

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

FLORIDA



**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:

Florida Department of Education

Address:

325 W Gaines St, Suite 644
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Rose Raynak

Telephone: (850) 245-0756

Fax: (850) 245-5036

e-mail: rose.raynak@fldoe.org

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

Dr. Eric J. Smith

Thursday, March 11, 2010, 9:47:33 AM

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.

Florida completed a revision to its Reading and Language Arts content standards which was scheduled to be presented to the State Board of Education for adoption in September 2009. However, due to Florida's commitment to adopt the national Common Core content standards by July 2010, Florida has temporarily suspended work on the Reading and Language Arts content standards. Once the Common Core grade level standards are published (expected in January 2010), Florida will work to review and adopt the Common Core content standards for Reading / Language Arts at the July 2010 State Board of Education meeting.

Florida is also planning to review and adopt the Common Core standards for mathematics at the same State Board of Education meeting in July 2010.

In September 2009, the State Board of Education approved a new rule requiring a periodic review of content standards for potential revision within a maximum period of 12 years.

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.

Florida has developed plans for the transition to new reading and mathematics assessments aligned to its revised Sunshine State Standards. These new assessments will be field-tested in the spring of 2010. The baseline administration will occur in the spring of 2011, and the new academic achievement standards will be established in the fall of 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 are not yet approved.

Florida has developed plans for the transition to new science assessments aligned to the revised Sunshine State Standards. These new assessments will be field-tested in the spring of 2011. The baseline administration will occur in the spring of 2012, and the new academic achievement standards will be established in the fall of 2012.

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	1,604,440		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,773		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	39,128		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	367,807		>97%
Hispanic	403,424		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	729,611		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	236,397	227,469	96.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	103,315		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	838,533		>97%
Migratory students	9,715		>97%
Male	823,541		>97%
Female	780,899		>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	59,566	29.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	126,892	62.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,686	8.2
Total	203,144	
Comments: 9th grade CWD students who are assessed and reported in N81 are excluded in N093 since we report only grade 10 in N093 per EDFacts/DANS reporting requirements. Below are the totals from N081, N093 and their differences: MATH -N81 WDIS total is 227469; N93 WDIS total is 203144. The difference is 24325 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81 not in N93). RLA -N81 WDIS total is 228155; N93 WDIS total is 203697. The difference is 24458 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81 not in N93).		

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	1,606,001		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,778		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	39,152		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	368,279		>97%
Hispanic	404,024		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	730,035		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	236,611	228,155	96.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	103,461		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	839,457		>97%
Migratory students	9,724		>97%
Male	824,579		>97%
Female	781,422		>97%
Comments:			

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

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do 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	59,432	29.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	127,566	62.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	16,699	8.2
Total	203,697	
<p>Comments: 9th grade CWD students who are assessed and reported in N81 are excluded in N093 since we report only grade 10 in N093 per EDFacts/DANS reporting requirements. Below are the totals from N081, N093 and their differences: MATH -N81 WDIS total is 227469; N93 WDIS total is 203144. The difference is 24325 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81 not in N93). RLA -N81 WDIS total is 228155; N93 WDIS total is 203697. The difference is 24458 and is due to 9th grade WDIS (reported in N81 not in N93).</p>		

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	578,937	556,980	96.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,714	1,648	96.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,617	14,313	97.9
Black, non-Hispanic	131,666	124,638	94.7
Hispanic	142,544	137,825	96.7
White, non-Hispanic	268,591	259,347	96.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	81,585	75,877	93.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	36,017	34,615	96.1
Economically disadvantaged students	283,493	271,549	95.8
Migratory students	3,215	3,111	96.8
Male	294,240	281,665	95.7
Female	284,697	275,315	96.7

Comments: These data are correct. For the black, non-Hispanic sub-category 124638 is the number who have a tested value of 1 and the score is valid. For black students, there were 463 students who participated but the score was invalid (and thus not reported in N081 as a participant). This makes the actual number who participated 125101 which makes the percent 95. For the CWD sub-category, there were 433 students who participated but the score was invalid (and thus not reported in N081 as a participant). This makes the actual number who participated 76310 which makes the percent 93.5 -still less than 95%.

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	23,329	30.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	45,424	59.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,124	9.4
Total	75,877	
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	206,381	160,319	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	603	501	83.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,062	4,596	90.8
Black, non-Hispanic	48,700	30,752	63.2
Hispanic	54,238	40,464	74.6
White, non-Hispanic	88,582	76,587	86.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,321	18,911	56.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,148	12,161	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	121,213	84,311	69.6
Migratory students	1,469	973	66.2
Male	106,170	82,674	77.9
Female	100,211	77,645	77.5
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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	206,379	147,071	71.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	604	450	74.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,059	4,186	82.7
Black, non-Hispanic	48,688	27,254	56.0
Hispanic	54,245	35,001	64.5
White, non-Hispanic	88,589	73,072	82.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	33,320	15,399	46.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	21,133	9,313	44.1
Economically disadvantaged students	121,210	74,566	61.5
Migratory students	1,468	719	49.0
Male	106,166	72,673	68.4
Female	100,213	74,398	74.2
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	197,171	147,562	74.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	559	441	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,784	4,282	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	44,519	26,940	60.5
Hispanic	51,089	36,659	71.8
White, non-Hispanic	87,654	72,617	82.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	31,514	16,276	51.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,586	8,112	52.0
Economically disadvantaged students	112,303	74,434	66.3
Migratory students	1,312	821	62.6
Male	101,163	75,831	75.0
Female	96,008	71,731	74.7
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.2.2 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	197,138	146,176	74.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	559	441	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,783	4,111	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	44,496	26,248	59.0
Hispanic	51,064	34,989	68.5
White, non-Hispanic	87,667	73,591	83.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	31,504	15,018	47.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,558	6,668	42.9
Economically disadvantaged students	112,270	72,641	64.7
Migratory students	1,310	675	51.5
Male	101,136	72,230	71.4
Female	96,002	73,946	77.0
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received..			

