

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

CALIFORNIA



**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).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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

Address:
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Justin Lane

Telephone: 916-319-0495

Fax: 916-319-0971

e-mail: jlane@cde.ca.gov

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

Friday, March 19, 2010, 3:41:57 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**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 not made or is not 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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

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 CDE is continuing to develop the California Modified Assessments (CMA). This standards-based assessment is administered to pupils with an IEP who meet the SBE approved participation criteria. In November 2006, a pilot test was conducted for the CMA in grades four, five, and six to provide information about the population of pupils to be tested. Blueprints for the CMA for grades three through five in ELA and mathematics were adopted by the SBE in 2007. The CMA was administered for the first time in 2008 to eligible pupils in grades three through five. A CMA writing test was developed and was administered to eligible pupils in grades four and seven in 2009. Additionally, assessments for grades six through eight in ELA, grades six and seven in mathematics were administered for the first time in 2009. Standard settings for all the assessments administered in 2009 have been completed and the recommended cut scores adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE). Currently, the CDE is in the production phase of the CMA assessments in Algebra I and Grade 9 ELA, to be administered in Spring 2010. Blueprints are being developed for CMA Geometry and Grade 10-11 ELA to be administered in Spring 2011.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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 with ESEA. 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 States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	3,333,825		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	28,873		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	407,021		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	254,044		>97%
Hispanic	1,665,102		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	946,431		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	353,767	337,118	95.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	778,673		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	1,878,993		>97%
Migratory students	63,519		>97%
Male	1,710,190		>97%
Female	1,622,452		>97%
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. 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	204,081	60.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	28,848	8.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	74,046	21.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	31,266	9.2
Total	338,241	
Comments: The totals in the Participation of Students with Disabilities include students whose Full Academic Year Status is unknown. They are not included in the Participation of all Students table.		

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	3,333,958		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	28,875		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	407,028		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	254,051		>97%
Hispanic	1,665,165		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	946,465		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	353,791	339,642	96.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	778,692		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	1,879,071		>97%
Migratory students	63,518		>97%
Male	1,710,245		>97%
Female	1,622,512		>97%
Comments: The totals in the Participation of Students with Disabilities include students whose Full Academic Year Status is unknown. They are not included in the Participation of all Students table.			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	189,549	55.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	25,219	7.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	94,668	27.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	31,350	9.2
Total	340,786	
Comments: The totals in the Participation of Students with Disabilities include students whose Full Academic Year Status is unknown. They are not included in the Participation of all Students table.		

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	1,447,135		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	12,568	12,061	96.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	177,628		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	112,607	107,748	95.7
Hispanic	709,148		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	422,187		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	148,714	140,819	94.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	281,406		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	781,344		>97%
Migratory students	27,495		>97%
Male	742,282		>97%
Female	704,562		>97%
Comments: While California narrowly missed the 95% target for students with disabilities participating in science assessments, efforts are being made to meet and surpass the 95% target in future years.			

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	87,951	62.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	10,364	7.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	29,663	21.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	12,841	9.1
Total	140,819	
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	465,913	296,246	63.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,874	2,155	55.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,818	47,900	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	33,369	16,288	48.8
Hispanic	240,049	131,155	54.6
White, non-Hispanic	125,085	94,752	75.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	47,920	20,523	42.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	157,282	78,827	50.1
Economically disadvantaged students	276,784	149,630	54.1
Migratory students	9,113	4,321	47.4
Male	238,891	153,298	64.2
Female	226,945	142,911	63.0
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.

1.3.2.1 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	465,880	203,367	43.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,874	1,433	37.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,804	36,462	63.1
Black, non-Hispanic	33,412	11,296	33.8
Hispanic	240,051	71,905	30.0
White, non-Hispanic	125,023	79,035	63.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	47,477	14,632	30.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	157,186	33,596	21.4
Economically disadvantaged students	276,764	82,653	29.9
Migratory students	9,116	1,735	19.0
Male	238,741	98,488	41.2
Female	227,060	104,848	46.2
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -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
Grade 3			
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: No statewide test in science administered in grade 3 in California.			

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	460,835	297,627	64.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,930	2,248	57.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,004	46,158	83.9
Black, non-Hispanic	34,215	17,153	50.1
Hispanic	235,536	131,108	55.7
White, non-Hispanic	127,106	97,371	76.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,755	21,376	42.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	135,275	63,639	47.0
Economically disadvantaged students	272,229	149,445	54.9
Migratory students	9,108	4,394	48.2
Male	236,376	151,507	64.1
Female	224,423	146,104	65.1
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.2 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	460,713	276,663	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,932	2,099	53.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	54,983	43,234	78.6
Black, non-Hispanic	34,207	16,809	49.1
Hispanic	235,448	112,893	48.0
White, non-Hispanic	127,093	97,950	77.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,352	19,508	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	135,143	45,116	33.4
Economically disadvantaged students	272,135	128,677	47.3
Migratory students	9,099	3,164	34.8
Male	236,223	133,510	56.5
Female	224,455	143,136	63.8
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: No statewide test in science administered in grade 4 in California.			

