvement. A district is placed into district improvement when it has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years. Likewise, districts must make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years to be removed from the district improvement list. Districts identified for improvement or corrective action are provided improvement strategies through the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) Handbook. The handbook lists actions that the district must integrate into their ACSIP plan in order to increase student achievement. Districts may request technical assistance from their assigned ACSIP Supervisor at any time. This technical assistance includes any advice and resources (that are within the ACSIP Supervisor's means) requested by the district. To inform districts of the implications of district improvement, Regional training sessions were held. Superintendents (or designees) attended this training which included: a definition of district improvement, causes of district improvement, federal requirements for districts in improvement, responsibilities of districts in improvement, suggested actions to increase student achievement. PowerPoint presentations and resources from these training sessions are posted on the ACSIP website. To further implement technical assistance, the ADE is also working to implement a program, Smart Accountability, which works to utilize resources for building district and school capacity in order to improve student achievement. This program creates School Specialty teams composed of school improvement, literacy, math, and science specialists (and other members as needed by the specific school). These teams work to provide intensive support, resources and assistance to schools that are identified as in improvement, giving priority to districts with schools identified as having high need. The Smart Accountability model will provide a more advanced level of technical assistance to schools and districts in improvement.

**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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09 |
|---|---|
| Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards | 8 |
| Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district | 1 |
| Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds | 0 |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP | 2 |
| 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 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action) | 0 |
| **Comments: Nine (9) districts chose to implement other actions that were approved by the ADE.** | |

**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 SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

| | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|---|---|---|
| Districts | 98 | 0 |
| Schools | 231 | 56 |
| **Comments:** | | |

| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete | |
|---|---|

**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 2008-09.

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

The table below pertains <u>only</u> to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during <u>SY 2008-09</u>.

*Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
  - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

*States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
  - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

| Category | SY 2008-09 | SY 2007-08 |
|---|---|---|
| Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09 | 173,119 | 171,581 |
| Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09 | 123,152 | 114,353 |
| Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09 | 71.1 | 66.6 |
| Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09 | 158,957 | 157,529 |
| Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09 | 102,890 | 95,495 |
| 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 2008-09 | 64.7 | 60.6 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**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 2008-09 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 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09 | 442 |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09 | 27 |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09 | 331 |
| **Comments:** | |

**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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

| Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.** | **Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.** | **Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used** | **Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance** | **Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status** | **Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)** | **Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.** |
| 1 | | 18 | 6 | 5 | C | |
| 2 | | 13 | 4 | 1 | A | |
| 3 | | 3 | 0 | 0 | D | No other positive outcomes occurred. |
| 4 | | 3 | 1 | 0 | A | |
| 5 | | 3 | 1 | 0 | A | |
| 6 = Combo 1 | Combination of strategies numbered 1 and 4. | 7 | | | | |
| 7 = Combo 2 | Combination of strategies numbered 1 and 3. | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| **Comments:** | | | | | | |

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

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

**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.

Schools and districts identified for improvement or corrective action are provided improvement strategies through the Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) Handbook. The handbook lists actions that the school must integrate into their ACSIP plan in order to increase student achievement. Schools and districts may request technical assistance from their assigned ACSIP Supervisor at any time. This technical assistance includes any advice and resources (that are within the ACSIP Supervisor's means) requested by the school. Superintendents, Principals and Title I Coordinators (or designees) attended regional trainings on school and district improvement led by ACSIP Supervisors. This training included: a definition of school improvement, causes of school improvement, federal requirements for schools in improvement, responsibilities of schools in improvement, suggested actions to increase student achievement. PowerPoint presentations and resources from these training sessions are posted on the ACSIP website. The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) is also working to implement a new differentiated accountability program, Smart Accountability, which works to utilize resources for building district and school capacity in order to improve student achievement. This program creates School Specialty teams composed of school improvement, literacy, math, and science specialists (and other members as needed by the specific school). These teams work to provide intensive support, resources and assistance to schools that are identified as in improvement, giving priority to districts with schools identified as having high need. The Smart Accountability model will provide a more advanced level of technical assistance to schools and districts in improvement.

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**

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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.

