

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

GEORGIA



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:
Georgia Department of Education

Address:
1966 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Levette Williams

Telephone: 404-463-6504

Fax: 404-651-0507

e-mail: lewillia@doe.k12.ga.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Kathy Cox, State Superintendent

Friday, March 12, 2010, 7:33:55 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.

No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned.

In early 2010 the English language arts standards will undergo a precision review; major revisions are not expected.

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.

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

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance 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	840,717		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,329		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,211		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	317,548		>97%
Hispanic	80,428		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	387,384		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	99,626		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	38,797		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	449,720		>97%
Migratory students	1,626		>97%
Male	426,846		>97%
Female	413,871		>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	23,772	24.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	66,996	67.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,075	8.2
Total	98,843	
Comments: This data is reported correctly. The difference of 24 is due to invalid test.		

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	840,971		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,330		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,251		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	317,591		>97%
Hispanic	80,490		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	387,466		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	99,663		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	36,491		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	449,866		>97%
Migratory students	1,627		>97%
Male	427,060		>97%
Female	413,876		>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	24,020	24.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	66,774	67.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,062	8.2
Total	98,856	
Comments: This data is reported correctly. The difference of 16 is due to invalid test.		

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	841,144		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,330		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,233		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	317,778		>97%
Hispanic	80,501		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	387,481		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	99,665		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	38,865		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	449,991		>97%
Migratory students	1,626		>97%
Male	427,076		>97%
Female	414,068		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	24,190	24.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	66,370	67.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,088	8.2
Total	98,648	
Comments: Data Are correct		

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	129,783	101,581	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	173	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,193	3,842	91.6
Black, non-Hispanic	48,189	32,404	67.2
Hispanic	14,514	11,037	76.0
White, non-Hispanic	57,772	50,150	86.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,507	8,475	54.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,238	8,056	71.7
Economically disadvantaged students	74,407	52,166	70.1
Migratory students	301	216	71.8
Male	66,707	51,223	76.8
Female	63,076	50,358	79.8
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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	129,547	116,416	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	192	89.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,091	3,906	95.5
Black, non-Hispanic	48,178	41,007	85.1
Hispanic	14,393	12,629	87.7
White, non-Hispanic	57,765	54,181	93.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,514	11,213	72.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,804	9,267	85.8
Economically disadvantaged students	74,237	63,476	85.5
Migratory students	294	250	85.0
Male	66,574	58,125	87.3
Female	62,958	58,281	92.6
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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	129,680	103,626	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	173	80.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,192	3,774	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	48,146	32,937	68.4
Hispanic	14,511	11,016	75.9
White, non-Hispanic	57,723	51,610	89.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,483	9,515	61.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,235	8,031	71.5
Economically disadvantaged students	74,325	53,179	71.6
Migratory students	300	215	71.7
Male	66,648	51,798	77.7
Female	63,032	51,828	82.2
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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	126,006	94,030	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	147	76.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,902	3,582	91.8
Black, non-Hispanic	46,541	28,744	61.8
Hispanic	13,264	9,409	70.9
White, non-Hispanic	57,434	48,508	84.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,608	7,434	47.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,743	4,911	63.4
Economically disadvantaged students	70,884	46,086	65.0
Migratory students	307	200	65.2
Male	64,416	47,573	73.8
Female	61,590	46,457	75.4
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	125,806	109,735	87.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	169	87.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,817	3,614	94.7
Black, non-Hispanic	46,525	37,821	81.3
Hispanic	13,164	11,092	84.3
White, non-Hispanic	57,426	52,831	92.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,615	9,962	63.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,353	5,795	78.8
Economically disadvantaged students	70,727	57,814	81.7
Migratory students	305	230	75.4
Male	64,313	53,981	83.9
Female	61,478	55,746	90.7
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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	125,919	98,104	77.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	154	79.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,901	3,513	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	46,514	30,082	64.7
Hispanic	13,256	9,541	72.0
White, non-Hispanic	57,387	50,934	88.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,594	8,863	56.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,736	4,886	63.2
Economically disadvantaged students	70,841	48,197	68.0
Migratory students	306	195	63.7
Male	64,369	50,335	78.2
Female	61,550	47,769	77.6
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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	125,818	110,324	87.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	183	89.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,986	3,824	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	47,230	38,764	82.1
Hispanic	12,670	11,002	86.8
White, non-Hispanic	57,415	52,709	91.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,086	9,710	60.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,396	4,219	78.2
Economically disadvantaged students	70,232	57,993	82.6
Migratory students	263	218	82.9
Male	64,182	54,904	85.5
Female	61,636	55,420	89.9
Comments:			

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.

