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

ARIZONA

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:

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

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 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:
Arizona Department of Education

Address:
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Richard Valdivia

Telephone: (602) 542-3270

Fax: (602) 542-3050

e-mail: richard.valdivia@azed.gov

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

_____   _Friday, March 12, 2010, 4:39:07 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.

The following changes have been or will be made to the academic standards since peer review and approval on July 1, 2006. The Mathematics Standard was revised during School Year (SY) 2007-2008. The State Board of Education approved the revised standard on June 23, 2008. SY 2008-2009 was the transition year with full implementation of the new mathematics standard during SY 2009-2010.

The Language Arts Standards revision was in process with an anticipated State Board approval date in spring 2010. At this time, the revision has been put on hold because Arizona has signed on to the development of the Common Core Standards proposed by CCSSO and NGA. In spring 2010, the State will reconvene the Language Arts Committee to review the Common Core Standard for possible adoption by the State Board of Education.

The Science Standard will be revised during SY 2011-2012 with adoption Spring 2012. Full implementation will be SY 2013-2014. This timeline for Science is dependent upon the adoption timeline of the Language Arts Standard. Arizona prefers to focus on the implementation of one new academic standard during any school year.

In fall 2008, the Alternate Achievement Standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities were clarified for greater understanding by educators.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following changes have been or will be made to the assessments and achievement standards since peer review and approval on July 1, 2006. Arizona will revise Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) Mathematics assessments for Grades 3-8 and high school to align with the new Mathematics Standard adopted June 23, 2008. Initial field testing of new items was done during spring 2009. New operational assessments will be administered during spring 2010. Standard setting and adoption of new achievement standards by the State Board will be complete in May 2010.

Arizona is developing an alternate assessment for the 2% modified achievement standards for eligible students, called AIMS Enhanced Accessibility (AIMS EA). Field testing of the AIMS EA will occur spring 2010 with the first operational assessment in spring 2011 for Grades 7, 8, and high school in reading and mathematics. Standard setting and adoption by the State Board of the new modified achievement standards will be completed in May 2010.

Arizona revised the Alternate Assessment for the 1% student population in the spring 2009 for reading and mathematics. Standard setting was conducted May 2009 with adoption of achievement levels May 18, 2009. The AIMS A assessment system was submitted to the USDOE October 13, 2009 for November 2009 Peer Review.

New Language Arts Assessments will be developed when the Common Core Standards Assessment is developed.

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 <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."

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.

> State assessments and academic achievement standards in science are not yet approved. The State submitted additional evidence in August 2009, that is being reviewed during the November 2009 Peer Review of Assessments. AIMS Science in Grades 4, 8, and high school was first administered Spring 2008 with Standard Setting and State Board adoption of Achievement Levels, June 2008. The AIMS Science was submitted for Peer Review, fall of 2008.
>
> The AIMS A Science for Grades 4, 8, and high school was submitted to the USDOE on October 13, 2009 with the AIMS A Reading and Mathematics assessment system for November 2009 Peer Review.

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	572,966		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	30,933		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,380		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	34,101		>97%
Hispanic	235,757		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	254,795		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	73,159		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58,859		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	291,788		>97%
Migratory students	1,797		>97%
Male	293,228		>97%
Female	279,738		>97%
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	66,028	92.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,290	7.4
Total	71,318	
Comments:		

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	573,648		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	30,985		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	17,391		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	34,126		>97%
Hispanic	236,098		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	255,048		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	73,249		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	58,934		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	292,285		>97%
Migratory students	1,803		>97%
Male	293,591		>97%
Female	280,057		>97%
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 <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	66,117	92.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,290	7.4
Total	71,407	
Comments:		

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	241,899	226,812	93.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	13,410	12,164	90.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,469	7,172	96.0
Black, non-Hispanic	14,468	13,275	91.8
Hispanic	97,398	91,086	93.5
White, non-Hispanic	109,154	103,115	94.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	29,650	27,171	91.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	22,390	21,135	94.4
Economically disadvantaged students	115,772	109,100	94.2
Migratory students	806	756	93.8
Male	123,642	115,308	93.3
Female	118,257	111,504	94.3
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 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	24,881	91.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations		
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,290	8.4
Total	27,171	
Comments:		

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	83,488	60,824	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,285	2,331	54.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,527	2,168	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,903	3,001	61.2
Hispanic	35,765	23,127	64.7
White, non-Hispanic	36,008	30,197	83.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,167	5,058	45.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,389	5,972	44.6
Economically disadvantaged students	46,301	29,509	63.7
Migratory students	165	90	54.6
Male	42,615	30,793	72.3
Female	40,873	30,031	73.5
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.