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

**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) <u>evaluation</u> and <u>technical assistance</u> activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

The Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) provided Root Cause Analysis training to Arkansas School Improvement Supervisors for use within their Specialty Support Teams. This training was conducted by The Southern Regional Education Board and covered the skills and knowledge necessary to provide a more efficient way of strengthening the design of data for the planning process with the schools. In addition, a team of four School Improvement Supervisors attended at training session led by the Education Trust. The participants in each training session learned to look at the gaps in student achievement and address concerns in closing those achievement gaps by reviewing instructional strategies, professional staff capacity and quality, school leadership, community and parents connections, and student centered learning climate. This information will be passed on to the Specialty Support Teams, which are an important link in the Statewide System of Support. Also, a library of resources has been established in the School Improvement office and includes various subjects and topics relating to low-performing schools. The purpose of this library is to provide extra resources to School Improvement Supervisors and Specialty Support Teams in regards to specific issues relating to their schools. A checkout system for the library book is available to all.

The Arkansas data warehouse, NORMES and APSCN, provides measurable outcomes on the number and percentage of students scoring proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics exams that are given annually in grades 3-8. This system allows for the ADE to monitor those who make adequately yearly progress and can move out of improvement status.

A desk audit monitoring has been developed for the schools to report what impact the 1003g funds have had on instructional strategies, technical assistance, professional development and leadership capacity. All the schools that received school improvement funds put a priority in their electronic school improvement plans that identifies the actions that will be taken and the budgeted amount. This aids the School Improvement Supervisors in offering additional, specialized technical assistance to schools.

---

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

**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 2008-09 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No known funds available.

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

**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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

    For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

|  | # Students |
|---|---|
| Eligible for public school choice | 110,221 |
| Applied to transfer | 164 |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 164 |

**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 under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

|  | Amount |
|---|---|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | $ 120,436 |

**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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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 | 132 |

**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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

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

    - In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

b.  How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

    For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

|  | # Students |
|---|---|
| Eligible for supplemental educational services | 71,942 |
| Applied for supplemental educational services | 1,720 |
| Received supplemental educational services | 1,720 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

|  | Amount |
|---|---|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services | $ 6,683,728 |
| **Comments:** | |

## 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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

| School Type | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Number 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 classes | 176,816 | 172,641 | 97.6 | 4,175 | 2.4 |
| All elementary classes | 120,897 | 118,668 | 98.2 | 2,229 | 1.8 |
| All secondary classes | 55,919 | 53,973 | 96.5 | 1,946 | 3.5 |
| Differences due to new EDFacts Guidance. | | | | | |

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

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

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


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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

| The State uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught |
|---|

**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 is 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 the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

In the tables 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 <u>not highly qualified</u>, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided <u>at each grade level</u> are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes <u>at a particular grade</u> 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 <u>for each grade</u> 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** <u>not</u> highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

| | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Elementary School Classes | |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 99.0 |
| 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 | 1.0 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 0.0 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

| | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Secondary School Classes | |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers) | 95.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 5.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 0.0 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used**

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

**NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).**

| School Type | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty Elementary Schools | 55,072 | 53,903 | 97.9 |
| Low-poverty Elementary Schools | 24,109 | 23,764 | 98.6 |
| Secondary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty secondary Schools | 14,602 | 13,889 | 95.1 |
| Low-Poverty secondary Schools | 38,100 | 37,371 | 98.1 |
| | | | |

**1.5.4** 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 | 78.2 | 49.4 |
| Poverty metric used | Free & Reduced Lunch. Differences due to new EDFacts Guidance. If data has not been entered for all schools, what is it compared to? | |
| Secondary schools | 61.4 | 45.5 |
| Poverty metric used | Free & Reduced Lunch. Differences due to new EDFacts Guidance. If data has not been entered for all schools, what is it compared to? | |

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

   a.   *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.*
   b.   *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.*
   c.   *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.*
   d.   *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/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

| Check Types of Programs | Type of Program | Other Language |
|---|---|---|
| No | Dual language | |
| No | Two-way immersion | |
| No | Transitional bilingual programs | |
| No | Developmental bilingual | |
| No | 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 | Other (explain in comment box below) | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

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

In the table below, provide the underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

| Number of ALL LEP students in the State | 27,715 |
|---|---|
| Comments: | |

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

In the table below, provide the underlined 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. | 27,166 |
| Comments: | |

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

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

| Language | # LEP Students |
|---|---|
| Spanish; Castilian | 24,318 |
| Marshallese | 1,038 |
| Hmong | 397 |
| Vietnamese | 389 |
| Lao | 379 |

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**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(a)(2).