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:			

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	193,809	120,409	62.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	601	405	67.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,787	3,899	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	42,906	18,625	43.4
Hispanic	49,666	28,675	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	87,564	63,436	72.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	29,853	10,833	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,912	4,024	31.2
Economically disadvantaged students	107,498	54,598	50.8
Migratory students	1,205	521	43.2
Male	99,278	62,707	63.2
Female	94,531	57,702	61.0
Comments: These data are correct. The large discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received. These data are correct. The large discrepancy is due to improvements in the data Florida received.			

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	193,789	137,902	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	602	451	74.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,784	3,999	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	42,916	23,670	55.2
Hispanic	49,646	32,942	66.4
White, non-Hispanic	87,555	70,552	80.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	29,860	12,457	41.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	12,891	4,683	36.3
Economically disadvantaged students	107,486	65,512	61.0
Migratory students	1,204	602	50.0
Male	99,263	67,684	68.2
Female	94,526	70,218	74.3
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	192,945	89,828	46.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	600	286	47.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,776	3,051	63.9
Black, non-Hispanic	42,744	11,147	26.1
Hispanic	49,484	19,295	39.0
White, non-Hispanic	87,094	51,928	59.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	29,525	8,095	27.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	15,332	2,761	18.0
Economically disadvantaged students	106,975	35,758	33.4
Migratory students	1,200	256	21.3
Male	98,788	47,532	48.1
Female	94,157	42,296	44.9
Comments:			

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

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	197,975	109,604	55.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	610	363	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,975	3,899	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	45,130	16,223	36.0
Hispanic	50,368	25,563	50.8
White, non-Hispanic	89,262	59,017	66.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	28,605	7,728	27.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,912	2,359	21.6
Economically disadvantaged students	108,457	46,311	42.7
Migratory students	1,293	518	40.1
Male	101,941	55,862	54.8
Female	96,034	53,742	56.0
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.2.4 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	198,165	131,385	66.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	609	433	71.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,979	4,028	80.9
Black, non-Hispanic	45,215	22,007	48.7
Hispanic	50,407	30,212	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	89,317	69,166	77.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	28,660	10,592	37.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,916	2,732	25.0
Economically disadvantaged students	108,613	59,553	54.8
Migratory students	1,291	586	45.4
Male	102,077	65,091	63.8
Female	96,088	66,294	69.0
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	195,094	117,863	60.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	599	367	61.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,783	3,997	83.6
Black, non-Hispanic	43,843	18,277	41.7
Hispanic	49,128	27,330	55.6
White, non-Hispanic	89,654	63,256	70.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	28,026	8,443	30.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,337	2,716	26.3
Economically disadvantaged students	102,551	49,354	48.1
Migratory students	1,206	519	43.0
Male	99,754	59,765	59.9
Female	95,340	58,098	60.9
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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	195,218	130,372	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	596	426	71.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,783	3,911	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	43,897	21,239	48.4
Hispanic	49,156	29,998	61.0
White, non-Hispanic	89,698	69,518	77.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	28,068	10,457	37.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,345	2,388	23.1
Economically disadvantaged students	102,652	56,382	54.9
Migratory students	1,205	494	41.0
Male	99,833	64,950	65.1
Female	95,385	65,422	68.6
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments:			

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	196,948	129,975	66.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	567	399	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,827	4,093	84.8
Black, non-Hispanic	44,742	20,312	45.4
Hispanic	49,287	30,158	61.2
White, non-Hispanic	90,858	70,223	77.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	27,909	9,831	35.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,909	2,744	27.7
Economically disadvantaged students	100,156	54,021	53.9
Migratory students	1,146	559	48.8
Male	100,694	66,822	66.4
Female	96,254	63,153	65.6
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	197,214	106,839	54.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	567	336	59.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,827	3,428	71.0
Black, non-Hispanic	44,805	15,475	34.5
Hispanic	49,335	23,142	46.9
White, non-Hispanic	90,994	60,354	66.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	27,981	7,154	25.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,901	1,061	10.7
Economically disadvantaged students	100,338	40,781	40.6
Migratory students	1,150	287	25.0
Male	100,841	50,943	50.5
Female	96,373	55,896	58.0
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	195,222	81,498	41.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	563	258	45.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,807	3,026	63.0
Black, non-Hispanic	44,126	8,945	20.3
Hispanic	48,978	16,467	33.6
White, non-Hispanic	90,113	49,635	55.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	27,367	5,536	20.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,566	995	9.4
Economically disadvantaged students	99,037	27,429	27.7
Migratory students	1,136	196	17.2
Male	99,668	44,027	44.2
Female	95,554	37,471	39.2
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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	386,275	263,115	68.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,145	846	73.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,570	8,261	86.3
Black, non-Hispanic	87,804	41,831	47.6
Hispanic	92,732	58,177	62.7
White, non-Hispanic	183,791	145,754	79.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	48,241	16,770	34.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,113	6,164	30.6
Economically disadvantaged students	167,431	93,978	56.1
Migratory students	1,897	954	50.3
Male	196,139	134,697	68.7
Female	190,136	128,418	67.5
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	388,879	161,874	41.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,149	513	44.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	9,596	5,551	57.8
Black, non-Hispanic	88,729	19,971	22.5
Hispanic	93,495	32,015	34.2
White, non-Hispanic	184,612	98,338	53.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	48,762	9,285	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	20,328	1,074	5.3
Economically disadvantaged students	168,816	47,912	28.4
Migratory students	1,912	305	16.0
Male	197,817	78,555	39.7
Female	191,062	83,319	43.6
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	168,813	63,464	37.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	485	200	41.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,730	2,581	54.6
Black, non-Hispanic	37,768	6,606	17.5
Hispanic	39,363	11,480	29.2
White, non-Hispanic	82,140	40,701	49.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,985	3,824	20.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,717	456	5.2
Economically disadvantaged students	65,537	15,563	23.8
Migratory students	775	114	14.7
Male	83,209	35,113	42.2
Female	85,604	28,351	33.1
Comments: These data are correct. The discrepancy is due to improvements in the quality of data Florida received.			