1.3.2.1 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	83,527	59,769	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,285	2,323	54.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,525	2,116	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,906	3,144	64.1
Hispanic	35,788	22,239	62.1
White, non-Hispanic	36,023	29,947	83.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,173	4,276	38.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,398	4,906	36.6
Economically disadvantaged students	46,318	28,614	61.8
Migratory students	165	97	58.8
Male	42,634	28,815	67.6
Female	40,893	30,954	75.7
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: Arizona does not assess proficiency in Science in 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.

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	82,934	61,602	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,467	2,472	55.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,545	2,227	87.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,835	3,068	63.4
Hispanic	35,372	23,444	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,715	30,391	85.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,326	4,787	42.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,871	4,945	41.7
Economically disadvantaged students	45,482	29,601	65.1
Migratory students	218	132	60.6
Male	42,503	30,941	72.8
Female	40,431	30,661	75.8
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.

1.3.2.2 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	82,967	59,758	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,469	2,395	53.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,544	2,166	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,836	3,059	63.2
Hispanic	35,384	21,845	61.7
White, non-Hispanic	35,734	30,293	84.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,341	4,246	37.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,871	3,663	30.9
Economically disadvantaged students	45,498	27,946	61.4
Migratory students	218	108	49.5
Male	42,526	28,858	67.9
Female	40,441	30,900	76.4
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.

1.3.3.2 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	81,684	46,703	57.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,297	1,475	34.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,517	1,878	74.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,760	2,144	45.0
Hispanic	34,911	14,763	42.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,199	26,443	75.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,156	3,714	33.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,709	1,608	13.7
Economically disadvantaged students	44,750	19,224	43.0
Migratory students	217	67	30.9
Male	41,856	23,895	57.1
Female	39,828	22,808	57.3
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
All students	81,684	46,703	57.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,297	1,475	34.3

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	81,600	58,758	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,302	2,209	51.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,450	2,130	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,904	2,942	60.0
Hispanic	34,243	21,882	63.9
White, non-Hispanic	35,701	29,595	82.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,103	4,034	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,705	2,743	31.5
Economically disadvantaged students	43,983	27,287	62.0
Migratory students	274	154	56.2
Male	41,790	29,686	71.0
Female	39,810	29,072	73.0
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.

1.3.2.3 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	81,612	59,940	73.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,305	2,369	55.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,451	2,103	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,903	3,202	65.3
Hispanic	34,249	22,026	64.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,704	30,240	84.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,109	3,864	34.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,707	2,260	26.0
Economically disadvantaged students	43,992	27,843	63.3
Migratory students	274	152	55.5
Male	41,793	29,168	69.8
Female	39,819	30,772	77.3
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.

1.3.3.3 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			
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: Arizona does not assess proficiency in Science in grade 5.			

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.

1.3.1.4 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	81,250	55,329	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,170	1,987	47.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,446	2,045	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,806	2,703	56.2
Hispanic	33,977	20,113	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	35,851	28,481	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,487	2,925	27.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,185	1,754	24.4
Economically disadvantaged students	42,963	24,694	57.5
Migratory students	270	137	50.7
Male	41,774	27,722	66.4
Female	39,476	27,607	69.9
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.4 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	81,260	57,011	70.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,175	2,133	51.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,447	2,026	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,806	2,965	61.7
Hispanic	33,980	20,080	59.1
White, non-Hispanic	35,852	29,807	83.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,490	3,173	30.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,187	1,147	16.0
Economically disadvantaged students	42,973	25,087	58.4
Migratory students	270	130	48.2
Male	41,781	27,765	66.4
Female	39,479	29,246	74.1
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.

1.3.3.4 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: Arizona does not assess proficiency in Science in 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	81,487	59,764	73.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,359	2,425	55.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,435	2,151	88.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,746	2,995	63.1
Hispanic	33,092	21,615	65.3
White, non-Hispanic	36,855	30,578	83.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,834	3,032	30.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,859	1,924	28.0
Economically disadvantaged students	41,067	26,152	63.7
Migratory students	277	167	60.3
Male	41,512	29,435	70.9
Female	39,975	30,329	75.9
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who 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	81,506	59,263	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,364	2,455	56.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,436	2,078	85.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,745	3,127	65.9
Hispanic	33,099	20,816	62.9
White, non-Hispanic	36,862	30,787	83.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,852	3,034	30.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,865	1,302	19.0
Economically disadvantaged students	41,080	25,484	62.0
Migratory students	277	150	54.2
Male	41,521	28,301	68.2
Female	39,985	30,962	77.4
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.

1.3.3.5 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			
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: Arizona does not assess proficiency in Science in grade 7.			