**1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the 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 | 27,383 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 307 |
| Total | 27,690 |
| **Comments: The number not tested on the state annual ELP assessment can be contributed contributed to the high mobility of this population in the state of Arkansas.** | |

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

| | # |
|---|---|
| Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment | 2,279 |
| Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment | 8.3 |
| **Comments:** | |

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment**

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

| | # |
|---|---|
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 24,625 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 357 |
| Total | 24,982 |
| **Comments:** | |
| In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress). | |
| | # |
| Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. | 3,460 |

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

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

| | Results | | Targets | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** |
| Making progress | 7,720 | 31.4 | 7,721 | 26.00 |
| ELP attainment | 2,032 | 8.2 | 2,032 | 2.00 |
| **Comments:** | | | | |

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

| | |
|---|---|
| State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s). | No |
| State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s). | No |
| State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s). | No |
| **Comments: Arkansas is an English-only state and does not offer native language assessments.** | |

### 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 ESEA accountability determinations for mathematics.

| Language(s) |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| **Comments:** Arkansas is an English-only state and does not offer native language assessments. |

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

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

| Language(s) |
| --- |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: Arkansas is an English-only state and does not offer native language assessments. |

### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

| Language(s) |
| --- |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: Arkansas is an English-only state and does not offer native language assessments. |

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 underlined 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 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 |
|---|---|---|
| 935 | 1,146 | 2,081 |
| **Comments:** | | |

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1,236 | 1,034 | 83.7 | 202 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

In the table below, report the number of 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 1.6.3.6.3 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1,120 | 891 | 79.6 | 229 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 total 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 396 | 182 | 46.0 | 214 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

**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 | 37 |
| | |
| # -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 28 |
| # -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1 | 36 |
| # -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2 | 35 |
| # -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3 | 32 |
| | |
| # -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 2007-08 and 2008-09) | 5 |
| # -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs | 0 |
| # -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809) | 0 |
| **Comments:** | |

**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 all three Title III AMAOs | No |
|---|---|
| Comments: | |

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

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

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

**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 underlined number of immigrant students enrolled in schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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 |
|---|---|---|
| 4,073 | 319 | 12 |

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 under 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) û The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course û (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. | 2,954 |
| Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 625 |

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.

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

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet 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 activities reported.

4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

| Type of Professional Development Activity | # Subgrantees | |
|---|---|---|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students | 31 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 21 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 28 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 25 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 22 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | | |
| **Participant Information** | **# Subgrantees** | **# Participants** |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 30 | 4,844 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 29 | 2,202 |
| PD provided to principals | 27 | 414 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 26 | 195 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 20 | 559 |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel | 13 | 220 |
| Total | 145 | 8,434 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/$$ Distribution |
|---|---|---|
| 07/15/08 | 09/01/08 | 60 |
| **Comments: Title III funding is not released to LEAs until the school improvement plan, including the Title III program, is submitted and approved by the SEA. Plans begin arriving at the SEA in September; the approval process must be completed befor funds are released. Some LEAs submit their plans earlier than others.** | | |

**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.

| |
|---|
| LEA notification of availability of funding is provided in August; LEAs then work at their own pace in submitting their Title III budgets for approval, and obtaining release of Title III funds. |

**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 |  |
| **Comments: Zero schools for status. Arkansas has no persistently dangerous schools. N130 file submitted in March 2009.** | |

**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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Graduation Rate |
|---|---|
| All Students | 83.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 81.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 89.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 76.2 |
| Hispanic | 77.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 83.1 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 75.8 |
| Limited English proficient | 74.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 90.2 |
| Migratory students | 79.2 |
| Male | 79.6 |
| Female | 85.4 |
| **Comments: We took another look at percentages in Black, non-Hispanic, Children with disabilities, and Migrant students, and numbers look correct according to data we received from our districts.** | |