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	464,431	262,149	56.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,048	1,854	45.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,619	43,275	77.8
Black, non-Hispanic	35,045	14,514	41.4
Hispanic	236,094	110,676	46.9
White, non-Hispanic	129,284	89,140	69.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	52,068	18,688	35.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	115,466	39,001	33.8
Economically disadvantaged students	271,236	125,256	46.2
Migratory students	9,153	3,663	40.0
Male	238,054	133,140	55.9
Female	226,333	128,989	57.0

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	464,397	247,261	53.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,045	1,836	45.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,607	39,806	71.6
Black, non-Hispanic	35,022	14,637	41.8
Hispanic	236,055	95,285	40.4
White, non-Hispanic	129,314	92,890	71.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	51,766	17,914	34.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	115,360	24,037	20.8
Economically disadvantaged students	271,158	107,432	39.6
Migratory students	9,154	2,651	29.0
Male	237,981	116,991	49.2
Female	226,370	130,251	57.5

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	463,752	227,178	49.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,036	1,745	43.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	55,546	37,886	68.2
Black, non-Hispanic	34,968	12,203	34.9
Hispanic	235,765	82,157	34.8
White, non-Hispanic	129,097	90,548	70.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	51,848	18,941	36.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	115,261	21,728	18.8
Economically disadvantaged students	270,770	93,723	34.6
Migratory students	9,143	2,058	22.5
Male	237,645	120,368	50.6
Female	226,063	106,794	47.2

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

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	465,285	222,940	47.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,010	1,610	40.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,331	41,118	71.7
Black, non-Hispanic	35,033	10,893	31.1
Hispanic	234,285	84,272	36.0
White, non-Hispanic	130,410	82,756	63.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,393	13,592	27.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102,683	20,478	19.9
Economically disadvantaged students	267,427	95,699	35.8
Migratory students	9,307	2,849	30.6
Male	238,354	115,579	48.5
Female	226,862	107,338	47.3

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

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	465,536	240,983	51.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,010	1,807	45.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	57,368	40,879	71.3
Black, non-Hispanic	35,056	13,506	38.5
Hispanic	234,327	90,785	38.7
White, non-Hispanic	130,553	91,419	70.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	50,098	13,752	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102,588	16,847	16.4
Economically disadvantaged students	267,533	101,737	38.0
Migratory students	9,292	2,711	29.2
Male	238,440	114,571	48.0
Female	227,027	126,380	55.7

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

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

	# 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
Grade 6			
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: No statewide test in science administered in grade 6 in California.			

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	473,665	212,956	45.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,147	1,486	35.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	58,441	41,482	71.0
Black, non-Hispanic	35,654	9,784	27.4
Hispanic	235,586	78,020	33.1
White, non-Hispanic	135,747	80,180	59.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	49,114	10,856	22.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	95,615	16,923	17.7
Economically disadvantaged students	264,530	87,537	33.1
Migratory students	9,157	2,739	29.9
Male	242,634	110,326	45.5
Female	230,941	102,607	44.4

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	473,872	254,446	53.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,148	1,991	48.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	58,456	43,310	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	35,702	14,629	41.0
Hispanic	235,610	94,191	40.0
White, non-Hispanic	135,866	97,783	72.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	49,004	13,829	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	95,566	14,186	14.8
Economically disadvantaged students	264,593	104,638	39.6
Migratory students	9,154	2,689	29.4
Male	242,737	120,192	49.5
Female	231,048	134,219	58.1

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

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

	# 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
Grade 7			
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: No statewide test in science administered in grade 7 in California.			

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	476,433	193,658	40.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,178	1,328	31.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	58,855	39,608	67.3
Black, non-Hispanic	36,606	8,899	24.3
Hispanic	233,661	68,020	29.1
White, non-Hispanic	139,139	74,095	53.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	47,164	7,528	16.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	83,552	13,488	16.1
Economically disadvantaged students	260,534	76,588	29.4
Migratory students	8,957	2,548	28.4
Male	243,420	96,759	39.8
Female	232,939	96,874	41.6

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	481,041	229,196	47.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,246	1,771	41.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	59,145	40,259	68.1
Black, non-Hispanic	37,141	12,694	34.2
Hispanic	235,921	79,633	33.8
White, non-Hispanic	140,518	92,586	65.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	48,295	11,292	23.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	84,528	8,114	9.6
Economically disadvantaged students	263,355	87,984	33.4
Migratory students	9,033	2,285	25.3
Male	246,241	106,385	43.2
Female	234,718	122,777	52.3

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	479,025	262,423	54.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,231	2,059	48.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	59,029	44,895	76.1
Black, non-Hispanic	36,819	14,084	38.2
Hispanic	234,979	98,353	41.9
White, non-Hispanic	139,937	100,622	71.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	47,913	12,886	26.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	84,208	16,367	19.4
Economically disadvantaged students	262,140	108,935	41.6
Migratory students	9,007	3,133	34.8
Male	245,001	138,313	56.4
Female	233,949	124,081	53.0

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

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	479,796	257,317	53.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,970	1,837	46.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	61,265	47,532	77.6
Black, non-Hispanic	37,798	12,677	33.5
Hispanic	226,917	92,271	40.7
White, non-Hispanic	145,990	100,887	69.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	44,302	11,275	25.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	78,306	17,047	21.8
Economically disadvantaged students	239,148	98,244	41.1
Migratory students	8,042	3,016	37.5
Male	245,217	134,855	55.0
Female	234,508	122,439	52.2

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	482,371	250,937	52.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,998	1,964	49.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	61,475	41,706	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	37,993	14,400	37.9
Hispanic	228,059	86,414	37.9
White, non-Hispanic	146,962	104,188	70.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	47,262	11,997	25.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	79,366	8,740	11.0
Economically disadvantaged students	240,454	88,886	37.0
Migratory students	8,105	2,185	27.0
Male	247,330	117,510	47.5
Female	234,977	133,392	56.8

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	469,725	207,694	44.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,794	1,556	41.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	60,957	39,064	64.1
Black, non-Hispanic	35,961	9,716	27.0
Hispanic	221,395	66,661	30.1
White, non-Hispanic	143,688	88,890	61.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	41,058	7,112	17.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	74,304	7,521	10.1
Economically disadvantaged students	229,036	68,811	30.0
Migratory students	8,855	2,263	25.6
Male	240,059	109,347	45.6
Female	229,551	98,325	42.8

Comments: In prior year submissions of this document, per California's Accountability Workbook, the Limited English proficient (LEP) subgroup has included some students who have been reclassified or redesignated as fluent English-proficient (R-FEP) but who have not demonstrated academic proficiency on the English-language arts (ELA) California Standards Test (CST). This year, California is reporting in the LEP subgroup only those students who are classified as English Learners (EL).