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	79,935	50,459	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,137	1,752	42.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,494	2,064	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	4,749	2,331	49.1
Hispanic	32,048	16,607	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	36,507	27,705	75.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,673	2,205	22.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,242	1,065	17.1
Economically disadvantaged students	39,184	19,842	50.6
Migratory students	264	114	43.2
Male	40,848	25,690	62.9
Female	39,087	24,769	63.4
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.

1.3.2.6 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	79,957	55,379	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,130	2,040	49.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,493	2,067	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	4,746	2,933	61.8
Hispanic	32,066	18,600	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	36,522	29,739	81.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,669	2,590	26.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,246	919	14.7
Economically disadvantaged students	39,195	22,413	57.2
Migratory students	264	132	50.0
Male	40,850	26,459	64.8
Female	39,107	28,920	74.0
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.

1.3.3.6 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	78,565	43,635	55.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,026	1,221	30.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,472	1,883	76.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4,669	2,006	43.0
Hispanic	31,486	12,759	40.5
White, non-Hispanic	35,912	25,766	71.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,469	2,056	21.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,106	421	6.9
Economically disadvantaged students	38,510	15,531	40.3
Migratory students	265	88	33.2
Male	40,103	22,017	54.9
Female	38,462	21,618	56.2
Comments:			

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

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	74,985	52,276	69.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,386	2,094	47.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,334	2,009	86.1
Black, non-Hispanic	4,556	2,605	57.2
Hispanic	28,499	16,896	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	35,210	28,672	81.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,728	1,870	24.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,020	803	20.0
Economically disadvantaged students	29,573	16,936	57.3
Migratory students	315	164	52.1
Male	37,993	26,066	68.6
Female	36,992	26,210	70.8
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	75,317	56,059	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,392	2,306	52.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,326	1,969	84.6
Black, non-Hispanic	4,537	2,985	65.8
Hispanic	28,698	18,231	63.5
White, non-Hispanic	35,364	30,568	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,773	2,459	31.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,062	664	16.4
Economically disadvantaged students	29,910	18,431	61.6
Migratory students	321	184	57.3
Male	38,142	27,451	72.0
Female	37,175	28,608	77.0
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.

1.3.3.7 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	66,563	25,855	38.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,841	587	15.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,183	1,281	58.7
Black, non-Hispanic	3,846	990	25.7
Hispanic	24,689	5,680	23.0
White, non-Hispanic	32,004	17,317	54.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,546	948	14.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,320		<3%
Economically disadvantaged students	25,840	5,927	22.9
Migratory students	274	37	13.5
Male	33,349	13,395	40.2
Female	33,214	12,460	37.5
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	1,915	1,425	74.4
Districts	572	348	60.8
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 not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	1,176	835	71.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	720	468	65.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	456	367	80.5
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
411	229	55.7
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	27
Extension of the school year or school day	2
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	6
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	6
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	15
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)	5
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	35
Comments:	

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. Implementation of a systemic Response to Intervention (R t I) model, an academic intervention designed to provide early, effective interventions to children who are having difficulty learning. Response to intervention models are used to implement curriculum and instruction that includes a multi-tiered instructional support, research based assessment system, data-based decisions, and professional development. In implementing the R t I model, schools focus on building systems that increase student achievement for all students.
2. Implementation of turnaround principals/school leaders who are given the necessary decision-making authority, as well as the necessary budget and staffing, to impact instructional programs with the focus on improved student achievement. In these situations, the principals are given the capacity to raise the professional expectations of staff and focus on data-driven instructional practices.
3. Implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) focusing on learning rather than on teaching, working collaboratively, and holding principals, teachers, and students accountable for results. In the process of implementation, schools revise master schedules to create scientifically-based, job-embedded professional development, and other professional collaboration opportunities. Schools reorganize themselves to integrate two concepts: professionalism and community. The characteristics of the PLCs in the restructuring schools include collective team work in which leadership and responsibility for student learning are extensively shared, a focus on reflective inquiry, emphasis on improving student learning, and shared values and norms.

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.

LEAs in year one of improvement receive a site visit by an ADE program specialist. The focus is on Standards 1 and 4 (Leadership, Culture, Climate, Communication) of the Standards and Rubrics for LEA Improvement. Technical assistance (TA) is provided to introduce LEAs to the Arizona Local Education Agency Tracker (ALEAT) program for development of their improvement plan. TA is provided in the development of improvement plan and in the application of improvement grant funds to support implementation of their plan. Periodic monitoring of plan's implementation occurs during the year.

LEAs in year two of improvement receive a Year 2 Resource Team visit using year 2 protocols, with a focus on Standard 3 (Assessment). Technical assistance is provided to assist with revision of their improvement plan. Year 2 Frozen LEAs conduct an Audit focusing on Standard 3 (Assessment). ADE reviews Audit findings and provides recommendations for improvement. Technical assistance is provided on application of improvement grant funds to support implementation of their plan. Periodic monitoring of the plan's implementation occurs during the year.