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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|---|---|
| All Students | 3.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 5.0 |
| Hispanic | 3.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 2.9 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 4.3 |
| Limited English proficient | 3.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3.1 |
| Migratory students | 4.8 |
| Male | 4.0 |
| Female | 2.9 |
| **Comments:** | |

**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 | 231 | 176 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 14 | 14 |
| Total | 245 | 190 |
| **Comments:** | | |

**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) | 129 | 31 |
| K | 506 | 124 |
| 1 | 512 | 127 |
| 2 | 462 | 107 |
| 3 | 453 | 91 |
| 4 | 474 | 92 |
| 5 | 349 | 84 |
| 6 | 338 | 89 |
| 7 | 316 | 86 |
| 8 | 298 | 86 |
| 9 | 319 | 104 |
| 10 | 312 | 103 |
| 11 | 289 | 71 |
| 12 | 326 | 64 |
| Ungraded | N<10 | N<10 |
| Total | 5,084 | 1,260 |
| **Comments:** | | |

**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 | 347 | 152 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 3,871 | 873 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 743 | 102 |
| Hotels/Motels | 123 | 133 |
| Total | 5,084 | 1,260 |
| **Comments:** | | |

**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) | 31 |
| K | 124 |
| 1 | 127 |
| 2 | 107 |
| 3 | 91 |
| 4 | 92 |
| 5 | 84 |
| 6 | 89 |
| 7 | 86 |
| 8 | 86 |
| 9 | 104 |
| 10 | 103 |
| 11 | 71 |
| 12 | 64 |
| Ungraded | N<10 |
| Total | 1,260 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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 | 71 |
| Migratory children/youth | 34 |
| Children with disabilities (IDEA) | 236 |
| Limited English proficient students | 93 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

| | # McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer |
|---|---|
| Tutoring or other instructional support | 12 |
| Expedited evaluations | 12 |
| Staff professional development and awareness | 12 |
| Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services | 11 |
| Transportation | 12 |
| Early childhood programs | 2 |
| Assistance with participation in school programs | 11 |
| Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs | 12 |
| Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment | 8 |
| Parent education related to rights and resources for children | 9 |
| Coordination between schools and agencies | 10 |
| Counseling | 9 |
| Addressing needs related to domestic violence | 2 |
| Clothing to meet a school requirement | 2 |
| School supplies | 12 |
| Referral to other programs and services | 9 |
| Emergency assistance related to school attendance | 3 |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

| | # Subgrantees Reporting |
|---|---|
| Eligibility for homeless services | 0 |
| School Selection | 0 |
| Transportation | 12 |
| School records | 8 |
| Immunizations | 5 |
| Other medical records | 0 |
| Other Barriers – in comment box below | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**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 ESEA 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 ESEA.

| 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 | 524 | 291 |
| 4 | 528 | 319 |
| 5 | 436 | 220 |
| 6 | 419 | 230 |
| 7 | 396 | 181 |
| 8 | 355 | 202 |
| High School | 278 | 124 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State ESEA 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 | 390 | 290 |
| 4 | 373 | 256 |
| 5 | 326 | 185 |
| 6 | 354 | 244 |
| 7 | 340 | 185 |
| 8 | 296 | 124 |
| High School | 502 | 256 |
| | **Comments:** | |

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

**1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS**

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 under 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-ofschool youth.)*

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the underlined 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

| Age/Grade | 12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|---|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 1,089 |
| K | 609 |
| 1 | 564 |
| 2 | 521 |
| 3 | 521 |
| 4 | 539 |
| 5 | 439 |
| 6 | 456 |
| 7 | 391 |
| 8 | 355 |
| 9 | 348 |
| 10 | 328 |
| 11 | 202 |
| 12 | 153 |
| Ungraded | N<10 |
| Out-of-school | 821 |
| Total | 7,340 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

**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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs

- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

| Age/Grade | Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|---|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 18 |
| K | 92 |
| 1 | 61 |
| 2 | 65 |
| 3 | 64 |
| 4 | 52 |
| 5 | 58 |
| 6 | 32 |
| 7 | 21 |
| 8 | 15 |
| 9 | 24 |
| 10 | 17 |
| 11 | 16 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | |
| Out-of-school | 190 |
| Total | 733 |
| **Comments: There were no students served in the Ungraded category for the summer of 2009.** | |

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The ARMEP added a summer program in the 2009 summer/intercession and increased the number of staff in several other of the summer programs. This enabled us to serve more migrant children.