1.3.2.3 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	125,578	116,026	92.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	195	95.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,911	3,775	96.5
Black, non-Hispanic	47,206	41,997	89.0
Hispanic	12,561	11,314	90.1
White, non-Hispanic	57,377	54,710	95.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,070	11,427	71.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,031	4,124	82.0
Economically disadvantaged students	70,065	62,341	89.0
Migratory students	261	220	84.3
Male	64,043	57,715	90.1
Female	61,517	58,300	94.8
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.3 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	125,700	95,877	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	177	87.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,984	3,541	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	47,195	30,236	64.1
Hispanic	12,660	8,617	68.1
White, non-Hispanic	57,352	49,823	86.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,059	8,387	52.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,394	2,637	48.9
Economically disadvantaged students	70,155	46,505	66.3
Migratory students	263	144	54.8
Male	64,110	48,612	75.8
Female	61,590	47,265	76.7
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	120,750	90,927	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	188	155	82.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,908	3,610	92.4
Black, non-Hispanic	45,708	29,171	63.8
Hispanic	11,680	8,363	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	55,360	46,540	84.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,428	6,369	44.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,664	2,702	57.9
Economically disadvantaged students	65,641	42,900	65.4
Migratory students	220	134	60.9
Male	61,756	45,737	74.1
Female	58,994	45,190	76.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.4 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	120,578	108,876	90.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	188	175	93.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,846	3,689	95.9
Black, non-Hispanic	45,702	39,540	86.5
Hispanic	11,579	10,126	87.4
White, non-Hispanic	55,348	51,737	93.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,422	9,350	64.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,291	3,358	78.3
Economically disadvantaged students	65,527	56,256	85.8
Migratory students	217	170	78.3
Male	61,658	53,790	87.2
Female	58,907	55,077	93.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.4 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	120,581	83,150	69.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	188	153	81.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,908	3,409	87.2
Black, non-Hispanic	45,638	24,139	52.9
Hispanic	11,674	7,226	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	55,272	45,348	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,390	6,158	42.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,663	2,050	44.0
Economically disadvantaged students	65,536	36,774	56.1
Migratory students	221	117	52.9
Male	61,660	43,077	69.9
Female	58,921	40,073	68.0
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	120,737	101,711	84.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	158	88.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,937	3,738	95.0
Black, non-Hispanic	45,977	35,246	76.7
Hispanic	11,500	9,421	81.9
White, non-Hispanic	55,586	50,053	90.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,547	7,968	54.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,278	2,883	67.4
Economically disadvantaged students	64,963	50,342	77.5
Migratory students	253	183	72.3
Male	61,904	50,709	81.9
Female	58,833	51,002	86.7
Comments:			

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	120,593	107,969	89.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	166	93.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,895	3,650	93.7
Black, non-Hispanic	45,979	39,295	85.5
Hispanic	11,392	9,764	85.7
White, non-Hispanic	55,579	51,793	93.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,533	9,134	62.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,810	2,751	72.2
Economically disadvantaged students	64,848	54,987	84.8
Migratory students	247	188	76.1
Male	61,811	53,263	86.2
Female	58,763	54,692	93.1
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.5 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	120,569	91,815	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	147	82.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,937	3,500	88.9
Black, non-Hispanic	45,899	29,159	63.5
Hispanic	11,490	8,176	71.2
White, non-Hispanic	55,513	47,955	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,499	6,843	47.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,275	2,126	49.7
Economically disadvantaged students	64,852	42,566	65.6
Migratory students	253	148	58.5
Male	61,797	46,306	74.9
Female	58,772	45,509	77.4
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,029	97,632	80.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	178	149	83.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,844	3,661	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	46,959	33,989	72.4
Hispanic	10,819	8,247	76.2
White, non-Hispanic	55,885	48,785	87.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,197	7,063	49.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,593	2,278	63.4
Economically disadvantaged students	63,814	46,149	72.3
Migratory students	192	126	65.6
Male	61,489	48,213	78.4
Female	59,540	49,419	83.0
Comments:			

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

1.3.2.6 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	120,832	113,337	93.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	179	171	95.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,799	3,657	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	46,931	43,012	91.6
Hispanic	10,707	9,675	90.4
White, non-Hispanic	55,862	53,612	96.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,200	10,259	72.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,215	2,505	77.9
Economically disadvantaged students	63,663	57,796	90.8
Migratory students	183	138	75.4
Male	61,367	56,241	91.6
Female	59,447	57,082	96.0
Comments: Data are correct			

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	120,717	78,702	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	177	137	77.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,844	3,253	84.6
Black, non-Hispanic	46,786	22,435	48.0
Hispanic	10,801	6,078	56.3
White, non-Hispanic	55,776	44,390	79.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,123	5,435	38.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,588	1,223	34.1
Economically disadvantaged students	63,595	32,749	51.5
Migratory students	192	70	36.5
Male	61,295	41,205	67.2
Female	59,422	37,497	63.1
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	94,141	72,805	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	170	144	84.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,392	3,130	92.3
Black, non-Hispanic	35,771	22,549	63.0
Hispanic	5,810	4,256	73.2
White, non-Hispanic	46,946	41,056	87.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,470	3,411	40.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,823	1,039	57.0
Economically disadvantaged students	38,392	25,171	65.6
Migratory students	86	51	59.3
Male	44,940	35,462	78.9
Female	49,201	37,343	75.9
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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	94,348	86,216	91.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	170	158	92.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,423	3,199	93.5
Black, non-Hispanic	35,813	31,164	87.0
Hispanic	5,864	5,070	86.5
White, non-Hispanic	47,023	44,688	95.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,515	5,063	59.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,777	1,187	66.8
Economically disadvantaged students	38,522	33,063	85.8
Migratory students	86	61	70.9
Male	45,140	40,306	89.3
Female	49,208	45,910	93.3
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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.

1.3.3.7 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	94,388	84,616	89.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	170	156	91.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,411	3,232	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	35,948	29,865	83.1
Hispanic	5,863	4,922	84.0
White, non-Hispanic	46,943	44,549	94.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,500	5,235	61.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,869	1,285	68.8
Economically disadvantaged students	38,565	31,999	83.0
Migratory students	85	71	83.5
Male	45,086	40,508	89.8
Female	49,302	44,108	89.5
Comments: Data reported correctly.			

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 C SPR 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	2,172	1,867	86.0
Districts	186	74	39.8
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	1,292	1,116	86.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,161	1,010	87.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	131	106	80.9
Comments:			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
186	73	39.2
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement 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	74
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	38
Other major restructuring of the school governance	
Comments:	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Georgia selected the best answer it could based on the choices provided, but it is not entirely accurate. It is unconstitutional for the state to take over schools in Georgia. Under the statewide single accountability system (SSAS), Georgia State Board of Education Rule 160--7-1-.04 (http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/_documents/doe/legalservices/160-7-1-.04.pdf) does require that any and all Georgia schools in NI-5 or higher (State Directed Status per the state's Differentiated Accountability (DA) plan) enter into a state contract with the GaDOE. For specifics, please see the SBOE Rule, the Georgia DA Plan and the GaDOE School Improvement website at http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/tss_school.aspx. In the future, It might be helpful if EDEN could provide an "Other" response for those states who might need to answer differently

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.