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	3,349	785	23.4
Districts	72		
Comments: There were 0 districts that made AYP in SY 2008-09.			

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	1,361	244	17.9
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,338	237	17.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	23	7	30.4
Comments: Based on guidance from EDEN Partner Support, Florida reported schools with too few students to calculate AYP as AYP Status = NOT REQUIRED. There were 30 such schools: 2 TA and 28 SW schools. As a result the count of Title I schools shown in row 1, column 1 in Section 1.4.2 (above) shows 30 less Title I schools than there actually are in Florida. The total number of 08-09 Title I schools in Florida is 1,391: 1366 SW and 25 TA.			

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
72		
Comments: There were 0 districts that received Title I funds and made AYP in SY 2008-09.		

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 û Year 1, School Improvement û 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	24
Extension of the school year or school day	5
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	5
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	29
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	25
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	56
Comments: The blank values indicate FL had no schools in the action.	

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)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	237
Comments: The blank values indicate FL had no schools in the action.	

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.

The Department provided technical assistance through Differentiated Accountability and its statewide system of support. While direct support was provided to low-performing schools in the state, the school support teams partnered with LEA officials to conduct site visits and follow-up. This capacity building provided LEAs with the tools necessary to further support all schools

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	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	69
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	7	1
Comments: Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete on 10-13-09.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	10/13/09
---	----------

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	258,993	
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	143,365	
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	55.4	
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	259,152	
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	138,374	
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	53.4	
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	94
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	
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	611
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

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

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		1	0	0	A	
2		28	0	0	A	
3		5	0	0	A	
5		32	0	0	A	
6 = Combo 1	1 and 2	267	7	69	A	
7 = Combo 2	1 and 3	63	0	0	A	
8 = Combo 3	1, 2 and 5	247	0	0	A	
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Column 6 Response Options Box

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) identifies effective strategies to improve student achievement in the Request for Application (RFA) for 1003 funds. The RFA is disseminated to all eligible local educational agencies (LEA) through FDOE's paperless communication system, is uploaded to FDOE's website, and is directly emailed to federal program coordinators of LEAs.

The FDOE convened a series of technical assistance regional meetings for LEA federal program coordinators and LEA school improvement members to share the RFA and effective strategies. These meetings were held in Panama City, Ocala, Tampa, and Fort Lauderdale.

FDOE's Statewide System of Support has placed curriculum experts and Regional Executive Directors in regions across the state to provide technical assistance and support to LEAs and schools in identifying and implementing effective strategies to improve student achievement.

A conference call was held to provide further technical assistance to federal program coordinators in completing the requirements of the RFA and to ensure effective strategies were utilized for the program year.

The results of the previous year's Consolidated State Performance Report are available on FDOE's website.

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.

The Florida Department of Education retained 5 percent of its total 2008-09 allocation for state level activities. These funds were consolidated, consistent with provisions of P.L. 107-110, Section 9201 and Florida's approved consolidated application. Florida is fully cognizant of its responsibilities with respect to meeting the requirements of P.L. 107-110, Section 1003(g), and the applicable requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, Sections 1116 and 1117.

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.

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	606,800
Applied to transfer	23,835
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	16,990

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	\$ 10,048,064

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	9

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	625,164
Applied for supplemental educational services	102,472
Received supplemental educational services	78,618
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	\$ 92,963,518
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	1,109,384	1,041,950	93.9	67,434	6.1
All elementary classes	632,474	607,649	96.1	24,825	3.9
All secondary classes	476,910	434,301	91.1	42,609	8.9

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.

Florida uses a departmentalized approach.

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	36.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	11.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	42.1
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" is used to report the following types of cases: (1) substitute teachers; (2) secondary social science teachers who are certified infield in social science but are not highly qualified in either history, economics, civics/government; and (3) geography and the special education teacher who do not have the base certification in special education in addition to being not highly qualified in the content area(s).

	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)	45.7
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	14.1
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	40.2
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Other" is used to report the following types of cases: (1) substitute teachers; (2) secondary social science teachers who are certified infield in social science but are not highly qualified in either history, economics, civics/government; and (3) geography and the special education teacher who do not have the base certification in special education in addition to being not highly qualified in the content area(s).

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	159,475	152,642	95.7
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	140,613	134,284	95.5
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	88,691	77,837	87.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	103,354	95,740	92.6

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	78.0	35.3
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price Lunch	
Secondary schools	64.3	25.8
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Price Lunch	

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.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.1 These are the instructional Models used in Florida to provide ELLs comprehensible instruction:
 Sheltered -English Sheltered -Core/Basic Subject Areas Mainstream/Inclusion -English Mainstream/Inclusion -Core/Basic Subject Areas Maintenance and/or Developmental Bilingual Education Dual Language (Two-way Developmental Bilingual Education)

Because our labels are different, it is unclear how Florida should answer this question.