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	9,857	4,936	50.1
Districts	1,024	369	36.0
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 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	6,013	2,652	44.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	4,542	1,836	40.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	1,471	816	55.5
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 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
936	298	31.8
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 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 ¹ Year 1, School Improvement ¹ Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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	223
Extension of the school year or school day	31
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	38
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	66
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	105
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	118
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)	61
Reopening the school as a public charter school	2
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	113
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	807
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.

1.4.5 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's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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.

California has taken a triage approach to district level intervention in local educational agencies (LEAs) subject to intervention under Title I, Part A. In this context, LEAs include districts and county offices of education. Beginning in 2003, the state legislature appropriated a portion of the Title I, Part A set-aside for LEAs at-risk of School Improvement, in School Improvement, or in School Improvement Corrective Action to use to improve student achievement.

As documented elsewhere in the California State Performance Report, LEAs must make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), which consists of four indicators: participation rate; percent proficiency in mathematics and English language arts; the LEA's aggregated academic performance index of growth; and graduation rates. AYP is aggregated at the LEA level and disaggregated by numerically significant student groups. Typically, California LEAs advance in school improvement status based upon the performance of English learners and students with disabilities.

LEAs at risk of School Improvement: California Education Code (EC) Section 52055.57(a) requires the State Educational Agency (SEA) to identify and notice LEAs that are at risk of being identified for school improvement within two years, providing them with research-based criteria to conduct a voluntary self assessment. Available state assessment tools include: 1) the grade-span appropriate Academic Program Survey, which measures school-level implementation of nine essential program components for instructional success; 2) the District Assistance Survey, designed to assess district support for school level implementation of the nine essential program components; 3) the English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment district survey to assess programs for English learners; and 4) the Inventory of Services and Support for Students with Disabilities, a district survey to assess programs for students with disabilities. These assessments are available at the California Department of Education State Program Assessment Tools Web page at: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ti/stateassesspi.asp>. LEAs are provided with technical assistance on the use of these tools through webinars and webcasts, and through the Regional System of District and School Support (RSDSS), which is one component of the Statewide System of School Support.

LEAs in School Improvement Year 1: When an LEA is identified for School Improvement, they must notify parents, conduct comprehensive self assessments using the tools identified above, and write an addendum to their LEA plan identifying key action steps for improvement. If fiscal resources are available, the district must contract with an external entity to verify the results of the self assessment and to support and monitor the implementation of the LEA Plan Addendum. LEAs are provided with technical assistance in the development and implementation of LEA Plans through CDE webinars and webcasts, ongoing telephone support with CDE staff, and RSDSS support. In the past, additional technical assistance has been provided through the annual On the Right Track Symposium and Title I Achievement Schools Conference. Districts are directed to reserve no less than 10% of their Title I, Part A allocation for high quality professional development, which is an ongoing requirement in any year that the LEA remains in School Improvement.

LEAs in School Improvement Year 2: In Year 2, LEAs continue to receive technical assistance via the Statewide System of School Support.

LEAs in School Improvement Year 3: In Year 3, LEAs are identified for corrective action. They are given the opportunity to appeal their scores and corrective action assignment.

As of November 2008, 145 LEAs have advanced to School Improvement Year 3 and have been assigned Corrective Action 6 to, "institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including participation in professional development for relevant staff, with special attention to the needs of high priority students." High priority students have been defined in California as English learners, students with disabilities, and students not meeting grade-level standards.

EC Section 512055.57(c) provides for the development of objective criteria to determine the pervasiveness and severity of LEA achievement problems. Based upon the objective criteria, an index score is generated for each LEA. LEAs are then ranked and assigned differentiated technical assistance requirements. In 2007, 44 LEAs with the most severe performance problems were required to work with district assistance and intervention teams (DAIT), although they were not funded to do so until 2008.

In 2006, the SEA developed standards and criteria for DAIT Providers, conducted a procurement for DAIT Providers, and trained all approved DAIT providers to carry out their responsibilities, which include the following:

Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment

Make recommendations for improvement (based on the results of the needs assessment)

Assist the LEA in revising its LEA Plans to document steps to implement the assigned corrective action

Support the LEA in implementing the LEA Plan

Monitor LEA implementation of the LEA Plan

LEAs must adopt DAIT recommendations unless exempted by the State Board of Education (SBE), and inform all parents of the assigned corrective action.

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	147
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	2
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	6	2
Schools	27	5
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	11/5/09
---	---------

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		1,141,253
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		433,230
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		38.0
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		1,140,109
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		386,016
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		33.9
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	
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	0
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	
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.
Comments: California did not implement ESEA Section 1003(g) in 2008-09, to which the above improvement strategies apply, and the State does not collect information on other improvement strategies that Title I schools may be implementing.						

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.

Not applicable. See comments for 1.4.8.3.

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

Not applicable. California did not implement Section 1003(g) in 2008-09.
--

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.