 LEAs in Corrective Action of improvement conduct an Audit focusing on Standard 2 (Curriculum, Instruction, Professional Development) with emphasis on Reading and/or math. If re-directing funds was chosen as their corrective action option, the focus is on Standard 5, resource management. ADE reviews Audit findings and provides recommendations. Technical assistance is provided on application of improvement grant funds to support implementation of their plan. TA is provided on revision of their improvement plan, correction action option monitoring, and periodic reporting of plan's implementation occurs throughout the year.

LEAs in Corrective Action II (those in corrective action the previous year) conduct an Audit of all 5 Standards. ADE reviews Audit findings and provides recommendations for improvement. ADE may provide an external consultant. Technical assistance is provided on application of improvement grant funds to support implementation of their plan. Correction action option monitoring, and monthly plan implementation progress is reported on ALEAT. Technical assistance is provided to support revision of improvement plan.

Corrective Action II Continuation LEAs (those in the third year or more of corrective action) receive a prescriptive Resource Team visit focusing on Self-Assessment results, SAI Survey results, student academic data, Resource Management, and Leadership. ADE may continue to provide external consultant. Correction action option monitoring, and monthly plan implementation progress is reported on ALEAT. Technical assistance is provided on application of improvement grant funds to support implementation of their plan. Technical assistance is provided to support revision of improvement plan.

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	26
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	8
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

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	41	1
Schools	104	4
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	07/22/09

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 only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

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	105,757	111,624
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	59,375	59,605
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	56.1	53.4
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	105,891	111,866
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	60,164	59,079
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	56.8	52.8
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	113
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	30
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	166
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.**
6 = Combo 1	Combination of 1 and 2.	291	30	107	A	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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.

ADE assigned Title I School Improvement Education Specialists to Schools and LEAs in improvement. The Specialists made regular site visits to each district and each school campus and worked with district and school leadership teams to write or revise school improvement plans. Specialists monitored progress of the schools throughout the year to fully implement school improvement plans. In September, all LEAs and schools in improvement were required to attend a mandatory technical assistance workshop. At workshop sessions, attendees learned about compliance, data analysis, design of school improvement goals and grant writing. Specialists were available during these workshops to provide individualized technical assistance.

Additional sharing strategies:

A. SEA sponsored Best Practices Institutes focusing on effective instruction, data analysis and building effective leaders;

B. Web-based access through Arizona State University's IDEAL for additional instruction and technical assistance in the area(s) school missed AYP; and

C. WestEd and Southwest Comprehensive Center (SWCC) provided research-based technical assistance in the above-mentioned areas.

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) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

PART ONE -EVALUATION Review and evaluation of the schools incorporated several areas associated with the Arizona School Improvement Plan (ASIP). School plans were reviewed to ensure the plan completely addressed the identified needs from the self assessment on the Standards and Rubric for School Improvement and the areas in which AYP was missed. Specialists evaluated the ASIPs to ensure the plans contained goals/strategies/activities, funding resources, time lines and professional development activities that were aligned with grant monies awarded to the LEA. Once the plan was approved and agreed upon, specialists spent the entire school year monitoring the implementation progress using on-site visits, electronic means and phone calls.

The ultimate goal was for schools to meet AYP targets and exit from school improvement status. The success of implementation was determined and evaluated through schools showing annual adequate progress relative to past and present program goals, performance measures, and gains in student achievement as measured by both norm-referenced and AIMS tests. Using spring 2009 data, 30 schools in improvement (7%) exited improvement status. 107 schools in improvement (35%) made AYP for the first time.

PART TWO -TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE Schools in corrective action or restructuring were assigned Title I School Improvement Education Specialists who made site visits to school sites and worked with building leadership teams to assist with revising and in some cases re-writing the school improvement plans. Specialists provided continuous support to the schools during the implementation of the school improvement plan. Specialists provided professional development in the areas of effective leadership, systems change, parent involvement, effective instruction and using data to make decisions. Specialists helped make connections with other ADE units and the schools. These units have experts in specialized fields (finance, budget, special education, reading, etc.) that provide the schools with needed information and training.

A mandatory technical assistance workshop was conducted for all schools in improvement at the beginning of the school year. Workshop sessions provided instruction in compliance, data analysis, school improvement plan design, and grant writing. During the workshop, school personnel had time for individual school consultations on an as needed basis by program specialists.

During the school year there were three forums to provide professional development and technical assistance. The forums addressed three vital needs identified by school leaders and specialists: Student Engagement, Effective School Systems and Parental Engagement.

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.