**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state of Arkansas MEP used MIS 2000 system to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts. Yes, child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Migrant Child counts are based first on eligibility data and individual student data from the COE, which is collected and entered throughout the year. These data are collected by means of interviews with the migrant families. The pertinent eligibility data and further documentation are noted on the Arkansas COE and the Supplementary Documentation Form. These data are then entered in the SIS after being reviewed by designated staff. Educational and other service data are also used in the calculation of child counts. These data are collected on student records, data entry forms and lists and are entered in the SIS throughout the year as services are provided. The Summer/Intercession count requires further data to be collected and recorded from migrant intercession staff demonstrating a Summer Enrollment and receipt of a migrant funded instructional service during the Summer Enrollment period. The following eligibility, student and educational data items are collected: Names of Migrant Children Parent or Guardian Names Complete Address Sex Birthdate Birthplace Grade Ethnicity Moved from city, state, country Moved to school district and state Qualifying Arrival Date Residency Date Qualifying Worker Name Qualifying Activity If work was Obtained or Sought Temporary or Seasonal With whom the move was made Interview Date Interviewer Name Interviewee Name General Comments Further Documentation Enroll Date Supplemental Program Start Dates Withdraw Date Generation Date

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 are inputted on each regional database and uploaded to the state database daily when any COE or intercession data is entered. This uploading process involves Internet contact to the state database and is usually done first thing in the morning or last thing in the day. The data uploaded can be verified by reconnecting with the state database through the Internet. At the state database all uploaded data is processed and stored on tables and can be accessed by searches and queries. Each day after all the data is processed the regional databases are updated with any updates made to the state database insuring that each database is identical. As the information is processed Student Records are printed from the local database and sent to the Migrant Clerks to be checked for errors and filed after any necessary corrections are made and processed.

Three times a year complete lists of the students are sent to the projects to be checked for accuracy and completeness. Projects are also encouraged to check the database through the Internet for individual students and complete lists of all of the migrant children in their district. Lists and special reports are provided any time during the year upon request. During the year when updates are made a record is sent to the school/district for verification of accuracy.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child counts are retrieved from the state database through queries that count only distinct student numbers statewide. The Category I queries calculate all eligible children who were residing in the state between the dates of 09/01/2008 and 08/31/2009. The queries are set up to only count the children who have completed three years of age before 08/31/2009 and have not left the state before their third birthday and children who turn twenty-two years of age after 09/01/2008. The queries are also designed to eliminate, from the count, children whose three-year eligibility have run out before 09/01/2008 or have a termination date before 09/01/2008. The Summer/Intercession queries count all children who show a Summer Enrollment, have a MEP funded Supplemental Instructional Code attached to that enrollment and remain eligible for funding purposes during the Summer Enrollment period.

Any preschooler or Out of School Youth who was a migrant in the previous year must have their residency verified for the present year before they can be counted in the system. This is verified by a visit to the home, a call to the family or an interview with the youth or family member. Once their residency is verified they may have a new school history line placed on the database and will be counted in the query.

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.