Title I schools supported by State-funded programs, including but not limited to the High Priority Schools Grant Program and the Quality Education Investment Act, are implementing the nine Essential Program Components endorsed by the State Board of Education (SBE):

- 1) Instructional Program: Standards-aligned English-language arts and mathematics textbooks and SBE adopted Pre-Algebra and Algebra I textbooks
- 2) Student access to high school standards-aligned core courses (master schedule and pacing schedule)
- 3) Principals' Instructional Leadership Training
- 4) Teachers' Professional Development Opportunities
- 5) Student Achievement Monitoring System
- 6) Ongoing instructional assistance and support
- 7) Teacher/Department and subject matter collaboration
- 8) Intervention programs for students performing below grade level standards
- 9) Fiscal support

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	1,291,627
Applied to transfer	21,612
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	79,592

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	\$ 17,266,767

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	0

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	1,144,596
Applied for supplemental educational services	146,723
Received supplemental educational services	108,402
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 120,892,841
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	664,627	623,926	93.9	40,701	6.1
All elementary classes	157,464	153,773	97.7	3,691	2.3
All secondary classes	507,163	470,153	92.7	37,010	7.3
Data Source= October 2008 California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) -Professional Assignment Information Form (PAIF) Numbers indicate all secondary classes including alternative education, special education, charters, K-12 programs, and middle/junior highs.					

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.

California counts self-contained elementary classes as one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher 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 not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	10.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	90.0
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)	0.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	23.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	77.0
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	109,912	106,908	97.3
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	47,189	46,522	98.6
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	311,836	284,035	91.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	192,144	183,102	95.3

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	35.0	15.0
Poverty metric used	Federal Free or Reduced Lunch Program was used. The data is based on school level elementary data. For this section of poverty quartiles, Charter schools are included. For reporting poverty in this section, only high and low poverty were required.	
Secondary schools	33.0	17.0
Poverty metric used	Federal Free or Reduced Lunch Program was used. The data is based on school level secondary data. For this section of poverty quartiles, Charter schools are included. For reporting poverty in this section, only high and low poverty were required.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.ncele.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	Cantonese, German, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Cantonese, German, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Cantonese, Spanish, Vietnamese
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Cantonese, Filipino, Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Armenian, Cantonese, Khmer, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian, Vietnamese
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In California, Dual Language programs are also known as Two-Way Immersion. We have entered the same information in both cells.

Other language instruction educational programs include: A Dual Immersion model in Spanish and/or students' native language (Mandarin, Mixteco) and English where students receive language instruction, and a newcomer program for grades 3-8 where Spanish is initially used and English is increased throughout the year. An English Language Mainstream Program is also being used for students who demonstrate English proficiency but have not met all criteria for reclassification. Language Enrichment Programs are also used. Students also receive English Learner (EL) Intensive Intervention English Language Development (ELD) instruction.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State 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	1,512,122
Comments:	

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

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of 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.	1,460,408
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	1,282,871
Vietnamese	35,587
Chinese	34,878
Tagalog	22,538
Hmong	17,606

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	
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Total	
Comments: We will have this data when CALPADS is launched for 2009-10.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	
Comments: We will have this data when CALPADS is launched for 2009-10.	

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	
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	
Total	
Comments: We will have this data when CALPADS is launched for 2009-10.	
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.	

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	729,464	48.0	651,163	51.60
ELP attainment	257,548	17.0	206,398	30.60

Comments: The number in the cohort for AMAO 1 is 1,261,944. If the number of Making progress of 729,464 is divided by the cohort for AMAO 1, the resulting percentage is 57.8%. The number in the cohort for AMAO 2 is 674,503. If the number of ELP attainment of 257,548 is divided by the cohort for AMAO 2, the resulting percentage is 38.2%.

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: California offers a Standards-based test in Spanish (STS)in Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics in grades two through eleven. These assessments are not used in AYP determinations. The STS is not currently offered in science.

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: California offers a Standards-based test in Spanish (STS)in Mathematics in grades two through eleven.

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: California offers a Standards-based test in Spanish (STS) in Reading-Language Arts in grades two through eleven. These assessments are not used in AYP determinations.

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: California does not offer a native language assessment in science.

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 unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP 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
110,210	86,174	196,384
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
195,402	121,490	62.2	73,912
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
195,451	122,027	62.4	73,424
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
60,156	35,726	59.4	24,430
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	634
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	205
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	523
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	513
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	238
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	65
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	130
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	74
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	138
Comments: The number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years includes the newly identified subgrantees not meeting AMAOs for four consecutive years(9) and subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for more than four consecutive years (129). Source: February 2010 Title III Accountability Report update	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The State met both AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 targets: Statewide AMAO 1 target = 51.6%, state results = 57.8% Statewide AMAO 2 target = 30.6%, state results = 38.2%	
The State did not meet AMAO 3 of LEP subgroup percent proficient rates for English-language Arts and Mathematics.	

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 unduplicated 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
115,267		220

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.

The number of immigrant students enrolled does not include students born to U.S. citizens abroad. The California Department of Education has corrected its definition of immigrant children and youth to include these students, effective fiscal year 2009-10.

For fiscal year 2008-09, the California Department of Education did not gather data on the number of immigrant students who (1) participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), and (2) did not receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under sections 3114(a) and 3115(a). This data will be collected starting in fiscal year 2009-10 via the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS).

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined 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) ù The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course ù (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.	202,163
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	15,548

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.

Some local educational agencies (LEAs) reported that they will have no need for additional authorized (certified/licensed) teachers in the next five years for the following reasons. The most common reason was declining enrollment of English learner (EL) students. Some LEAs have reported a declining enrollment of up to 30%. Based on this declining enrollment pattern, LEAs are indicating that they will not need any additional teachers for the next five years. The budget crisis in California has also drastically affected the funding level of LEAs, and a lot of them have to lay off teachers, including EL teachers. Classroom teachers are being reduced while class sizes are increasing.