1. SEA sponsored Best Practices Institutes focusing on effective instruction, data analysis and building effective leaders;
2. Online access through Arizona State University's IDEAL for additional instruction and technical assistance in the area(s) the school missed AYP; and
3. WestEd and Southwest Comprehensive Center (SWCC) provided research-based technical assistance in the above-mentioned areas.

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	175,323
Applied to transfer	472
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	472

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	$ 593,419

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	75

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	92,671
Applied for supplemental educational services	9,219
Received supplemental educational services	7,717
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	$ 7,613,587
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	286,710	267,736	93.4	18,974	6.6
All elementary classes	182,398	172,981	94.8	9,417	5.2
All secondary classes	104,312	94,755	90.8	9,557	9.2

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.

At the elementary level, a classroom is counted 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	46.0
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	11.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	43.0
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)	44.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	15.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	41.0
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	51,358	47,660	92.8
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	49,710	48,337	97.2
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	14,514	12,551	86.5
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	24,434	23,142	94.7

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	87.4	32.4
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced fee lunch (as reported in SAIS).	
Secondary schools	75.0	21.6
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students eligible for free or reduced fee lunch (as reported in SAIS).	

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
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Navajo
No	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
No	Content-based ESL	
No	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other" program refers to Mainstream Classes with Individualized Language Learner Plans (ILLPs) for those schools with a low incidence of English Language Learners.

Please note: Arizona does not differentiate between types of bilingual programming.

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	149,320
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.	144,865
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	119,488
Navajo; Navaho	2,666
Vietnamese	1,238
Arabic	1,155
Somali	554

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	134,915
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	14,405
Total	149,320
Comments: ELL program participation and ELL assessment will vary by about 10% because students in a program based on an assessment from the prior year can leave the program before the annual assessment is made, usually in the spring.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	45,360
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	33.6
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	131,040
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	13,829
Total	144,869
Comments: ELL program participation and ELL assessment will vary by about 10% because students in a program based on an assessment from the prior year can leave the program before the annual assessment is made, usually in the spring. With reference to the "number not tested," please note that the state data collection system for this field has been changed for 2008-2009. This field now captures students withdrawn from the system. The number of Title III LEP students who took the State annual ELP test for the first time is 40,267, as specified by the EDFact file specification. However, ADE has TWO data points for many new students. The correct number of Title III LEP with only one data point and who were not included in the calculation for AMAO1 is only 10,790.	
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.	40,267

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 ôMaking Progressö 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 ôMaking Progressö and the number and percent that met the State definition of ôAttainmentö 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	58,539	38.9	19,656	15.00
ELP attainment	44,070	29.3	19,656	15.00
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:	

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:

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:

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:

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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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
35,895	15,680	51,575
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
32,339	23,210	71.8	9,129
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
32,374	22,673	70.0	9,701
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
10,627	4,495	42.3	6,132
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	211
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	116
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	211
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	165
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	158
# -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)	82
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	95
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 200809)	20
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 <u>unduplicated</u> 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
17,328	1,905	7

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.	5,079
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	2,743

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.

ADE changed the data collection system for this field beginning in 2008-2009.

* 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 currently 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	78	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	62	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	70	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	66	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	44	
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	67	7,022
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	80	3,335
PD provided to principals	64	547
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	61	425
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	50	932
PD provided to community based organization personnel	17	11,854
Total	82	24,115

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ADE changed the data collection system for this field beginning in 2008-2009.

1.6.6.2 "Other" types of Professional Development Activities include these training subjects:

Communication with ELL Parents, OCR Plan to Serve all ELL Students, ELL Registration 8 ELL methodologies (i.e. minimal pairs etc.) Training for specific ELL based purchased programs Grammar SIOP Round IIA Components of Reading Instruction/Intervention TESOL and OELAS Grammar Instruction Methodologies ADEPT TRAINING Writing ILLPs On-going Coaching in implementing instructional strategies and student engagement. Analysis of assessment data to monitor ELL student learning and to adjust teaching strategies in response to such data. ILLP training SBRR Differentiated Instruction Procedures and documentation of specific AZELLA testing strategies and procedures.

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 <u>intended school year</u>. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

<u>Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:</u>

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
07/01/08	09/15/08	76
Comments:		

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

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

limited to 8,000 characters.

The State's collection system, the Student Accountability Information System (SAIS), collects student level data throughout the school year from LEAs that upload data via their selected student management system. LEAs have until June 30th, which is the end of the fiscal year, to submit and complete their student level data reporting responsibilities.

Once the ADE has received student level data from the LEAs, it usually takes approximately 30 to 45 calendar days for the ADE to validate all of the data statewide. By shortening this data validation turnaround time, the ADE would then be able to distribute these Title III funds more expediently.