N/A

**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.

Quality Control begins with staff development. All recruiting staff goes through a thorough training regimen with state and regional level workshops. They also work with veteran recruiters before they complete their training. These trained recruiters interview the potential migrant parent, guardian, out-of-school youth or other person to determine eligibility. If the children are determined to be qualifying Migrant Students or Out-of-School Youth a COE will be filled out with the necessary information and a supplementary documentation form if needed. The Recruiter/Interviewer then sends the COE to the regional offices where it is reviewed and verified by the Recruitment/Eligibility/Data Specialist (REDS). If there is any discrepancy or doubt on COE data it is returned to the Recruiter/Interviewer for clarification or contacted for further explanation. Once it has been reviewed and accepted by the REDS regional directors examine it for final review before the data is input to the SIS. After the student is enrolled in the ARMEP and is in the SIS random lists of students are pulled in a report and re-interviews are done on many of the newly entered students and phone re-interviews are conducted by the REDS on a small number of students statewide. If the re-interview finds that the student is ineligible the student is removed from the SIS. All eligibility questions that arise are dealt with by a standard procedure. The procedure is included in the ARMEP Handbook and is incorporated in the training that each recruiter is given. The following is a simple outline of the eligibility question process used in training:

1. Check your manuals and other materials. You may have the information you need in some of the literature that you have received in the past.
2. If you cannot find the information by researching you should then call your Recruitment / Eligibility / Data Specialist (REDS). She will generally know the answer. If she has doubts and cannot locate the answer she will refer the question to the State Education Agency(SEA).
3. The SEA will attempt to answer the question immediately or research it. If the SEA has no set policy on the question and is unable to respond or locate the answer they may refer the question to OME for a decision.

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 ARMEP Re-Interview process is conducted throughout the year. The state is divided into five different regions and each region conducts its own re-interviews under the guidance of the SEA. The REDS conduct phone re-interviews on a number of students as soon as possible after entering them into the SIS so that problem areas may be identified quickly. Each region is given random lists generated by the SIS of students recruited during the previous months in their respective regions. The reports are broken by school districts in order to facilitate location of the families. The re-interviewer obtains a copy of the original COE and works with local district personnel to assist in locating the families. The re-interviewer attempts to make a home visit or arrange for the parents to meet them at the school for the interview. If the family cannot be located the first time no more than 2 further attempts are made to re-interview the family. During the interview all data regarding eligibility and student information is verified. All discrepancies are noted for review and correction and a decision is made on the validity of the original eligibility determination by the state designee. When the random list is completed or no more families can be located the re-interviewer reports the results of the re-interviews to the regional director who reviews the report and determines, with assistance of the SEA, what actions need to be taken if errors or ineligible children are found. The following is a summary of the Arkansas Migrant Education Re-Interviews: Random Sample: 345 Re-Interviews Conducted: 131 Eligible: 131

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.

Before entering data from a COE on any child a name and birthdate based search is run on the state database to verify for previous information. If the child is already on the database the REDS input the new data with the existing Student Identification Number. If the child is not found on the database a distinct Student Identification Number is created by the SIS and the data is input with the new number. All enrollments, updates and records entered in the SIS during the year are printed and sent to the school or staff who requested the data input for verification of accuracy. During the year there are opportunities to validate the data on the databases by means of lists of eligible students currently enrolled, printing of the Migrant Student Records, lists of residency only and preschool children, and reports written for specific needs as per school district request. Another valuable tool in the process is access to our on line version of the database where authorized Migrant school/regional personnel may log on a secure database to check and verify the information on individual students or see a list of all the Migrant children in their area. During the year lists of possible duplicate students are run to consider if the students are duplicated on the database. If, after review by the regional data specialists and the SEA, it is determined that the children have duplicate numbers the identifiers are merged.

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

A complete list of all eligible Migrant Children for each region and district is made from the state database. These lists and counts are run with the Category I queries first. The same queries are run on the regional database and compared with results on the state database. If there are discrepancies they are researched by student number. REDS send a copy of the list report to the Migrant Clerk in their respective region to verify that the list compares correctly with the students in their schools. Any discrepancies are also reviewed individually. Running the queries for Summer/Intercession on the state database and breaking it by district is done after the Category I verification. The REDS for each region are given the counts and relay those district counts to the LEA Migrant Clerks. If there is any disagreement in the numbers the Migrant Clerks send a list of the Migrant Children that were served in the summer to the REDS and they check that each student has the proper information in order to appear on the Summer/Intercession count.

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.

Individualized training will be provided for recruiters who need review on areas of eligibility. The SEA will adjust the state and regional trainings for any topics that have caused students to be considered ineligible.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A