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	257,776
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.	238,349
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	187,339
Haitian; Haitian Creole	28,088
Portuguese	3,353
Vietnamese	2,965
Arabic	2,095

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	193,474
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	23,395
Total	216,869
Comments: The data are correct.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	31,740
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	16.4
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	193,044
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	23,315
Total	216,359
Comments: The data in this section (1.6.3.2.1) are populated by the data reported in EDFacts file N138, T3 LEP ELP Test. The reporting period for N138 is the testing window, which in Florida is the spring semester. The data in section 1.6.2.2 are populated by data reported in EDFacts file N116, T3 LEP Students Served. The reporting period for N113 is the entire school year. It is for this reason that the data in 1.6.3.2.1 is 238349 students served; and the data in 1.6.2.2 193044 student tested. That is, the data in 1.6.2.2 is 81% of the data in 1.6.3.2.1. The data reported in 1.6.2.2 and 1.6.3.2.1 are correct per the guidance in EDFacts.	
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.	50,584

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	43,484	34.3	0	0.00
ELP attainment	31,675	25.0	0	0.00

Comments: Florida does not have a single state target for AMAO1 (progress). Instead Florida has different targets for AMAO1 (progress) on three separate assessments: Listening/Speaking (70%), Writing (54%) and Reading (56%). Students in Florida exceeded the target in each assessment. The number (and percent) of students who met the target in Listening/Speaking is 93,600 (78%); 78,068 (64%) in Writing; 81,463 (68%) in Reading. Florida does not have a single state target for AMAO2 (proficiency attainment). Instead Florida has different targets for different grade clusters: K-2 (23%), 3-5 (8%), 6-8 (7%) and 9-12 (7%). Students in Florida exceeded the target in each grade cluster. The number and percent of students who met the target in K-2 is 2,526 (33%); 8,055 (22%) for 3-5; 3,935 (23%) for 6-8; 3,518 (22%) for 9-12. The reason that the number of students meeting the targets on assessments is greater than the number of students who made progress or attained proficiency overall shown in the Results column of 1.6.3.2.2 is that the student counts for the targets (above) are duplicated for each assessment. So a student would be counted on each assessment that he made progress or attained proficiency. But the count of students who made progress or attained proficiency overall show in the Results column is a count of students who made progress or attained proficiency in all three assessments.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

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

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments: No assessments are given in native languages.

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: No native language assessments are given in Reading/Language Arts.

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: No native language assessments are given in Reading/Language Arts.

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
59,670	9,136	68,806
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
57,371	37,205	64.8	20,166
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
57,424	33,706	58.7	23,718
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
11,923	3,618	30.3	8,305
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	49
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	4
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	49
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	41
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	4
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	45
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	0
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	0
Comments:	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the 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
124,694	6,991	22

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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) - The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	39,861
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	

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.

Because Florida's Consent Decree, requires ESOL content area teachers to be ESOL endorsed or certified, to utilize Title III funds for certified/licensed teachers would be considered as supplanting instead of supplementing. Last year's numbers are significantly different because the Department did not take into consideration that all their certified and endorsed teachers, working in any Title III program could be counted.

Florida anticipates it will need no additional certified/licensed teachers within the next five years.

* 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	0	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	0	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	0	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	0	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	0	0
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	0	0
PD provided to principals	0	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	0	0
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	0	0
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	0	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Florida's Consent Decree requires ESOL content area teachers to be ESOL endorsed or certified. To utilize Title III funds for certified/licensed teachers would be considered as supplanting instead of supplementing. Therefore, there are no data to collect.

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
7/15/09	7/15/09	90
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.

Florida has implemented the following steps to shorten the process of distributing Title III funds:

- provided technical assistance to districts/LEAs through workshops and review process

- utilized an online application system

Note: Final distribution depends on when the districts/LEAs submit corrections to their application for final approval.

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: Florida has no 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	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	76.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	58.7
Hispanic	67.1
White, non-Hispanic	81.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	43.0
Limited English proficient	52.2
Economically disadvantaged	61.1
Migratory students	52.9
Male	68.7
Female	76.8
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	2.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	3.6
Hispanic	3.1
White, non-Hispanic	1.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4.5
Limited English proficient	4.2
Economically disadvantaged	2.9
Migratory students	5.3
Male	2.9
Female	2.3
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	34	34
LEAs with subgrants	33	33
Total	67	67
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)	119	818
K	518	3,591
1	478	3,514
2	420	3,468
3	402	3,417
4	386	3,079
5	346	2,814
6	330	2,877
7	319	2,754
8	276	2,682
9	228	2,581
10	170	2,040
11	128	1,559
12	188	1,465
Ungraded		
Total	4,308	36,659
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	674	8,569
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,295	24,054
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	144	991
Hotels/Motels	195	3,045
Total	4,308	36,659
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)	
K	3,591
1	3,514
2	3,468
3	3,417
4	3,079
5	2,814
6	2,877
7	2,754
8	2,682
9	2,581
10	2,040
11	1,559
12	1,465
Ungraded	N<10
Total	35,842
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	4,903
Migratory children/youth	758
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,436
Limited English proficient students	3,629
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	33
Expedited evaluations	24
Staff professional development and awareness	33
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	32
Transportation	30
Early childhood programs	23
Assistance with participation in school programs	31
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	28
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	30
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	33
Coordination between schools and agencies	33
Counseling	22
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	25
Clothing to meet a school requirement	31
School supplies	33
Referral to other programs and services	33
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	30
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	7
School Selection	5
Transportation	10
School records	7
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	6
Other Barriers – in comment box below	10