In order to address the problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action, the Georgia Department of education is doing the following:

- 1 The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) is providing the services of Lead School Improvement Specialists (with expertise in analysis and planning) for 37 NI Systems. These specialists meet with the appropriate school district staff responsible for improvement on a periodic basis during the year. The specialists initially work with the district personnel to ensure that the districts have viable improvement plans and that the plans adequately address the data issues within the system that have significant impact on AYP. Guidance is provided via the System Fieldbook, which has specific directions for completing the Comprehensive LEA Improvement Plans (CLIP). These specialists assist the school systems in the development and/or revision of these plans (CLIP). During the year, the GaDOE specialists meet with system personnel to check progress in the implementation of these plans and make suggestions on implementation issues that may arise. In the case of districts in Corrective Action, Guidance is provided in the System Fieldbook for the development of addenda to the CLIP (LEA Corrective Action Addendum). The assigned specialists assist these districts in the development of the LEA Corrective Action Addendum and make follow-up visits to check progress and address implementation issues.
- 2 The Georgia Department of Education provided Title I School Improvement Grants (1003 (a) and 1003 (a) ARRA for Title I NI schools within the systems that are in needs improvement. These grants are used to fund the school CLIP and/or the LEA Corrective Action Addendum for the Title I NI schools within the systems.
- 3 The Georgia Department of Education provided services school improvement support for schools within the system:
 - o For Title I schools in NI 1-2, school improvement services were provided by a RESA School Improvement Specialist
 - o For schools in NI 3-4, school improvement services were provided by GaDOE School Improvement Specialists
 - o For Title I schools in NI 5 and higher, school improvement services were provided by a GaDOE State Director, who assisted the schools in implementing the terms of an improvement contract. In cases of schools in NI levels 7 and higher during 2008-2009, the ratio of State Directors to schools was 1:1.

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	3
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	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	2	2
Schools	132	22
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	07/31/09
---	----------

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	91,142	
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	62,906	
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	69.0	
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	93,627	
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	79,958	
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	85.4	
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	115
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	49
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	77
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.
5	Short Term Action Plan and Monitoring Process-In State Directed schools (NI levels 5 and higher), a process was implemented whereby manageable parts of the school improvement plan were targeted for implementation on a 45-60 day cycle. Each period, the degree and impact of implementation was monitored formally by the assigned State Director and a Lead State Director. Determinations were made as to what needed more work and the plan was re-cycled for the next period.	43	17	30	D	The short term action plan format systemitizes the approach to monitoring of the improvement interventions in a school. INcreased accountability and responsibility for the work is another product of thi approach. The STAP enalbes a schools to do fewer things better and see real results. with specific interventions.
2	(Observations with Feedback)	185	49	109	D	Credibility and trust is heightened when GaDOE specialist can demonstrate research based practices ad help teachers to identify areas for improvement through focused obserations and timely, descriptive feedback.
						Clarityof expectations and an intensified sense

3	(Improvement Contract)	43	17	30	A	of accountability are effects of the use of an improvemet contract. Entering into an agreement also helps to create an improvement collaborative between the SEA and LEA and school.
						Focused professional learning that is correlated to the needs of the students in NI schools makes for direct
4	(Professional Learning)	43	17	30	D	hits on schools improvement targets. Teachers get more out of job-imbedded learning that has relevance for their attempts to improve academic standards.
1	(GAPSS Analysis)	27	9	22	A	Participation in a GAPSS Analysis familiarizes the entire school faculty with the School Keys (Georgi's school performance standards). The process gives a tight focus to the improvement efforts in the school. GAPSS data helps a school leadership team to work "smarter." School Keys, measured by the GAPSS Analysis, is correlated with Leader Keys and with CLASS Keys.
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.

Georgia's Statewide system of Support includes the use of School Improvement Specialists serving schools in NI 1-4 and State Directors serving schools in NI 5 and higher. These improvement specialists supported schools receiving 1003 9a) and (g) funds on a regular basis. School Improvement Specialists were assigned to schools on a 1:4 basis and State Directors were assigned to schools on a 1:1 basis (full time). these specialists worked closely with the principal and the school leadership teams to design the best approach for improvement. They assisted with the development of the improvement plans, including data analysis, identification of target areas for improvement, implementation and monitoring of implementation and impact. Each specialist was charged with conducting classroom observations and providing feedback during each visit to the schools. A team of specialists conducted Mandatory GAPSS Analyses in NI 5 and 7 Schools and the specialists serving the schools followed up with the school in the implementation of the recommendations generated from the GAPSS Analyses. The use of Short Term Action Plans (STAP) was mandated in NI 5 and higher schools and encouraged in NI 4 schools. These plans provided focus on a manageable number of interventions from the school improvement plans and utilized a formal system for monitoring the implementation and impact of the plans on a 45-60 day cycle. This approach provided added accountability for the work of school improvement. Each NI 5 and higher school had an improvement contract with the Georgia Department of Education. These contracts provided for customizations and included non-negotiables whether applicable. The improvement contracts set the direction fo the school improvement work to be done in the school. Targeted, data-driven professional learning was provided and/or brokered by simplmentation needed. State Direcdcted schools (NI 5 and higher) received professional learning via a summer leadership academy and through follow-up activities during the year in Active Literacy, Data Teams, Formative Assessment and Thinking Maps. Implementation expectations were developed and monitored by specialists serving the schools.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

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

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

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The use of the Title I part A, 1003 (g) funds falls into two categories:

- 1 Salaries for State Directors
- 2 School Improvement Grants

State Directors are the link from the GaDOE to the school for technical assistance. A set of assurances is used to clarify acceptable use of the funds. The State Directed status, created by the federally approved Differentiated Accountability Plan, is guided by an improvement contract. In effect the State Director, who is assigned to a State Directed school on a full-time basis serves to ensure that the elements of the Improvement Contract are carried out. Technical assistance is given in the areas of:

-Replacement of staff (input in decision-making) -Implementation of instructional frameworks -Administration of benchmark assessments
-Implementation of short-term action plans (STAP) -Analysis of teacher attendance data and development of action plans if applicable
-Analysis of student attendance data and development of action plans if applicable -Analysis of discipline data and development of action plans if applicable

-Addressing target areas from the GAPSS Analysis -Participation in the CLASS Keys teacher evaluation system participation and follow-through with expectations of required professional

The school improvement grants are provided in order to support schools in implementing their school improvement initiatives, in effect, funding the school improvement plans. State Directors and Atlanta staff provide assistance as needed to help schools ensure alignment between the plans for expending grant funds and the content of the school improvement plan. Periodic monitoring of the school improvement grant expenditures is done by the State Directors and other GaDOE school improvement field staff.

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.

One action that is not funded by Title I 1003 (a) or (g) is a voluntary GAPSS analysis. Schools in Needs Improvement that are not in NI 5 and 7 may request that the GaDOE conduct voluntary GAPSS Analyses. These GAPSS Analyses were coordinated by state-paid school improvement specialists with special expertise in the GAPSS Analysis process. The GAPSS Analysis measures the degree of implementation of Georgia's school performance standards (School Keys). The process utilizes perception, survey and classroom observation data and results in a concise list of target areas for school improvement. A positive relationship has been documented between schools undergoing the GAPSS Analysis and schools making AYP. Another action supported by funds other than Title I 1003 (a) or (g) funds is the technical support of NI 4 schools by state-paid School Improvement Specialists. These specialists attempt to mirror the effective practices of the State Directors who are assisting the NI 5 and higher schools. In particular, they monitor the fidelity of the implementation of 45-60 day Short Term Action Plans (STAPs) and also monitor the impact of these plans on student achievement. These specialists conduct classroom observations and provide feedback to teachers upon each school visit. They provide technical assistance as schools develop, implement and monitor school improvement plans. Georgia's Statewide System of Support (SSOS) provides for what are referred to as Regional Support Team Meetings. These meetings are held in the five school improvement regions of the state. At these meetings, led by the GaDOE school improvement field staff, the GaDOE staff and all partners in school improvement review the work of school improvement in case study fashion. These sessions spotlight the real work of school improvement as the varied partners share real school issues and ideas on possible next steps to make the work more effective. These meetings are also used to monitor pre-determined benchmarks for school improvement initiatives identified for the year.

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	164,164
Applied to transfer	7,510
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	6,102

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	\$ 7,576,744

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	26

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	34,422
Applied for supplemental educational services	17,818
Received supplemental educational services	12,379
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	\$ 12,584,289
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	284,117	277,689	97.7	6,428	2.3
All elementary classes	84,301	82,658	98.0	1,643	2.0
All secondary classes	199,816	195,031	97.6	4,785	2.4

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.

No Response

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.

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	20.4
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	2.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	77.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	24.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	74.5
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools			
Low-poverty Elementary Schools			
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools			
Low-Poverty secondary Schools			

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	75.8	39.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced	
Secondary schools	75.7	39.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Although at this time, dual language programs are not widely implemented in Georgia, there are three programs, two of which are offered in charter schools, that have been developed and are expanding their classes on an annual basis. Other LEAS are expressing increased interest in pursuing the implementation of dual language as a program model. LEAs also utilize the Push-in and SIOP models. The Push-in model allows the ESOL or ESOL-endorsed teacher to enter the regular education classroom and work directly with ELLs in the classroom to provide language support. The SIOP model incorporates the use of specific strategies to ensure that academic content material taught in the classroom is comprehensible to ELLs, promoting development of English language proficiency. SIOP was created to provide teachers with a well articulated and practical method of sheltered instruction that facilitates high quality instruction for ELLs in content areas.

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	80,825
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.	68,716
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	64,028
No linguistic content; Not applicable	3,491
Vietnamese	2,223
Korean	2,069
Chinese	1,148

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

The category "No linguistic content" listed above as the second most commonly spoken language represents GA LEP students who speak "Other African" languages. The GA language code individually lists the primary African languages spoken by GA LEP students, but does not list each African language separately. French and Portuguese are the sixth and seventh most commonly spoken languages by ELLs in Georgia.

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	73,072
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	7,753
Total	80,825
Comments: Only K-12 English Language Learners, coded ELL-Y, are included in the total count of LEP students tested on the annual state ELP assessment. Students are coded ELL-Y (LEP-Y) upon determination of eligibility and remain coded as such until their status changes to ELL-M (LEP-M). ACCESS for ELLs is the annual ELP assessment. In Georgia, it is administered during a specific testing window between late January and the beginning of March. Students who enter GA schools outside the ACCESS testing window dates are reported as ELL-Y upon screening and meeting eligibility requirements; however, if they are not enrolled during the ELP testing window, the ACCESS cannot be administered to them. Because this population is highly mobile, a significant number of ELLs may miss the testing window while still being included in the total count of LEP students in the state.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	10,073
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	13.8
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	71,118
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	7,595
Total	78,713
Comments: As noted in the comment section for 1.6.3.1.1, the ACCESS for ELLs annual ELP assessment is given only during a clearly defined testing window; however, students who enter at any time during the school year and are identified as eligible for language assistance services are coded as ELL-Y in the Student Record database. Therefore, the number of ELLs not tested on the State annual ELP assessment includes ELL-Y students who were enrolled in Georgia schools outside the testing window.	
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.	23,982

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	31,337	55.7		48.00
ELP attainment	11,330	20.2		5.00

Comments: GA does not use number (#) of students as a target for making Progress or ELP Attainment; all targets are based solely on percentages. The system would not allow us to enter "N/A" as a response in the blank for Target numbers.

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: Georgia provides content testing in English only.

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)
None
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the 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
11,516	7,907	19,423
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
11,948	10,354	86.7	1,594
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
11,953	11,190	93.6	763
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
11,752	9,407	80.0	2,345
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	87
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	76
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	86
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	80
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	82
# -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)	1
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	9
# -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
31,102	9,042	113

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: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) ù The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course ù (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	2,075
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	215

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.

The estimated number of additional certified/licensed teachers needed for Title III language instruction is based on the expectation that the total ELL student population in Georgia will grow by approximately 10%, or 9,000 students, over the next five years. The number 215 resulted from dividing 9,000 new students by 42, the number of students the state funding formula anticipates being assigned to a teacher. This estimate takes into account that new families are not moving into the state due to the recession, but also considers the fact that Georgia is a key refugee relocation center and will therefore continue to experience an increase in ELL students. Additionally, the largest population of new ELLs entering Georgia public schools is in Kindergarten; many of those future public school students may already be living in the state. Georgia currently has a total of 8,553 individuals who hold a valid teaching credential for ESOL, either a teaching certificate or an ESOL endorsement that has been added to an existing teaching certificate. Many of these teachers are general education teachers who have added the credential in order to better serve ELLs in mainstream classrooms.

* 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	86	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	87	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	64	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	64	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	87	
Other (Explain in comment box)	53	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	87	24,067
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	87	3,724
PD provided to principals	68	889
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	54	528
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	47	632
PD provided to community based organization personnel	23	326
Total	87	30,166

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "other" category encompasses subgrantees who had teachers or administrators enrolled in the Georgia ESOL Endorsement course sequence in their own courses offered by the school district directly, at a Regional Education Service Agency (RESA), or at a college or university. It also includes subgrantees who had teachers and administrators engaged in SIOP training. Both of these professional development activities encompass more than one of the types of professional development activities listed above. The total number of subgrantees offering professional development is 90, or 100% of all subgrantees. Many of the subgrantees offered more than one type of professional development to more than one group of participants.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

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

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/08/08	08/14/08	36
Comments: The Georgia State Board of Education approves all grant awards to local school systems. The GSBOE meets on the second Thursday of each month. It takes several weeks to calculate grant amounts and prepare and route Board Item for approval once a grant award has been received.		

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.

We are considering preparing an Item for Information for the State Board of Education prior to receiving the grant award. This is not standard operating procedure; however, it could possibly allow us to make the grant funds available more quickly.

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: Georgia does not have any Persistently Dangerous Schools. File N130 was uploaded with a "No" indicator for all schools resulting in "zero" schools. EDEN Partner Support indicated that "zero" answer would result in blank field for this report.	

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	75.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	77.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	69.2
Hispanic	65.5
White, non-Hispanic	80.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	37.7
Limited English proficient	50.2
Economically disadvantaged	67.0
Migratory students	24.5
Male	72.0
Female	78.8
Comments: The Graduation Rate submitted for the American Indian or Alaska Native population is correct as reported.	

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	3.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	4.0
Hispanic	4.2
White, non-Hispanic	3.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.4
Limited English proficient	4.2
Economically disadvantaged	4.1
Migratory students	3.4
Male	4.3
Female	2.9
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	150	101
LEAs with subgrants	30	30
Total	180	131
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)	180	223
K	1,089	1,516
1	1,036	1,391
2	919	1,384
3	875	1,428
4	820	1,294
5	739	1,195
6	676	935
7	746	987
8	703	978
9	615	1,207
10	426	801
11	267	598
12	399	652
Ungraded		
Total	9,490	14,589
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	1,369	2,829
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,470	10,728
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	118	513
Hotels/Motels	1,244	1,986
Total	9,201	16,056
Comments: One subgrantee failed to report data to the SIS. The numbers do not match because the information came from two different sources and gathered at two different times.		

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)	218
K	1,467
1	1,363
2	1,345
3	1,392
4	1,255
5	1,164
6	911
7	963
8	951
9	1,183
10	795
11	590
12	637
Ungraded	
Total	14,234
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	895
Migratory children/youth	111
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,394
Limited English proficient students	838
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	29
Expedited evaluations	23
Staff professional development and awareness	29
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	29
Transportation	29
Early childhood programs	25
Assistance with participation in school programs	29
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	28
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	29
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	29
Coordination between schools and agencies	29
Counseling	28
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	28
Clothing to meet a school requirement	28
School supplies	29
Referral to other programs and services	29
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	28
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.

This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth survey. One grantee failed to submit data to this source.

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	6
School Selection	9
Transportation	16
School records	13
Immunizations	14
Other medical records	10
Other Barriers – in comment box below	7

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Barriers:

Parent involvement; transportation; uniform policy; registration documents; clothing, school supplies.

This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth survey.

Two grantees failed to report data to this source.

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	1,710	1,398
4	1,600	1,239
5	1,527	1,288
6	1,232	995
7	1,277	1,034
8	1,227	1,061
High School	581	466
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	1,711	1,109
4	1,607	926
5	1,535	1,159
6	1,234	716
7	1,283	922
8	1,235	796
High School	582	337
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

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

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-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)	820
K	814
1	504
2	507
3	410
4	395
5	381
6	325
7	296
8	328
9	281
10	234
11	159
12	127
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	4,310
Total	9,894
Comments: The decrease is less than 10%.	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease is less than 10%.

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)	184
K	295
1	175
2	167
3	129
4	159
5	109
6	108
7	92
8	69
9	43
10	24
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	18
Total	1,582
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 increase is less than 10%.

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.