All LEAs in California reported that all their teachers are authorized to teach EL students, and/or are in programs to complete their credentialing to instruct EL students. The teachers that are not authorized to teach EL students are not currently assigned any EL Students.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development 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	581	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	558	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	536	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	497	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	501	
Other (Explain in comment box)	170	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	560	99,896
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	548	82,534
PD provided to principals	552	6,840
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	508	5,270
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	447	11,082
PD provided to community based organization personnel	194	5,777
Total	588	211,399

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other professional development activities of subgrantees related to the teaching and learning of English learner (EL) Students were provided in the following areas:

- (1) Program Training: Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) strategies; Advanced Via Individual Determination (AVID) training; Guided Language Acquisition and Design (GLAD); Explicit Direct Instruction (EDI); Leadership Academy; Thinking Maps.
- (2) Culturally Responsive instruction: Academic Language Cultural Proficiency Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol; instructional approaches and relationship building to assist in the closing of the achievement gap.
- (3) Secondary Teachers: Professional development in differentiated instruction to make core classes such as Algebra/Geometry accessible to EL Students; Sheltered Instructional Protocol (SIOP); Response to Intervention (RTI) training.
- (4) Bilingual Programs: Professional development for Two-Way Immersion Programs; Bilingual Paraprofessional training; Spanish-to-English Bilingual.
- (5) Parents/Community: Workshop Training for EL parents and other community members about Title III programs and services for EL students; Community involvement opportunities for EL Students; EL Study groups, EL Parent Outreach.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/08	01/23/09	200
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.

To minimize the time elapsed between an LEA's receipt and disbursement of federal program funds, the California Department of Education (CDE) developed a Web-based system for subgrantees to report federal cash balances on a quarterly basis. The new Web-based system was piloted with the Title II, Improving Teacher Quality federal program in October 2009; CDE plans to expand this Web-based reporting to other federal programs. Additionally, the CDE has hired cash management analysts to review quarterly reported federal cash balances and to work with LEAs in meeting federal interest requirements. The CDE is also developing new fiscal monitoring processes that include cash management.

In addition, the CDE has developed a Web-based system for consortium applications, in order to expedite the gathering of apportionment information.

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: California has zero persistently dangerous schools.	

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	79.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	74.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.6
Black, non-Hispanic	63.7
Hispanic	73.2
White, non-Hispanic	87.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	60.2
Limited English proficient	73.0
Economically disadvantaged	73.6
Migratory students	77.2
Male	76.3
Female	83.0
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts 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	4.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.2
Black, non-Hispanic	9.0
Hispanic	6.0
White, non-Hispanic	3.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6.4
Limited English proficient	5.3
Economically disadvantaged	5.8
Migratory students	4.8
Male	5.6
Female	4.1
Comments: Source: Data Quest	

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	1,436	1,436
LEAs with subgrants	90	90
Total	1,526	1,526
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)	4,218	3,487
K	13,792	9,963
1	13,943	10,495
2	13,921	11,046
3	13,661	11,149
4	13,361	11,541
5	12,572	10,877
6	12,314	10,563
7	11,142	9,804
8	10,306	8,608
9	11,281	9,785
10	9,927	8,099
11	9,187	6,840
12	8,330	6,241
Ungraded	1,176	604
Total	159,131	129,102
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	18,541	14,726
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	121,811	97,294
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	8,264	5,919
Hotels/Motels	10,515	11,163
Total	159,131	129,102
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)	6,022
K	15,159
1	15,626
2	15,938
3	16,182
4	16,214
5	15,349
6	14,881
7	14,162
8	12,194
9	13,614
10	11,120
11	9,625
12	9,022
Ungraded	813
Total	185,921
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	4,329
Migratory children/youth	2,730
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	9,380
Limited English proficient students	41,212
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	77
Expedited evaluations	51
Staff professional development and awareness	87
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	87
Transportation	86
Early childhood programs	49
Assistance with participation in school programs	85
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	70
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	75
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	87
Coordination between schools and agencies	89
Counseling	61
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	68
Clothing to meet a school requirement	82
School supplies	90
Referral to other programs and services	86
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	70
Other (optional – in comment box below)	35
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

? Training due to staff mobility (4) ? Parental barriers (3) ? Confidentially laws ? Decreased funding (3) ? Required school uniforms ? Lack of coordination with other school districts ? Implementation accountability (2) ? Foster youth identification ? Class-size reduction

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	32
School Selection	35
Transportation	49
School records	29
Immunizations	24
Other medical records	16
Other Barriers – in comment box below	23

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

? Advocating at other school-level meetings (3) ? Holiday and anytime organization of donations and collections (5) ? Coats for Kids ? Shop with a Cop ? Food closet volunteers (3) ? Assistance to homeless teens for college assistance and enrollment ? JOBS Programs and Job Fairs

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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		

Comments: This information is not collected as an assessment; however, the program office does collect this data. Hopefully, for the 2009-10 school year, this data will be collected through CALPADS. # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test Grade: 3: 8373 4: 8274 5: 8157 6: 7488 7: 7108 8: 6292 High school: 15,323 # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient Grade: 3: 2582 4: 3407 5: 3209 6: 2750 7: 2356 8: 1889 High school: 6340

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
High School		

Comments: This information is not collected as an assessment; however, the program office does collect this data. Hopefully, for the 2009-10 school year, this data will be collected through CALPADS. # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test Grade: 3: 8863 4: 8903 5: 8365 6: 7910 7: 7372 8: 6794 High school: 13,892

Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient Grade:
 3: 4274
 4: 4543
 5: 3633
 6: 2598
 7: 2085
 8: 1765 High school: 4689

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-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 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)	20,853
K	11,408
1	10,158
2	12,322
3	12,073
4	11,699
5	11,362
6	11,034
7	11,379
8	11,415
9	10,769
10	11,265
11	10,738
12	13,732
Ungraded	416
Out-of-school	32,091
Total	202,714
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The number of students reported in Category 1 decreased 6% from last year.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,832
K	5,810
1	6,692
2	7,418
3	7,307
4	7,082
5	6,838
6	6,475
7	6,532
8	5,608
9	6,340
10	5,728
11	5,290
12	2,588
Ungraded	144
Out-of-school	6,178
Total	97,862
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.