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	2,276	1,264
4	2,128	1,230
5	1,888	1,006
6	1,906	871
7	1,812	834
8	1,742	602
High School	2,516	611
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	2,273	1,387
4	2,126	1,227
5	1,888	762
6	1,896	603
7	1,809	656
8	1,726	771
High School	2,476	1,125
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-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)	4,241
K	2,002
1	2,013
2	1,817
3	1,712
4	1,508
5	1,387
6	1,487
7	1,391
8	1,390
9	1,308
10	1,340
11	1,332
12	1,454
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	6,390
Total	30,772
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 significant changes reflected in the numbers being reported for both Category I and Category II can be attributed to the following factors:

the loss of significant farmland -for example, between 2000-2007, the total citrus acreage in the state decreased from 832,000 to 576,000; there was a slight increase in acreage to 592,000 in 2008; a decrease in agricultural products in 2007/08. The Florida Department of Agriculture indicates that a combination of the devastating 2005 hurricane season followed by a 2006 drought season affected agricultural production in 2007 and freezing temperatures affected production in 2008. Reports from the field suggested that less acres were planted in major crops (oranges, tomatoes) requiring less workforce;

the end of eligibility for a number of families; the impact of immigration reform issues on migrant families;

a decrease in the number of school-aged migrant children enrolled in the state during 2008-09 school year;

and an over-all reduction in the number of students enrolling in schools for the 2008-09 school 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)	905
K	449
1	453
2	390
3	324
4	282
5	226
6	254
7	260
8	249
9	227
10	258
11	247
12	109
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	470
Total	5,103
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 significant changes reflected in the numbers being reported for both Category I and Category II can be attributed to the following factors:

the loss of significant farmland -for example, between 2000-2007, the total citrus acreage in the state decreased from 832,000 to 576,000; there was a slight increase in acreage to 592,000 in 2008;

a decrease in agricultural products in 2007/08. The FL Department of Agriculture indicates that a combination of the devastating 2005 hurricane season followed by a 2006 drought season affected agricultural production in 2007 and freezing temperatures affected production in 2008. Reports from the field suggested that less acres were planted in major crops (oranges, tomatoes) requiring less workforce;

the end of eligibility for a number of families;

the impact of immigration reform issues on migrant families;

a decrease in the number of school-aged migrant children enrolled during the summer; and

an over-all reduction in the number of students enrolling in schools for the 2008-09 school year.

Question #: 1.10.2.1 Program Office Response to State: The reasons for the decline in the summer count are the same as those provided for the overall decrease in the child count. What are the specific factors for the decline of the summer count (other than those stated for the year-round count)? (For example, are more migrant children attending Title I/State/District-funded summer programs?)

State Response: Other specific factors for the decline of the summer count include:

Fewer districts provided summer programs that are designed to serve all ages, which affected the migrant summer program population. For example, there were districts who only provided a summer program for a certain grade (3rd grade) to help them in their FCAT reading; that limited the options the migrant program could provide to anyone that was not a 3rd grade student.

Districts faced a lot of cuts this last summer due to the economic situation so districts provided fewer summer programming opportunities. Even though the state provided funding, most of the districts had planed to coordinate with regular district offerings and, when these were not provided often due to cuts, local MEP programs were forced not to provide a summer session.

Also, one district experienced major organizational and programmatic restructuring right before the summer term; because of the timing of this change the MEP program was unable to provide summer programming.

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.

All local student data are transmitted to the state via an automated Management Information System (MIS) -the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System. The data are collected by the school districts through their local system and submitted to the state at preset times throughout the year, with a nine-month window of opportunity to correct any errors in the original transmission. The districts use this same system to transmit the data that are used to calculate the migrant count. This year's count was obtained using the State of Florida Student Information Data Base System using data submitted by the districts in August, 2009, via Survey 5, with updates and corrections up to November 23, 2009. Survey 5 differs from all other surveys in that it is a cumulative count of all students served in all programs during the preceding school year, and therefore captures all migrant students.

Last year's child counts were generated using the same system. In 2002, a data element was added to the Florida Student Information Data Base system, the Migrant Status Term, Student Demographic Reporting Format. This data element uses a coding system to indicate whether the migrant child was served in the regular term, summer term, or both.

In Migrant Status Term, a separate code (Code X) is used to identify students who qualified as migrants, but received no services (neither academic nor support services in the regular or summer term). In 2006, the coding used to indicate that the migrant child was served in the regular term (3) was revised to reflect that the migrant child was enrolled/served--with services provided during the regular school day--(D) or that the migrant child was enrolled/served --with some or all services provided during extended day/week--(E). Extensive technical assistance was provided to school districts to ensure the accuracy of this coding system, including regional workshops and presentations at Florida's annual Information Database Workshop held in June each year, and at the State Migrant Education Conference usually held in the fall of each year.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District Migrant Education Program (MEP) staff (recruiters/advocates/liaisons) identify eligible migrant children through face-to-face interviews and document their eligibility using a state approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) form. This form captures all the necessary data for identification and reporting: student name, parent names, qualifying arrival date, TO/FROM city and state, date of birth, gender, race/ethnicity, country of birth, current school enrollment, etc.

Florida's guidelines require district MEPs to generate a new COE each time a migrant child makes a new qualifying move. In addition, district MEP staff is required to annually contact the child or the child's parent/guardian in order to update the child's COE. Documentation of this process is maintained at the district-level. District MEP staff is trained to verify the information on the COE, and enter it into the local Management Information Services (MIS) data bases. Districts transmit the student-level data from their local systems to Florida's Automated Student Data Base System in Survey 5. A complete description of the system used, along with a complete layout of the data elements, may be found at: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/student_0809.asp

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) staff conducts annual on-site reviews that include re-interviewing selected families to ensure that the information on the COEs is accurate and that the children on the COE are eligible to receive Migrant Education Program services.

Question #: 1.10.3.2

Program Office Response to State: How are COEs updated when children withdraw from a FL school?

State Response: COEs are not updated after children withdraw. The updates occur in student rosters and student records in local/state student databases. Districts are not required to do anything to a COE once a child withdraws.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data from the COEs are entered locally, either at the school or the district level, aggregated for the whole district and transmitted electronically during the required survey periods through Florida's Automated Student Information Data Base System. The Student Demographic Format collects student-level data on all students in Florida, including but not limited to Date of Birth, Qualifying Arrival Date, Country of Birth, and other information about services provided to qualified students. To obtain a student count, the database is queried for all students meeting the criteria for current migrant status in regular and summer categories.

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.

Same process was used to collect and maintain the state's Category 2 count.

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 database is queried for all children between the ages of 3 and 22 (Date of Birth range of 9/2/86 through 8/31/06, inclusive, which captures those that were 2 and turned 3 and those who were 21 and turned 22), whose Qualifying Arrival Date is greater than 8/31/05, with a valid Migrant Status Term Code, and an appropriate service for Summer Session. This process is applied to all migrant child cases that are identified as migrant in the state student database and then the cases are sorted by Category I or II using the Migrant Status Term data element. Edit checks for Category I and Category II are performed on the data file generated by this query to delete children who may be included in error. The student counts are then shared with district MEP and Management Information Services (MIS) Departments to verify their data. Districts are provided a reasonable time to make corrections as needed before the revised data is extracted once more. With regard to verifying that those children whose 3rd birthday occurs during the eligibility period are still resident in the State before including them in the child count; on-site monitoring (conducted by State MEP staff) of basic district level quality control procedures being implemented document a standard practice among district MEPs. It is a standard procedure that children who will turn 3 during the eligibility period are flagged by the data clerk (whose responsibility it is to input student data into district data base) at the beginning of each school year or at the time of interview or re-interview of a family. Before data is submitted for the reporting period (Survey 5), data clerks confer with recruiters to ensure that these children/families are still in the district.

The query used finds all migrant children identified within the eligibility reporting period. Since Survey 5 data are cumulative for the entire school year, all those children meeting the eligibility requirements are captured, regardless of their length of stay. Recruiters are in constant contact with their families so that when a child turns three during the reporting period, district MEP staff will then identify that child as migrant on the student data base. The data element Migrant Status Term identifies which term(s) a migratory child was served and/or identified. Further, migratory children selected for inclusion in the count from the State Student Data Base had to have had a Qualifying Arrival Date greater than 8/31/05. FDOE staff conducts various edits to ensure that children, whose eligibility expired during the regular school year and may be receiving services under the "continuation of services" provision, are not included in the child count calculations.

In addition to the Migrant Status Term data element contained in the Student Demographic Format, data elements in the Federal/State Compensatory Evaluation Format, also transmitted in Survey 5, provide information regarding summer services to migrant students. The summer school code (Category II) cannot be entered on a student without a link to a code for summer services. Each year, a comprehensive presentation is made at the State Data Base Workshop. This presentation targets migrant staff, data clerks, and MIS staff and covers all reporting requirements for migrant students and migrant program data. When the specific Migrant Status Term data element was created, very explicit definitions were developed and disseminated to MEP/MIS staff. Two of the codes were created to identify students who received services during the summer. The codes are "B"--students who were served in both the regular 180 day school year AND the summer term and "S"--students that were served only in the summer term. The definition for summer services state that a student must be served in a Federally Funded (partially or fully) program designed (in whole or part) especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Students enrolled in a conventional summer school must, additionally or concurrently, be provided services that are fully or partially Federally Funded and designed especially for Migrant Students in order to be counted. Summer programs and services that are funded partially or fully by migrant program funds are clearly highlighted in district Migrant Education Program Project applications and are corroborated by district logs and reviewed during on-site district MEP monitoring visits. Districts have been provided guidance clarifying those children who receive instructional packets as a one-time act of providing instructional or support services cannot be included in their "summer count".

All students in Florida are assigned a unique, ten-digit Student Number Identifier, Florida (SID) number, consisting of the student's Social Security number followed by an 'X'. Those without Social Security numbers are assigned a SID by the local school district using a state defined methodology, which then becomes the student's State SID. Should a student move, the receiving district is required to search the State's Student Locator system to determine if the student has prior enrollment history in any of Florida's public schools. If so, the SID which was originally assigned as the student's SID, is to be assigned to the student in the receiving district. Please refer to: http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0809/st262_1.pdf. Because the SID is unique to each student, further matching is not performed at the state level.

For this year's count, the following process was used: A master file containing all the students in the state was generated and the students that met the federal criteria were coded as 'Migrant'. A separate data file containing only migrant students served in Regular and Summer Sessions was generated. All records were matched and (unduplicated) by data element fields: Migrant Status Term, SID, District Number and School Number. Because of the uniqueness of each students' SID, there is an assurance that data are unique for each student based upon the Migrant Status Term data element and the Florida Student Number Identifier. By using the SID and Migrant Status Term and matching for duplicate SID's this methodology insures the data tables produce an unduplicated count for each session. When students are

initially enrolled by district data staff, THEY must ensure that if a pre-existing SID is selected for a student, it must match on all variables, i.e.; name, DOB, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, home language, and parent names at a minimum before assigning a new SID.

An additional measure to ensure that districts do not generate a new SID for a student with an existing SID will be to disseminate extensive 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.

Same process was used to generate State's Category 2 count

In response to Question #: 1.10.3.3

Program Office Response to State: The State count is tied specifically to Florida's Student Information System, yet many migrant children are not enrolled in public schools. How are OSY students included in the count? How does the FL Student Information System "flag" MEP children who are not enrolled in public schools? If the OSY are not in the State database, how are those records entered and maintained electronically? "State Student Data Base reporting procedures require that any migrant child who had graduated at the end of the regular school year, would not have a record in the student data base." How does the State ensure that students who graduated from a FL school during the program year are included in the count? Please explain how the State information system filters records for students who graduate at the end (or during) the program year; for 12th grade students who do not graduate (but do not "officially" drop out or withdraw); and for students who drop out.

State Response: OSY are reported in the State database. The same procedures and data elements outlined in the description for how child count is calculated and compilation process and edit functions that are built into the student information system(s) apply to OSY with the exception that OSY are identified as non-attenders and for the School Number data element the code "9997" is used. Students not enrolled in public schools are identified with School Number "9997." The statement "State Student Data Base reporting procedures require that any migrant child who had graduated at the end of the regular school year, would not have a record in the student data base" was submitted in error and has been deleted from the narrative above. A migrant child who had graduated at the end of the regular school year would have a record in the State Student Data Base. All high school students regardless of their graduation status are included in the count. The State does not filter records for students who graduate at the end (or during) the program year; for 12th grade students who do not graduate (but do not "officially" drop out or withdraw); and for students who drop out (based on Section sections 1115(b)(1)(A) and 1309 (2)).

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.

In 2006, FLDOE established a Florida Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Office. The ID&R office includes a state ID&R Coordinator, a trainer and an administrative assistant. The ID&R office is responsible for providing technical assistance and training to district MEPs on procedures and guidelines for eligibility, identification and recruitment; updating the procedures and forms (COEs) used by recruiters to meet accepted practices; and resolving questionable eligibility information on the COE forms with district MEP staff and other credible sources. The ID&R office also has updated the Florida ID&R Manual, developed a quality control document (which includes a COE checklist), modified the COE, provided new instructions for appropriate COE completion, and met with stakeholders and practitioners to develop and recommend eligibility policy to be accepted by the state.

The district MEPs have the responsibility of following the procedures and practices contained in the Florida ID&R Manual, developing a local Quality Control Plan, ensuring that staff is aware of the local Quality Control Plan, as well as the procedures and guidelines for ID&R in Florida, and participating in workshops and/or conferences conducted or sponsored by the SEA and/or the ID&R Office.

A new COE is generated for any new migrant child and existing COEs are updated annually for continued residency and age eligibility. Technical assistance is provided by the staff in the Florida Migrant Education Program Office or the ID&R Office, specializing in identification and recruitment procedures and practices to district and school-level migrant staff. Selected district MEPs are visited to ensure that the COEs are properly completed, reflect valid eligibility determinations and are submitted to local MIS offices for transmission to the State in a timely manner. This practice has been incorporated in annual, prescheduled monitoring activities for all Federal Programs, but remains a stand alone activity for MEP Programs (at the discretion of the State) in districts that may not be targeted for monitoring. The following Quality Control Procedures incorporate the steps the State will take to ensure the integrity of the eligibility determinations made by district MEPs and the accuracy of migrant child data collected and submitted as well as to address the outcomes of the Re-Interviewing Initiative:

a. The initial eligibility determination of a student is made through face-to-face interviews with a parent, guardian, other responsible adult or an out of school youth traveling on his/her own.

b. The SEA provides state-wide Identification and Recruitment training at least once a year, more frequently to individual districts by request or by triggers that may surface during the annual district COE review. During these trainings, MEP definitions, interviewing skills, COE completion and quality control training are provided to enhance the level of knowledge of veteran and new staff. In 2009, five regional training events were conducted throughout the state to discuss the basic core of eligibility requirements, implementation of a recruiter's code of ethics, update on migrant policy from the state, review of the ID&R handbook, and a review of the new federal regulations and the potential impact on current ID&R procedures.

c. Florida utilizes a Policy Work Group comprised of state and local MEP administrators, recruiters, advocates and other stakeholders, to assist in drafting guidance/policy regarding program implementation procedures and practices with particular emphasis on researching and collecting data to address Florida-specific grey issues on eligibility and qualifying activities.

d. Florida, in collaboration with the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training (ESCORT) and the ID&R Office, has revised their Identification and Recruitment Handbook. The SEA distributed a final copy to districts and stakeholders in March 2008. In the interim of the release of the ID&R Recruitment handbook, the Florida MEP ensured that every MEP staff person had in their possession a copy of the current Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance and other pertinent documents. MEP staff was expected to follow the guidelines of the draft NRG along with all other guidance as disseminated by the Florida MEP.

e. The COE was modified to facilitate the collection of information by recruiters and to align the items with similar forms used in other states. The 2009 COE reflects the changes and new regulations implemented by the Office of Migrant Education (OME). The 2009-2010 COE was delivered to districts around the first week of August, prior to the start of school. The form includes items and instructions related to issues such as "to seek", FERPA and Principal Means of Livelihood (PMOL). Based on the federal program regulations from 2009, the ID&R office provided guidance to districts regarding how to accurately complete the COE and document "economic necessity" and "temporary employment." Training on the use of this form was provided to districts during the 2009 Spring Regional Training events. To provide further assistance to districts and migrant staff, a presentation and a handout highlighting the key changes to the form were made available during the training and on the Florida Migrant Education Identification and Recruitment Office website at http://www.flrecruiter.org/files/2009FLMEP-COE_Completion-WebinarPPHandouts.pdf.