COEstar was used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. The child counts for the last reporting period were also generated using the COEstar system.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Note: This information pertains to both the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Upon enrollment in the Migrant Education Program (MEP), information from the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is entered into COEstar by a trained Georgia Department of Education Migrant Education Agency (MEA) data specialist.

Data on the COE includes:

- (1) Family data (parent/guardian name(s), family language, current address, and home base)
 - (2) Child data (name, sex, race, date of birth, birthplace, school, grade, and school enrollment date)
 - (3) Eligibility data (where moved from, where moved to, with/to join or on his/her own move, date of move, qualifying worker, qualifying activity, employer, whether work is seasonal or temporary, whether work is agricultural or fishing related, whether move was for economic necessity)
 - (4) Residency date
 - (5) Comments explaining migrant work history and qualifying activity as identified in the eligibility section
 - (6) Other data (previous school enrollments, etc.)
 - (7) Parent/Guardian and recruiter signatures
- All of the above information is obtained through a face-to-face interview with the family, generally at their residence or workplace by a trained regional MEA office GaDOE recruiter/employee or a trained LEA migrant staff person. Occasionally, the family interview occurs when parents come to the school to register their children. In all cases, the COE is completed and submitted to the appropriate regional MEA office for processing. COEs are completed on each new family/self-eligible youth identified by the MEA recruiter/employee or LEA staff during the initial interview. Identification and recruitment (ID & R) activities are carried out year round. Occasionally, ID & R activities are conducted as a part of other MEA or LEA activities, e.g., summer festivals, migrant health fairs.

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 GaDOE employs a single, full-time MEP state data collections coordinator and a full-time state data specialist. Each MEA regional office has one full time data specialist. The primary responsibility of the state data collections coordinator is to monitor/maintain the statewide data system, update the data in COEstar and the national migrant student information exchange (MSIX) system, as well as generate reports and queries as requested by the GaDOE and the LEAs.

Every day the data specialists from each of the four regional offices send electronic copies of their COEstar database to the state data specialist. (Each regional office has a complete statewide copy of the COEstar database.) The state data specialist synchronizes each copy, running checks to catch any duplication, errors, and/or missing data. If problems with the data are detected, the state data specialist sends an e-mail to the appropriate MEA data specialist, the appropriate MEA coordinator, and the state program director, explaining the problem. When the MEA data specialist has corrected the problem, she sends a secure e-mail with the corrections to inform the state data specialist, the state program director, and the MEA office coordinator that the problematic data have been corrected. When this review process is complete, the state data specialist then uploads an updated, corrected copy of the COEstar database to each MEA data specialist.

Because each regional MEA office and the State Data Collections Office have complete copies of the COEstar database, many errors and duplicates are caught at the regional level. Each month the state data collections coordinator prepares a performance report to provide an overview of every aspect of the COEstar database for the state program director. If the state program director sees any problems, these are communicated by e-mail to the state data collections coordinator for resolution.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for both counts were collected and maintained using the same set of procedures.

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 GaMEP uses the following processes to calculate each child count:

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)

Response: COEstar is programmed to produce a count based on all the eligibility criteria contained in the federal statute.

Children who were resident in your State for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/1-8/31)

Response: COEstar's Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the state during the period. These include checking the school year listed on school enrollment records, the qualifying arrival date(QAD), residency dates, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, departure dates, LEP, needs assessment, graduation/termination dates, special services dates, and health record dates performed in the state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if departure dates indicate that they left before the period began, or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the state when the period began.

Children who -in the case of category 2 -received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term:

Response: Each summer or intersession term, the local project director forwards a report to the regional MEA office containing the number of eligible migrant children or youth who received services (instructional or support) at least one day during the summer or intersession term. The data regarding the particulars of the services are entered into the individual student's information/school history line in COEstar.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

Response: The state data collections coordinator runs COEstar's Performance Reporter, which has a number of programmed interventions to count migrant children only once, state wide, for the period specified in the state data collections coordinator query. Some of these interventions include checking names that are the same or similar, checking the maiden name of the child's mother, and checking the date and place of birth, the QAD, etc..

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count was generated using the same system as the Category 1 count.

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.

It is the goal of the Georgia MEP to achieve and maintain 100% accuracy in its recruiting processes. Important new quality control steps and processes have been implemented in recent years at the MEA and state levels to improve the GaDOE's ability to ensure and verify the accuracy of eligibility determinations prior to or immediately after entering eligibility information in the COEstar system. They are:

Ongoing Recruiter Training All MEA and LEA migrant staff members are provided mandatory ID & R training throughout the year. They attend in-services on: The Migrant Education Program The role of recruitment How to apply the eligibility section of the Non-Regulatory Guidance How to resolve difficult recruitment cases How to conduct interviews How to fill out a COE The Identification and Recruitment Handbook Effective recruitment techniques Records maintenance/documentation

All program staff members (including LEA funded staff) are required to attend these training sessions. The staff are required to pass a series of assessments to certify their understanding of the state's recruiting policies and guidelines. Passing scores will be mandatory in order to receive a satisfactory annual evaluation from program administrators. All full time recruiters are required to meet at least once every quarter with the state ID & R coordinator to review any change in guidelines, discuss policies, procedures, and to discuss and resolve difficult or ambiguous recruitment cases. All newly hired recruiting staff participate in an initial three day recruitment training session prior to beginning any recruitment effort for the state. All new recruiters also have all their paperwork fully screened by an experienced recruiter until they successfully complete at least ten enrollments with no errors that would require follow up with the families.

Certificate of Eligibility (COE) Processing

Statewide uniformity at the MEA level in processing COEs for data system entry is as follows:

MEA recruiters/employees recruit families or youth by completing a COE in a face-to-face interview.

Written information recorded during the interview is verbally reviewed by the recruiter/employee for accuracy. The recruiter/employee then signs the form and asks the interviewee to sign as well.

The pink copy is immediately given to the interviewee as a record of the eligibility interview.