Use of SAIS improves the accuracy and timeliness of student counts required for state and federal funding and reporting.

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 -No schools in Arizona are identified as persistently dangerous.	

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	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	59.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	72.7
Hispanic	66.5
White, non-Hispanic	82.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	63.7
Limited English proficient	48.4
Economically disadvantaged	66.2
Migratory students	71.2
Male	70.7
Female	79.2
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 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	6.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	11.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4.7
Black, non-Hispanic	7.5
Hispanic	8.0
White, non-Hispanic	5.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7.5
Limited English proficient	10.1
Economically disadvantaged	7.8
Migratory students	6.8
Male	7.6
Female	6.2
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	191	191
LEAs with subgrants	24	24
Total	215	215
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)	162	77
K	1,735	630
1	1,468	670
2	1,484	583
3	1,445	652
4	1,280	574
5	1,160	550
6	1,228	528
7	1,150	567
8	1,166	519
9	898	1,201
10	805	1,070
11	784	932
12	946	1,065
Ungraded	N<10	N<10
Total	15,715	9,621
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	3,939	2,201
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	11,063	6,864
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	287	228
Hotels/Motels	426	328
Total	15,715	9,621
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)	41
K	321
1	409
2	354
3	378
4	315
5	302
6	295
7	261
8	251
9	825
10	649
11	699
12	764
Ungraded	
Total	5,864
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	363
Migratory children/youth	33
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	880
Limited English proficient students	838
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	13
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	13
Early childhood programs	4
Assistance with participation in school programs	13
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	11
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	7
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	11
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	7
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	6
Clothing to meet a school requirement	14
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	4
School Selection	1
Transportation	6
School records	1
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

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	374	224
4	320	193
5	307	178
6	309	163
7	308	159
8	301	156
High School	678	358
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	372	228
4	318	184
5	307	164
6	309	164
7	307	175
8	300	124
High School	674	337
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)	827
K	558
1	525
2	559
3	590
4	522
5	548
6	623
7	591
8	680
9	559
10	630
11	627
12	790
Ungraded	48
Out-of-school	45
Total	8,722
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.

The reason for the 12% decrease from FY2008 to 2009 can be explained by several factors. First, agriculture continues its decline in Arizona and paving farmland for urban development is more common. Increased automation also reduces the need for workers. As a result, agricultural work in Arizona is reduced. Second, some migrant workers may have been affected by the increased enforcement of immigration rules by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and the adoption of employer sanctions by Arizona.Some of these workers may have: (1) stopped migrating or (2) left the State, with or without their families. Without migration, migrant students lose their eligibility for migrant services. LEAs have reported that due to the reasons listed above it is becoming increasingly difficult to identify families who are migrant.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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)	82
K	119
1	113
2	149
3	117
4	119
5	120
6	150
7	160
8	78
9	61
10	49
11	66
12	49
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	1,436
Comments:	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Due to budget constraints, many LEAs did not run the Title I-A summer programs that had served MEP students in the past. The State MEP office campaigned for MEP funded LEAs to apply for summer school monies to ensure that all MEP students had an opportunity to participate in summer school programs. As a result, various LEAs with migrant populations ran MEP-funded summer programs and the number of MEP funded summer schools grew more than 42%.

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)? <u>If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.</u>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State used COEStar for this reporting year and the last reporting year.

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.

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

What data were collected?
The following data are collected relevant to the child count:

      (1) The COE
      (2) School or program enrollment including the school term, school year, enrollment and withdrawal date from the program
      (3) LEP assessment, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination data
      (4) Instructional and Supportive Services program data including type of program and funding source.

How was the child count data collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data?
Clerks/liaisons at each school site conduct a home visit with each migrant family who may be eligible for the Migrant Education Program. An interview is conducted, eligibility is determined, and the migrant clerk collects all information needed to report in COEStar. Information is collected on the student's classes of attendance, start date, end date, and days of attendance. The student must be present in order for that information to be entered into COEStar. The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by having the Statewide Services personnel provide the training needed in order for the clerks to input the information correctly. This training includes what needs to be entered, when it has to be entered and provides technical assistance for them to enter into COEStar. Statewide Services is also responsible for conducting Data Verification with each LEA on a yearly basis. During the Data Verification, Statewide Services randomly selects students file to review. This review consists of checking the NCOE and the Arizona Attachment data against what is in the COEStar system as well as reviewing supporting documentation in the student file for all supplemental codes that are associated with the respective students. All Data Verifications are sent to the State MEP office for review and follow up, if necessary. The State MEP also conducts a Data Verification associated with the Cycle 4-On Site Monitoring.

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?
COEStar is an integrated component of our data collection system and data is collected during the entire year.