f. The proper chain of command for resolving eligibility issues is that the recruiter brings the issue to local MEP staff and the Coordinator; if the issue is still unclear, the Coordinator can refer the issue to the state Identification and Recruitment Coordinator. The state ID&R coordinator will research for similar situations and prior determinations that may facilitate a decision. Also, the ID&R coordinator will contact other districts as well as practitioners in other states who, in a confidential manner, will provide feedback. If a clear determination cannot be made, the issue is submitted to the Office of Migrant Education (OME). When possible, the FL-MEP will include the state's position or recommendation in the issue. The consensus of OME is shared with all local MEP staff.

g. It is a standard operating procedure to verify the migrant child data extracted from the State student database with the migrant student data submitted at the district level. Files of these data are provided to districts for that purpose. Windows of opportunities to correct/revise/delete migrant child records are given to district MEPs to ensure that all students captured for state funding purposes are eligible migrant children.

h. A monthly e-newsletter is sent to recruitment staff across the state. Through the newsletter, recruiters and other migrant staff are kept informed of eligibility and policy guidance affecting the state. Also, the newsletter provides information on upcoming training events, and has a monthly "Question of the Month" for recruiters regarding key eligibility issues. Currently, there are over 225 migrant personnel registered to receive the newsletter.

i. The Florida ID&R Office developed a code of ethics for recruiters and recruitment staff. The purpose of the code is to provide recruiters with the minimum expectations and responsibilities associated with the MEP. The code is to be reviewed every year to incorporate changes based in current issues affecting recruiters.

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.

Upon submission of the 2006 Re-Interview Initiative Report the FLDOE began the process of implementing the corrective actions described therein. The state has conducted statewide and regional training activities with recruitment staff regarding making proper eligibility determinations. In addition, LEAs were trained on how to corroborate information provided by families on the COEs. A state ID&R manual has been completed and disseminated, additionally; a quality control document has been developed and disseminated. An ID&R Office was established and staff was hired to specifically manage recruitment issues throughout the state. Significant changes to the COE were implemented, and key stakeholders were involved in recommending policy and guidance regarding eligibility to the state. At the local level, key corrective actions have been implemented as well. Many LEAs have initiated local re-interview processes using the protocols and forms developed by the state. The districts conduct re-interviews on an ongoing basis to validate eligibility determinations, particularly in situations where there is recently hired staff and unusual eligibility circumstances. The districts make sure that recruitment staff participates in all ID&R-related training provided by the state. In addition, the LEAs are compiling and updating a list of the major qualifying activities in their area. The districts also communicate, on a regular basis, with the ID&R office to discuss eligibility questions and review particular cases. Based on the number of questions received and the content of such questions, the ID&R Office provides guidance, through the e-newsletter, to clarify any ongoing issues related to eligibility determinations. In addition, the ID&R Office continuously schedules training with new staff at the districts. The ID&R office conducted a pilot study to ascertain the effectiveness of rolling re-interviews in the state. Nine districts, from different locations throughout the state, were selected to participate in the pilot. The study lasted from March to October, 2008. The purpose of the study was to determine the feasibility of conducting rolling re-interviews at the local level. A secondary purpose was to validate the re-interview form and protocols, as well as to familiarize local districts with the process. Initial findings and lessons learned suggest that, in order to conduct re-interviews effectively in the state, the district's size, the time of the year when re-interviews are conducted and the uniform training of re-interviewers needs to be considered. The ID&R office expanded the re-interview process to additional LEAs in 2009.

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 revised data element allows FDOE to produce preliminary reports and distribute these to school districts for further verification. Also, each District Migrant Coordinator is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the electronic records match the information on the COEs before the records are transmitted electronically to the State.

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 following verification process was used: A file broken down by LEA/district level containing student counts of all students reported in the data element Migrant Status Term code was sent to both MEP and MIS staff in each district on August 13, 2009, August 23, 2009, September 11, 2009, September 24, 2009 and November 10, 2009. Data was due to the state on August 7, 2009 and districts had until November 23, 2009 to verify this data and submit any corrections to the SEA.

Districts were to use the file to verify the accuracy of data coded into the state student data base system. Both the district Migrant Coordinator and district MIS Directors were provided with these data files. FLDOE advised all district MEP and MIS staff to work collaboratively to ensure that the student counts were accurate, unduplicated and that each student record met the No Child Left Behind Act definition of a migrant student. School districts were allowed to make updates to their data up to the last possible moment to ensure the greatest degree of accuracy possible. Analysts in the Department then produced the final migrant student count using the data set/file containing all corrections made by school districts during the verification phase.

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.

Customized training will be provided to districts based on the findings of the re-interview. Corrective actions will include:

- Increased visits by FLDOE/ID&R Office staff to specific districts;
- Accompany recruiters during ID&R efforts to identify errors, mistakes in interviewing techniques;
- Review of additional COEs to identify error patterns;
- Provide specific training to districts with high defect rates; and
- Conduct e-interviews with non-LEA personnel.

The ID&R Office will refine and implement a detailed plan for conducting random prospective re-interviews of migrant families throughout the state during 2010.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The FLDOE Migrant Education Program is assured of the accuracy of the migrant child counts reported for Fiscal Year 2008-2009.

Question #: 1.10.3.4 Program Office Response to State: How does the state check the status of students who were identified in the MEP during a prior year (whether or not they are currently enrolled)?

State Response: Students are identified on the current year student demographic format with Date of Birth and Qualifying arrival date filters specific to the current year. These students are reported with Migrant codes listed here - http://www.fldoe.org/eias/dataweb/database_0809/st201_1.pdf