The original (white copy), along with the recruiter or LEA copy (yellow) go to the regional data specialist.

The COE is date stamped upon arrival at the regional office.

The data specialist reviews the COE for completion to ensure that all boxes are marked and that the COE is filled out according to the state's completion instructions as described in the GaDOE MEP ID & R Handbook (2007 Edition).

If the COE meets all of the necessary criteria, the data specialist initials it in the top right hand corner. It is then given to the regional MEA office coordinator for final review and approval.

If the data specialist sees that an item is missing or believes that an item needs clarification, she records the date and concern(s) in a log, retains a copy of the COE, and returns the original white and yellow copy to the recruiter/employee who conducted the interview. The request is made in writing that the recruiter/employee correct and/or provide additional comments or corrections. The recruiter/employee is required to go back to the family for any additional information and both must initial the changes on the form. A data specialist can correct and initial spelling mistakes without having to notify the recruiter or family/youth.

As mentioned, the data specialist maintains a list of concerns that are encountered, and the name of the recruiter/employee submitting the COE in question. This assists in monitoring errors as they arise. The regional MEA office is responsible for (1) resolving outstanding issues/discrepancies and (2) providing feedback and training to individual recruiters as the need arises.

All COEs receive regional MEA office coordinator verification and approval prior to being entered into the COEstar system. A signature line is included on the original and yellow copy of the COE for this purpose.

As errors and discrepancies are resolved, the information on the COE is entered into the COEstar system.

The original COE and the electronic COE are maintained at the regional office.

The yellow copy is sent to the original interviewer. The data specialists and recruiters/employees work as a team. They consult with each other to resolve issues and answer questions that

may arise. If there are issues that the data specialists and recruiters/employees are unable to resolve independently, they will consult with the regional MEA office coordinators immediately to resolve the issues.

Any issues, which the region is unable to resolve independently, are referred to the state ID & R coordinator. If at any time the state ID & R coordinator is unable to answer the question, it is referred to the Migrant Education Office within the United States Department of Education in Washington, DC for assistance.

Should a question arise from any source regarding an eligibility determination made on a child, the state takes action on the question or concern by requesting that a re-interview be conducted. The form that is utilized is the same as that used in the random sample rolling reinterview process and is available from the State MEP Data Collections Office.

The process for evaluating the eligibility determination follows that of the rolling re-interview process.

The state, itself, is solely responsible for reviewing and monitoring the quality of its migrant student eligibility documentation as it relates to the annual child count, including student eligibility data related to attendance in regular year and summer/intersession projects. All eligibility decisions are finalized and made by the coordinator in each of the state's regional MEA offices prior to the delivery of any MEP services. Every child's eligibility documentation is included for selection in the random sample process associated with the quality control efforts of the state's rolling re-interviews.

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.

On the first working day of each month, the MEP Data Collections Office runs a query generating a statewide list of COEs entered the month before. The same office determines the random sample size required for the month in each MEA region, either five percent or ten COEs, whichever is greater. The random selection is done following the protocol established by the state data collections coordinator. More than the required amount is pulled to allow for substitutions due to moves or the inability to locate interviewees.

Exceptions: a. If a region does not generate at least 64 COEs during a given month (except for the month of August, for which quality control must take place in September regardless of the number of COEs), the MQC for the region will be postponed until the following month, or until the region has generated at least 64 COEs. 15% of 64 COEs is equal to ten re-interviews.

B. Some migrant workers are more highly mobile than others. This fact could mean that a migrant worker has already departed and is no longer in residence during the MQC period. When a region experiences a high degree of migrant mobility and the MQC process is continually turning up workers who have already departed -thus making it difficult for the region to meet its monthly re-interview requirement -the following procedure should be followed:

A region may cease in its effort to meet the monthly QC quota only after the region has attempted to contact at least 15% of the COEs generated during the previous month. At that point, it is sufficient to cease the effort because it has clearly been documented that there was a high level of migrant mobility and that, in all likelihood, the original eligibility determinations were accurate. Documenting that an individual/family has departed requires three attempts (visits) or confirmation from a reliable source (other family member, crew leader, farmer, school official) that the individual/family has departed. In both exception cases, the regional MEA coordinator will electronically inform the state ID & R coordinator which situation has occurred. This communiqué will become a permanent part of that month's MQC analysis for the state.

The data specialists make photocopies of the original COE corresponding to each COE selected. The COE copies will be given to the regional MEA coordinator for distribution to reviewers, along with the verification forms generated by the MEP Data Collections Office. The regional MEA coordinator chooses the most appropriate reviewer for the verification of eligibility re-interview. It is expected that the verification will be done by a trained reviewer different than the original interviewer. The data specialist maintains a log of who is in charge of completing the verification of each COE for the regional office and distributes the paperwork for completion.

Conducting the Verification Process in the Field All verification of eligibly MUST be done through a face-to-face interview with the original interviewee. The reviewer completing the verification of eligibility should only use phone calls to set up appointments. On the day of the verification, the reviewer in charge can be accompanied by another recruiter or LEA staff member, but not by the same person who originally signed the family. The reviewer doing the verification explains, in a positive manner, the reason why this quality control measure is taking place. If it is determined that a family has departed, the reviewer will document who provided the information using a comment such as: "Departed per aunt, neighbor," etc. The interviewer signs and dates the certification form and moves to the next COE from the random sample. If the reviewer finds an interviewee not at home, he or she makes at least three attempts to locate or meet with the individual before moving to the next COE from the random sample. Each try takes place at different dates and hours of the day and each one is documented in the top section of the verification form. After the third try, the reviewer circles the last visit documentation notation.

The reviewer then enters a comment such as: "3 attempts unable to locate," on the space provided for the parent's signature. The reviewer signs and dates the verification form. Each field of the verification form in sections IV and V must be completed by the reviewer. If one of the fields does not apply, a N/A notation is used. The reviewer is free to paraphrase any of the questions in order to clarify the meaning of a question to the family, but must not use any leading questions. The COE is available only to help the reviewer to organize his/her thoughts and understand the eligibility decision prior to the reinterview.

The reviewer must not refer to previously recorded facts or show the COE to the family. At the end of the visit, the reviewer verbally reviews the data entered on the verification form with the interviewee and dates the verification form. If the interviewee is unable to write or sign, a witnessed mark can take the place of the signature. If the interviewee refuses to sign, the reviewer makes a notation of it and the reason, if any reason is given. The lack of a signature has no impact on eligibility or ineligibility and the verification is still considered valid. The reviewer in charge of the eligibility verification has until the end of the month to deliver the completed forms to the respective regional MEA coordinator.

Completing Final Paperwork The data specialist uses the electronic spreadsheet for her region contained in the "Monthly Quality Control" Excel document to enter the results of the re-interviews. Information is entered for each randomly selected COE used during the MQC process, whether the verification attempt was successful or not. This Excel document is sent as an electronic attachment to the state ID & R coordinator and the state data collections coordinator by the first Friday of the following month. The regional MEA coordinator compiles a folder that contains the following completed documents: -A hard copy of the "Monthly Quality Control" Excel document, acting as a cover page -Each of the verified COEs attached to the back of its respective "Verification of Migrant Child/Youth Program Eligibility" form -Each verification form is numbered in the top right corner, in the order in which they were entered in the electronic spreadsheet Copies of the COEs and the verification forms are mailed to the state ID & R coordinator no later than seven working days after the end of the month. The original folder is filed and available for audit at the regional office. The regional MEA coordinator takes immediate appropriate action facilitating data correction of any misidentified children or families. The data specialist prepares the letters to notify any misidentified families by mail by the beginning of the second week of the following month. The data specialist notifies the appropriate school districts in writing of the misidentified families with a request to remove migrant coding and cease services immediately. The state data collections coordinator removes the misidentified children listed on the Excel document and the regional offices receive the corrected database through the daily transfer of information. Misidentified children's information is never permanently erased.

For this reporting period, 551 re-interviews were attempted to reach the required 231. 193 were successfully completed, and 186 (96.37%) were found eligible. The state was able to conduct only 193 out of 551 because of high mobility rates (departures) within the sample and/or an inability to find the required interviewee after making three separate attempts at different times of the day.

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.

At the beginning of each school year and through a process managed at the MEA level by the coordinator, each child enrolled in the previous school year is re-signed. This means each family is contacted, existing data is verified, and updated information is secured. A new COE is not created, unless there has been a new qualifying move. The previous COE is recertified with any updated information or necessary corrections.

As the primary component of its program eligibility monitoring, the state began conducting monthly random samplings of newly identified students in each of its four regional areas in February, 2006. The sampling size has been equal to 5% of the region's previous month's recruitment or at least 10 families, but no more than 20. This process has significantly helped to ensure that child count data are maintained accurately.

At the same time, the state also put in place a request for eligibility re-certification process that now allows any individual with a legitimate concern regarding a child's eligibility for MEP services to petition for an eligibility re-certification on the child. Cases are handled by staff from the regional MEA offices following the same procedures and protocol established for conducting the monthly random samplings.

In addition to a random sample re-interview, at any time during the year and based upon the COE stored in COEstar, a determination of eligibility is relatively simple. The qualifying arrival date (QAD) listed on the COE is tested for the eligibility range. The residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is run. The age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he or she can be counted for funding/services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). Examples of additional checks include a comparison of like or nearly like names by looking at other demographic data (e.g., birth date, grade, gender, mother's maiden name, etc).

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.

COEstar is a separate, but at the same time integrated component of Georgia's statewide student information collection with appropriate checks and balances performed in an ongoing manner annually. Each spring, the LEAs must match their migrant coding in Student Record to the COEstar system before they are able to sign off on their data submission for the year. This helps to eliminate or correct coding and reporting errors in both systems. In addition, the COEstar Performance Reporter is run monthly to be sent to the state MEP director and regional MEA coordinators for review. This report is intended to catch obvious errors continuously throughout the program year rather than waiting until the end of the year.

As a final check for accuracy, the state MEP director is provided the data gleaned by the Performance Reporter in an Excel workbook covering the entire program year. The State MEP director reviews the data provided looking for anomalies and areas of confusion and/or contradictory data. When errors or problems are noted, immediate consultation with the state data collections coordinator, TROMIK (COEstar provider), and the regional MEA data specialists is initiated by the state director for explanation, review, and correction until the information is considered to be as accurate as possible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since beginning the monthly rolling re-interview process in February, 2006 and at the conclusion of each month's work, a plan is established by the state to address, through corrective actions and improvements, any issues that led to any incorrect eligibility determinations uncovered during the previous month's re-interviews. Such plans are documented in the state's monthly re-interview quality control summary report.

During the reporting period, 9/1/08 to 8/31/09, the state identified 7 (3.63%) children out of 193 whose re-interview information led to the conclusion that they were ineligible for program services. The reasons for changing the eligibility status of these 7 children were: the family was signed as seeking qualifying work without the required prior history of moves to obtain qualifying work, the intention of the move was for non-agricultural work, the worker admitted to giving false information in order to obtain services, the family did not establish residency, they commuted to their job, the move was a 'to join move' that exceeded the allowed time for such a move, the intention of the move was a permanent relocation to the new school district.

The following is a summary of the corrective actions taken as a result of the rolling re-interview process during the reporting period:

All recruiters at fault were contacted individually and specific re-training was delivered on the problematic areas identified. Additionally, training covering the problematic points discovered during the re-interviews was integrated into the mandatory ID & R training that all staff responsible for recruiting receives during the year.

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 child counts being reported are accurate and are based on an eligibility determination process that is well structured and sound.