Are there differences in how the State's Category 2 count was collected and maintained?
The difference is in COEStar coding. Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are enrolled in a specific summer school line in COEStar and receive a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, students receive a unique "I" code enrollment type which corresponds with Intersession

</div>

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.

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:10px;">

COEStar is our primary filing system for student information, from the COE to the collection of services. COEStar provides a set of reports in its Performance Reporter software to provide the child count and additional reports for the Comprehensive State Performance Report.

Student data is collected locally by the LEAs participating in the Migrant Education Program and entered into COEStar by the districts directly, if they have the capacity to do so, or by the staff from our data center at Statewide Services, if districts are unable to enter data directly. At the beginning of each school year, Migrant Clerks are responsible for checking with each school's registrar to determine if enrollment is the same. Regardless of enrollment status, it is the Clerk's responsibility to attempt to contact each Migrant family in the district. This is done by either telephone or home visit. Once contact has been made, the clerk re-interviews the parents/guardians to determine if there has been any change in eligibility. Updates to student records are made by the LEA staff upon receipt of the information, which is validated, from parents, students or school records. COEStar conducts data checks to ensure integrity of the data on the system. The system produces exception reports, which are subject to review by our Statewide Services office. The staff review may generate changes or updates to the information.

The State ensures that all information is reported accurately by providing training to the Migrant Student Information Center personnel in order for the clerk to input the information. This training includes what data needs to be entered and when, along with technical assistance for them to enter into COEStar.

</div>

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.

Category 2 MEP students registered for a Migrant Summer Program are shown as enrolled on a specific summer school line in COEStar with a unique "S" enrollment type code which corresponds with summer school. Likewise, they receive a unique "I" code enrollment type which corresponds with Intersession.

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.

Since COEStar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEStar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source.

The calculation of eligibility is relatively simple because the COEStar system contains a copy of the actual COE. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; and the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if the child can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEStar data searches and synchronization effectively eliminate this possibility). By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulation, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted. To maintain an audit track, COEs cannot be physically deleted after they are added to COEStar, but COEs determined to be ineligible may be disqualified.

TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, Residency dates, Enrollment dates, Withdrawal dates, Departure dates, LEP, Needs Assessment and Graduation/Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate the child left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began.

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

COEStar Performance Reporter provides unique counts of children eligible to be counted in each category at the state, region, county and LEA levels based on unique identifying numbers. At the state level, eligible children are counted only once in each eligible category.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable.

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.

Migrant Recruiters and Liaisons at the LEAs receive information directly from parents or guardians regarding eligibility for MEP services. Questionable data is reviewed and parents or guardians are asked to produce information to validate eligibility data. For example, the Liaison or Recruiter may ask for proof of qualifying employment, proof of a qualifying move and school records. Recruiters and Liaisons may query school records directly to verify information.

Eligibility verification is done at the LEA level. Districts are required by the State to make annual contact with families and verify eligibility information. Residency is verified during these annual contact meetings. The State provides Identification and Recruitment trainings for both Migrant Recruiters and Migrant Clerks several times during the year. The State Recruitment Specialist does Migrant Program Orientation and Training for migrant staff as soon as a district hires their migrant personnel. Recruiter/Liaisons receive complete training on the rules, regulations, and guidelines for eligibility of Migrant students. Recruiters also receive basic training on COEStar and data entry requirements. Migrant clerks receive complete COEStar data input training and hands on training on the processing of Certificates of Eligibility. Migrant clerks also receive training on Migrant program regulations to ensure they are aware of the eligibility requirements of the program. This type of training ensures Migrant Recruiters/Liaisons and Clerks are cross trained so they are aware of the validity of the information they input and recruiters/liaisons are oriented in data input so they are able to enter COEStar to retrieve information on former and current Migrant students. All LEA MEP staff members are provided with the State of Arizona's Identification and Recruitment manual, copies of OME guidance, and copies of federal regulations.

If an eligibility question does arise that a Migrant clerk is not able to resolve themselves, the State has procedures in place to resolve eligibility questions. First, LEA staff contact the State Identification and Recruitment specialist with questions regarding eligibility. If the question is not answered, the ID&R Specialist will contact the Migrant State Department of Education (ADE) Education Program Specialist for assistance. If the eligibility question is not resolved by the ADE Education Specialist, the Specialist will consult with the State Migrant Program Director for guidance. If the eligibility question is not resolved by the State Director, the State Director will contact the Office of Migrant Education (OME) in Washington, DC for assistance.