The number of students reported in Category 2 decreased 5% from last year.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Migrant Education Regional Offices entered Certificate of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar (software program) by TROMIK. The Migrant Education Regions then used COEstar to transmit records electronically to the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) server at WestEd. The same systems were used to generate the Category 1 and 2 child counts for the last reporting period.

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.

a. Data Collected: The regional offices entered Certificates of Eligibility (COE) data via COEstar. COEstar assigns a regional "COEstar number to track records. The COEDATA table contains Certificate of Eligibility (COE) information; the I.D. tables contains student information such as school of enrollment, birth date, and grade level; the SH tables contains school history information such as date of enrollment, withdrawal date and the school year and the SUPPROGS table contains support services information. All data are collected from the local Migrant Regional Office. To differentiate between a summer/intersession service and a regular term service a summer service is coded with an "S" and an Intersession service is coded as "I".

b. Activities Conducted to Collect the Data: The data collection begins at the Regional level or in the case of directly funded districts at the school district level. Recruiters assigned to the Migrant Regional Offices are community based. District recruiters can be school based or they can perform community based identification and recruitment. All recruiters were trained to conduct interviews applying the revised eligibility criteria as described in the 34 CFR 200 that went into effect August 28, 2008. A state developed COE is used to record the migrant family's eligibility for the MEP. Community based recruiters search out eligible migrant families through a variety of means.

Community based recruiters use a paper COE or an electronic version using the Tablet PC. All COE data including signatures are captured on the electronic form. In the conventional method using the paper COE when the form has been completed by the recruiter, the reviewer assess the form for accuracy and completeness and signs the COE. The COE is submitted to the data entry section for input into the local database (COEstar). Before the COE information is permanently applied to the local database a final quality review is conducted; the data entry operator is also instructed to perform a search of the database to see if a qualifying COE already exists for the same qualifying move that is to be recorded.

The process for collecting COE data on the Tablet PC has been modified to take advantage of the benefits of the technology. Because the host system and the Tablet PC are synchronized almost daily the recruiter conducts the search for a potential duplicate in the field and thus reduces the possibility of creating a duplicate record. At the end of the day the mobile unit (Tablet PC) is connected to the district or regional network and the data is transferred to a QA machine for review before the COE is verified and applied to the database.

I&R supervisors generate monthly End of Eligibility (EOE) Reports that are used by recruiters to contact families whose eligibility is about to expire to see if they have had a new qualifying move. Student lists are also produced and distributed to school districts to determine if previously enrolled students are still present at the start of every regular term before a new enrollment is entered into COEstar. This is done as part of the State requirement for Regional Offices to conduct an Annual Verification of residence.

To collect Summer/Intersession service information the districts/regions utilize standard enrollment lists that are available through COEstar to record the types of services that provided to the students. The completed service roster/lists are submitted to the data entry staff for input. The data files containing all the data mentioned, can be submitted daily to the MSIN (statewide system) if needed.

c. When Were Data Collected: I&R is a year-round activity. Regional offices have been instructed by CDE to submit data via COEstar as existing records are updated or new COEs are created. During peak migration periods district/regional data transfers can occur daily.

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.

Migrant Education Regional Offices enter and transmit the student data files containing all added, updated, and deleted COE data using COEstar. Transmittal of the records is done electronically (via FTP or the Global Data Transfer System (GDTS) an alternate secure internet connection to the MSIN server at WestEd. Records are updated for every term regular and summer/intersession terms. Students are withdrawn and then re-enrolled with current information at the beginning of each session. WestEd used automated procedures to detect new files that were received from the regional offices. WestEd has software that compares data fields with existing records to detect a match. Fields such as name birth date and parents' names are compared for a match. If a child received summer/intersession services the type of service and service date/s were entered into the local system. This information is also sent electronically to the statewide database. These files are then decompressed and decrypted. The student records are then updated with the academic or support service information.

The records are then imported into a master database where eligibility for category 1 and 2 were determined according to the decision rules established by CDE based on Federal law/rules which establishes student eligibility enrollment and services. These rules are used to train all identification and recruitment staff as well as the data entry staff. The CA MEP Guidance Related to the 34 CFR 200 Final Regulations, COE Instructions Identification and Recruitment Manual and Data Entry Instructions contain all of the procedures that are followed with respect to recruitment as well as verifying information for eligibility. An additional quality check is the validation of critical

fields. COEstar does key field validation at input. This check ensures that all of the fields required to determine eligibility have been collected and recorded.

Management and QA reports are produced by the State MEP and shared with the regional offices to confirm receipt of the records to confirm eligibility and as tools to assist with improving data quality. Additional reports are available on the Migrant Student Locator a web-
If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The COEstar system is the software used to collect all of the student data pertaining to program eligibility and other student information. The Performance Reporter is designed to produce reports specifically requested by the Federal government pertaining to all migrant program information. WestEd receives all of the data collected with COEstar and checks for duplicates as well as compiles reports of different data elements as requested by regions as well as the federal government.

Migrant Education staff is trained to complete accurate COEs based on Federal Program eligibility criteria. The COEs are checked via regional process before entering COEs data into COEstar on a COE screen. Since COEstar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility (COE) all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time 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 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 run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can 1. Be counted for funding and 2. Be counted for services. Each year, information is updated through personal interviews with families. This allows student information to be updated yearly if not more frequently. Once a student graduates from high school, that student's information is updated and the student is then flagged as no longer eligible. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered into databases multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). The additional checks involve the use of a WestEd internet-based application that allows regional staff to check data fields such as name birth date place of birth and parents' names as well as make direct comparisons of electronic versions of the source documents to further eliminate the possibility of duplicates.

Students who were resident in your state for at least one day during the eligible period (9/1-8/31).

Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are 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 Assessments and Graduation/Termination dates Special Services dates and Health record dates performed in the state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate they left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began. The State does assume that the inputted data with respect to COE information is correct. There are quality control checks that exist prior to entering information into the database. When a recruiter gathers information from a family and records it on a COE another staff person reviews the COE for completeness and accuracy.

Students who in the case of category 2—received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term.

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment and service in a summer or intersession term in order to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Descriptions of services indicate the nature of services. In addition summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still with in the 3-year eligibility period when service began.

Students once per child count category.

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

category.

WestEd checks each incoming ID record against the statewide database to determine if the same student is already in the system (e.g. to identify a potential match with an already existing student record). Possible outcomes include: a. exact matches on all matching criteria b. no match (less than 5 criteria match) c. possible match (5 or more criteria match). The criterion includes student name school of enrollment and parents' names. When possible matches are identified they are flagged and sent back to the region to determine if there is a match or if the student is new. WestEd assigns the Migrant Student Directory (MSD) Number, a unique statewide identification number, to each unique record. Possible matches are assigned the same MSD number. Unique numbers are reserved for half of a potential pair of duplicates.

The regions view data records containing possible matches on-line. Regions research the information to determine if possible matched records represent the same or unique children. Regions use the Duplicate Resolution screen on the Migrant Student Information Network locator site (developed by WestEd) to research and resolve potential duplicates. Regions that share the potential duplicates can research independently while seeing what the other region has determined. Students who are in fact unique are immediately reassigned new MSD numbers in the central database. The changes/updates are returned electronically to the regions to keep the local database synchronized with the local COEstar database.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The CA MEP has developed a web based I & R Issues Clarification Center to assure consistency in the interpretation of eligibility guidance and uniform application of eligibility criteria statewide. The purpose of this center is to provide policy and procedure information for I&R topics which are unclear or not specifically addressed in the I&R Manual. Regional staff first address their questions to their I&R Supervisor/Advisory Committee member. Committee members are encouraged to post questions directly into this site. Questioners who prefer anonymity can send questions to CDE by email and their questions appear anonymously. The State I&R Support Team, after deliberation and consultation, post a discussion and answer to each question. Every effort is made to respond in a timely manner. All Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN) members (there are currently over 1,450 active account members representing the 23 Migrant Regional Offices School Districts Migrant Programs and State Staff members) can view all the postings. Once the answer has received final approval by the CDE Migrant Office, it is effective immediately. Issues that generate an update to the I&R Manual will be addressed in periodic "Updates to the I&R Manual" posted in the MSIN Intranet Documents section.

The California Department of Education (CDE) has instructed the subgrantees (regions) to perform "Quality Control" checks on all COEs using each regional office's internal procedures. CDE has developed the following quality control documents to guide the regions in establishing effective and efficient procedures and staff training:

-Identification and Recruitment Manual (includes COE Instructions)

-California Quality Assurance Guidelines for Collecting and Entering Data

-Guidance related to new Regulations Governing Title I, Part C -Migrant Education Program 34 CFR 200

"Second person" checks of COEs are part of the process. If information of a COE is in question a follow-up visit/interview is conducted. In addition the CDE I&R manual contains a Certificate of Eligibility Monitoring Checklist and instructions on how to use this checklist. CDE consultants are assigned regions/subgrantees to monitor on an ongoing basis. The process includes the I&R component. The state Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM) process includes random sampling and review of COEs. Also each region has established a quality control process prior to the entry of information from the COE into the COEstar database.

Migrant Education staffs responsible for interviewing migrant families and completing COEs receive ongoing training at the regional level and also statewide training is provided. Statewide training is provided annually at the Migrant Student Identification and Recruitment and Data Training. At the regional level it is common practice for staff to meet once a month for training.

At the collection/electronic-input stage COEstar mimics paper COE collection methods. Each COE can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes.

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.

From August through October of 2009, the State MEP conducted prospective re-interviews using independent re-interviewers with migratory children determined eligible for the California MEP as of September 1, 2008. These re-interviews incorporated conditions stipulated in the Final Determination Letter (PDL) issued to the California Department of Education in January 2009. Following clarifications with the U.S. Department of Education, the PDL called for a stratified random sample of 300 children including:

- 50 randomly sampled cases from Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) where a relative or guardian (non-parent) was the qualifying worker (PDL).
- 50 cases from LAUSD selected randomly based on CDE preferences.
- 50 cases identified using one or more of the following indicators: (a) COE data indicated the child moved from Mexico to the district during the winter or summer school break, (b) current and prior COE data indicated that the child has lived at the same address within the school district, and/or (c) school enrollment data indicated that enrollment in school was not interrupted during the move period.
- 50 cases selected randomly from students in the Pajaro Valley Unified School District not included in the sample above.
- 100 randomly selected migrant children from other districts and not included in the above groups. Methodology The CDE contracted with the Kern County Superintendent of Schools Office (KCSOS) and JBS International (JBS) to conduct the re-interviews. Together, CDE, KCSOS and JBS developed a sampling methodology and followed a re-interview protocol that met or exceeded the requirements of both the PDL and the Draft Technical Assistance Guide on Re-Interviewing. KCSOS hired a team of re-interviewers who were fluent in Spanish and knowledgeable about migrant populations, and, working with JBS, provided all re-interviewers with a two day training on the re-interview protocol and procedures. To ensure re-interview quality, re-interviewers were tested using role-playing during training, observed during actual interviewing and provided feedback. To avoid conflicts of interest, JBS drew the samples, monitored

interviewer quality and analyzed the data on sampling compliance and eligibility. KCSOS was not part of the eligibility determination process. Results To allow for non-response, JBS drew a stratified, random sample of 437 students. Although response rates were sufficient in four of the

A total of 329 re-interviews were collected from August through October of 2009. Sampling, Responses and Identified Errors.

Group Pop. Re-Interv. Sample size Re-Interv. Ineligible COE Required w/oversample Completed Moves Identified

LA Guardians 87 50 87 53 0 Other LAUSD 869 50 70 52 3 Winter Moves 1,950 50 70 64 18 Other PVUSD 1,455 50 70 58 5 Other Statewide 53,555 100 155 102 21 Total 57,916 300 452 329 47

After reviews by JBS and CDE, 47 of the 329 COE moves (20.3%, weighted) were determined to be ineligible. The errors identified were weighted to reflect the differing population sizes of the sample groups. There were four key areas of errors identified in the 47 ineligible COE moves: the family did not move (55%), the move given on the COE was a vacation move (22%), the child did not move (18%), and the listed qualifying worker did not seek or obtain qualifying work (5%). Analysis of the errors showed differences by sample and by region. There were relatively few problems found in the Pajaro sample or either of the LAUSD samples. However, the Winter Moves and the Statewide sample had more errors. There were several Regions with high error rates and high numbers of children which have the highest contributions to the state's discrepancy rates. These included Regions 1, 4, 5, 17 and 23. In addition there were other discrepancies identified between the re-interview data and the COEs which did not result in the COE move being ineligible. These discrepancies appeared to stem mainly from either clerical errors or recruiters having trouble understanding migrant families' histories, which often included multiple moves.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The vendors provide reports to CDE and the Regional offices on an ongoing basis. The reports include student information with respect to eligibility, enrollment and services. It provides regional directors current information with respect to their current recruitment efforts. If the child counts in a region(s) is much lower or higher than the year before vendors and CDE consultants work with the regions to insure that the data is correct. Data are checked for completeness throughout the year.

In addition, 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, such as enrollment and services data is thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

COEstar does not merge data. All data kept by COEstar databases is relational based on internal keys and all information for a child is related. The system does support data synchronization between multiple stand-alone systems using very accurate and proprietary technology developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation. This method relies on record stamping using keys and data signatures to determine how data is exchanged and consolidated. The process is similar to other database synchronization methods but is much more refined and precise.

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 Department of Education Migrant Indian and International Education Office has a consultant assigned to review the sub-reports submitted by the vendors. The consultant checks these reports against the sub-reports before the information is entered on to the Annual Performance Report form and submitted to the Federal Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The report is checked against the last report (in terms of large increases and/or decreases) it is checked by sections in terms of federal requirements it is checked for possible math and/or content errors. It should be noted that these final steps taken by CDE have been preceded by the electronic check in COEstar and the associated Performance Reporter; 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 addition to the steps described above, prior to certifying data on the CSPR, the program office must deliver a copy of the supporting data (e.g., Eden data file, etc.) and business rules on a CD or DVD to the department's CSPR Coordinator.

Criteria for Supporting Documentation

Should support numerical data (not narrative) responses to the CSPR.

Should provide sufficient detail to reproduce the CSPR data entries if needed in any future audits or evaluations.

Should be in a format that an auditor can read and understand (e.g., Excel or MS-Word). If the nature of the data requires providing it in another format (e.g., SAS) the office should contact the CSPR Coordinator and provide an explanation of how the auditor can view the supporting documentation.

The data must be of sufficient detail to allow an auditor to see underlying detail that supports totals. For example, if the CSPR data is a count of districts with a specific status, the supporting document should list the data at the district level. If the CSPR is a count of schools with a status, the supporting document should list the data for each school. The document should also reflect the sum of the detail.

Each supporting document on the CD should be named to reflect the corresponding CSPR section number (e.g., CSPR 1.6.1). The CD and CD case must have a label that clearly reflects the following:

- o The year and part(s) of the CSPR.
 - o For each section of the CSPR, the full name and phone number of the person that is responsible for answering any questions related to the supporting documentation.
- Totals in supporting documentation must match, exactly, the totals reported in the CSPR.

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 following corrective actions or improvements will be made by the CDE to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

- 1) All students that were found to be not eligible as a result of the re-interviews were deleted prior to submitting the child counts.
- 2) A monitoring process will be implemented beginning in 2010 to address the error patterns identified in the re-interview process. The monitoring will allow the CDE to:
 - A) Review the quality control practices of the regions where the problems persist
 - B) Identify error patterns or systemic weaknesses
 - C) Take action to correct any identified weaknesses
 - E) Provide additional training and technical assistance The monitoring and training will begin February 2010 and continue through the end of the year. A schedule will be developed to ensure that all regions are reviewed in a two year cycle.
- 3) The CDE will host its annual statewide I&R training on February 9-10, 2010. The results of the prospective re-interviews will be utilized to inform training topics and follow up technical assistance.
- 4) The CDE will host quarterly I&R Coordinator meetings. Additional training and technical assistance will be provided to field staff at these meetings on topics related to quality control procedures.
- 5) The CDE will continue to use the MSIN Issues Clarification Web Portal to respond to on-going I&R questions and issues

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.

While the prospective re-interviews did not, and were not intended to establish an error rate for the 2008-09 child counts, the CDE will consider options to address any further implications that these finding may have on the child counts in this report. The CDE will communicate with the federal Office of Migrant Education to discuss options for addressing this concern.