COEStar mimics paper COE collection methods in that each COE can be marked as verified and locked. Invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

Our Migrant Student Information Data Center staff will conduct Data Verification. The data centers produce and send a list of eligible students to each LEA on a monthly basis with a request to confirm the accuracy of the district counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff. In addition, Data Centers will conduct a yearly COE review. One year it will be on-site and the next year will be a paper review. Through this process they are also checking for eligibility, QAD, qualifying activity, dates and locations.

Our data is also verified and validated at the State level. An ADE Education Specialist reviews all data from the Statewide Services office prior to submission into the CSPR. The Specialist reviews each individual student and checks against students with similar information to determine if there are duplicates that have not been identified in any of the other checks in place. Once this process has been completed, all possible duplicates are sent back to Statewide Services for staff to review. Any errors are corrected, the report is run again, and the process is repeated until the State and Statewide Services have agreed that all data is in fact unduplicated.

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 SEA conducted a prospective re-interview process for the students included in this reporting period.

In keeping with the MEP Federal Regulations 200.89 (b)(2)(ii), the ADE MEP used the recommended sample size of 50 families for the prospective re-interview process. TROMIK created the random list of students using a 2 step process which included the entire database of students who were eligible during the reporting period. TROMIK created a random ID by extracting 4 digits out of their current SAIS/COEStar number. This new four number ID was then multiplied by 77 and then the students were reordered according to their new ID numbers. The second step used the RND() function in Access to assign a random decimal value and reordered. This step was completed twice to increase the random order of the students.

The first 100 students on the list were sent to the SEA for use as the initial list. The SEA requested twice the recommended sample size to compensate for families who might not be located.

The SEA selected associates, not involved with determining original eligibility, to conduct the re-interviews. At the initial meeting of the

associates, the names of the randomly selected students were placed into a container. The associates' names were also placed in a container. The associate names were drawn to determine the order in which the associates would draw the student names. Each associate selected a name in rotation until each associate had pulled 10 names. The associates were provided a re-interview document in English and Spanish to be ensure continuity in the interview process. The associates conducted face to face interviews. After each interview was conducted, the associate was responsible for determining whether or not the initial eligibility determination was correct.

Any students found to have a determination of "ineligible" or "not able to determine eligibility" entered into an appeals process. LEAs were notified of the students in this category and were requested to provide additional evidence.

All 50 students selected for the prospective re-interview were found to have been correctly determined to be eligible originally.

The full SEA written procedures for this process are available upon request.

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.

COEStar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data. Since all COEStar data originates with the collection of the COE, COEStar is included in the overall Quality control process. Additional data, like enrollment and services data, is thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

 COEStar does not merge data.

Staff at State Wide Services reviews COE data inputted at local terminals to ensure accuracy of the COE. Data verifications are done by sampling LEA COE's. The amount sampled correlated to the number of students in each program. This year, the Arizona Department of Education implemented a process for further testing and verification of the COEStar data. This process is designed to validate the information in COEStar by district, school, and student name to identify any errors that COEStar may not have picked up.

Throughout the year, Statewide Services staff and staff from the Arizona Department of Education conduct staff development sessions where Recruiters, Liaisons and clerks are trained in the requirements of the Migrant Program including eligibility data input and validation. The two data centers in Yuma, Arizona and Littleton, Arizona synchronize three times a week to ensure accuracy of the student data. Staff review error reports produced by COEStar, validate the data and generate necessary data inputs to correct these errors. The Data Centers produce and send to each LEA a list of eligible students on a monthly basis with a request that the districts confirm the accuracy of their counts. Errors are rectified in conjunction with LEA staff.

 A similar process is also conducted by the ADE Education Specialists during the on-site monitoring of LEA MEPs. The Specialist reviews a random set of COEs and student files in the same process of Statewide Services.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State MEP Office requests student information from the Data Centers in the form of a table with information including student name, ID number, district, and school information. Identical matches and near matches are identified. Near matches are investigated by hand and a determination made as to whether they are the same child. Any near matches that are found to be duplicates are sent back to the data center for corrections to be made prior to the submission of the child count report. This process continues until all students have been individually looked at and no further changes are requested. When corrections have been made and a new count generated this information is then compared to previous year's numbers. Once all verification has been done, a final count is submitted to the Migrant Director for review.

COEStar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and dependable. All numbers are double and triple checked against other sources to insure accuracy. In addition, reports are run throughout the year to monitor child counts as part of the quality control process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State will improve technical assistance and training to ID&R specialists and clerks to ensure familiarity with Title I Part C student eligibility laws, regulations, policies and procedures.

The state will implement re-interview requirements of the federal law when new requirements become effective.

At onsite visits to the LEAs, SEA Migrant Staff will review a random sample of COEs to verify the eligibility determination and accurate documentation. The State will explore the possibilities of automating some of the manual data verification processes at the State level to become more efficient and further minimize the possibility of human error.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA is not concerned about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts